



Final evaluation of the Institutional
University Cooperation with Eduardo
Mondlane University

Table of contents

ACRONYMS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1. Introduction	12
1.1. <i>Background</i>	12
1.1.1. What is an IUC?	12
1.1.2. The IUC with UEM	12
1.1.3. Terms of Reference of the evaluation	14
1.2. <i>UEM and its context</i>	14
1.2.1. Government policies	15
1.3. <i>Evaluation methodology and process</i>	22
1.4. <i>Structure of the evaluation report</i>	25
2. Evaluation	26
2.1. <i>Evaluation of Desafio at the programme level</i>	26
2.1.1. Relevance	26
2.1.2. Effectiveness	30
2.1.3. Efficiency	37
2.1.4. Sustainability	44
2.1.5. Impact	47
2.2. <i>Evaluation of Desafio at project level</i>	51
2.2.1. Overview of the projects: description of the main output	51
2.2.2. Project 1: on the right to health and sexual and reproductive rights in the context of HIV/AIDS	54
2.2.3. Project 2: to develop and strengthen the academic capacity of UEM in the field of social rights/social protection and to ensure evidence-based knowledge and expertise	62
2.2.4. Project 3: strengthen capacity in research and teaching in gender, health and family issues, increase and disseminate knowledge (HIV/AIDS and reproductive health) by empowering communities and informing policy-making	69
2.2.5. Project 4: to understand structural factors affecting accessibility, availability and quality of services, generate knowledge on determinants of health seeking for maternal health and HIV,...	77
2.2.6. Project 5: to develop capacity for research, capacities related to Academic English, capacities related to education and to overview the postgraduate studies process.	86
2.2.7. Project 6: to develop statistical tools and develop research activities	98
3. Conclusions and recommendations	105

4. ANNEXES	112
4.1. <i>ToR (see separate document)</i>	112
4.2. <i>Evaluation framework from the inception report</i>	112
1.1. <i>Five evaluation questions at project level</i>	113
1.2. <i>Five evaluation questions at programme level</i>	123
4.3. <i>Mission programme</i>	130
4.4. <i>List of persons consulted</i>	132
4.5. <i>List of documents consulted</i>	134

ACRONYMS

CAD	Centre for Academic Development
DGD	Directoraat-generaal Development
IUC	Institutional University Cooperation
KULeuven	Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
LC	Language Centre
MSc	Master in Science
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
UEM	University Eduardo Mondlane
UHasselt	Hasselt University
P	project
PhD	Doctor of Philosophy
PL	Project Leader
PSU	Programme Support Unit
SD	Scientific Directorate
ToR	Terms of Reference
UGent	Universiteit van Gent
VC	Vice-Chancellor
VLIR-UOS	Vlaamse Interuniversitaire Raad – Universitaire Ontwikkelingssamenwerking
VUB	Vrije Universiteit Brussel

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background - An Institutional University Cooperation (IUC) programme is a long-term (12 years) institutional partnership between a university in the South and Flemish universities and university colleges. The programme supports the partner university in its triple function as provider of educational, research-related and societal services. It aims at empowering the local university as to better fulfil its role as development actor in society. VLIR-UOS channels the funding, supports the partners in the execution and manages the evaluations of the programmes.

Short description of the IUC programme Desafio – Desafio started in 2006. The table below gives an overview of the funds provided through this IUC:

Year 0 (inception) 2006-2008	500.000 EUR
Phase 1 (y 1-y5) 2008-2013	745.000 EUR/year
Phase 2 (Y6-Y10) 2013-2017	570.000 EUR/year which decreased to 400.000 euro in 2017)
Out phasing (Y11-12) 2018 – end of 2019	115.000 euro

Desafio was subdivided in 6 projects, 2 transversal projects and 4 projects revolving around the same central topic, Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights and HIV. During the first phase (from 2008-2013) investments were done in libraries and equipment, outreach activities were undertaken and work was done on strengthening the academic capacity of the faculties involved through scholarships. In phase II the focus on scholarships (PhD's and MCs), research (including scientific publications) continued. Outreach and attention for sustainability were emphasized in the design of Phase II, whereas working on quality of education and innovation of learning received less attention.

In 2012, a mid-term evaluation took place. The conclusions of this evaluation lead to a number of adaptations in the execution and the management of the programme, for e.g. increased effort to ensure close follow-up of PhD scholars, the establishment of a management team and the integration of the Programme Support Unit into the Office of International Cooperation. These measures had to improve progress in realising planned activities (more in particular PhD's), ownership at the level of Faculties involved and efficient project management which were considered to be weak.

The budget repartition between the projects was different by design. When looking at phase II, the budget division was the following:

Project	Budget
Project 1 on right to health and sexual and reproductive rights in the context of HIV/AIDS (from a legal perspective)	347.769 euro
Project 2 on social rights/social protection (from a legal perspective)	346.810 euro
Project 3 on research and teaching in gender, health and family issues and dissemination of knowledge on HIV/Aids and reproductive health	346.467 euro
Project 4 To understand the structural factors affecting the accessibility, availability and quality of services; To generate more knowledge on determinants of health seeking for maternal health and HIV	478.475 euro

Project 5 (transversal) on capacity for search, academic English, teaching and postgraduate school	288.310 euro
Project 6 (transversal) on bio statistics and modelling	351.093 euro
Project 7: Project Support Unit (PSU)	521.076 euro

Because of delays in the progress of PhD's it was decided in 2017 to orient all (financial) efforts towards the PhD's and to delete some of the planned activities.

Objectives and methodology of the evaluation - The specific evaluation objectives are the following: (i) assessment of performance according to the OECD criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability) + scientific quality.

VLIR-UOS contracted the Belgian based firm, ACE Europe to execute the evaluation. The team was comprised by Corina Dhaene, sr. consultant at ACE Europe and Katia Taela, independent consultant from Mozambique. The evaluation was implemented in three phases: an inception phase, a phase of data-collection (including a field mission to UEM from August 8th to 18th 2018) and a phase of analysis and reporting. The main methods applied were the following: document study and analysis of self-assessment reports, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions, and exchanges with external stakeholders.

Some challenges were related to the inability of the team to talk to important stakeholders from P5, the lack of available data (for e.g. overall view of academic staff and their status at the level of the faculties involved, consolidated data on reach of short courses and MCs courses, full overview of articles published) and finally to the tension between appreciating what was planned (following the logical framework) and what has emerged as important change. The appreciation of what was planned was based on a set of indicators (as developed in the evaluation framework during the inception phase) and a score; the narrative has put this into perspective (factors that influenced on results) and has also appreciated emerging changes, the importance of changes and good practices from which can be learned.

Overview of main outputs - The evaluators understand the following about the main outputs:

- In the course of Desafio, men and women have been equally selected for PhD and MSc scholarships;
- PhD's: 11 out of 31 funded scholarships are completed and 11 are ongoing (expected to finish before the end of 2019). This is a success rate of 35% only, which might increase up to 70% by the end of 2019. P3 was the most timely and successful in realising the PhD's;
- MSc's: 22/42 completed (or 52%), a number of these MSc were followed in Belgium or in South Africa;
- 3 PhD's were cancelled, as were 14 MSc scholarships (of which 11 in P4);
- 5 research units have been established (next to the existing centre of Human Rights), of which 1 (at the Faculty of Medicine on Sexual and Reproductive Health) is already functional;
- Articles in international and national peer reviewed newspapers have been published: in total 40 articles were published with 12 still under review at the time of the evaluations. In total, at least 23 articles were published in international peer reviewed newspapers. Articles have been mainly published under Projects 4 and 6, medicine and statistics). In 2017 there was a clear increase, due to the increased rhythm of PhD execution.

This output compares to the outputs of the Swedish cooperation programme which was evaluated in 2017. The following table presents an overview of the outputs per project.

Project	Objective and topic, main output (phase II)
<p>Project 1</p> <p>PL: Eva Brems (UGhent) and Armando Di-mande (UEM)</p> <p>Hosted by: Faculty of Law, department of HR</p>	<p>UEM is enhanced as a major provider of knowledge and competences on the right to health and sexual and reproductive rights in the context of HIV/AIDS, awareness and expertise on Human Rights has improved and a rights-based approach with respect to reproductive health and HIV/AIDS is adopted by governmental and non-governmental actors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PhD: 1 PhD might finish in 2019 (of 4 that started, 1 is cancelled, the realisation of two others unclear/uncertain) • MSc: 4/5 completed (of 1 status is unclear) • Master course developed within Desafio, 4th edition: Master in Human Rights (runs every two years) • Articles in international peer reviewed journals: 0 • Articles in national peer reviewed journals: 1 • UEM human rights law journal (5 volumes): 32 articles • Further development of an existing Centre for Human Rights
<p>Project 2</p> <p>PL: Petra Foubert (UHas-selt) and Armando Di-mande (UEM)</p> <p>Hosted by: Faculty of Law, department of HR</p>	<p>To develop and social rights/social protection and to ensure UEM provides evidence-based knowledge and expertise to key stakeholders and contributes to the increase of public awareness of social rights/social protection issues in general, with a particular emphasis on rights related to HIV</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PhD: 1 finished of 2 started (the other one will finish soon but no date set yet, with extra funds from UHasselt) • MSc: 1 completed of 2 started (status of the 2nd one is unclear) • Master course developed within Desafio: master of law in social law (is being reviewed, evening courses) • Articles in international peer reviewed journals: 2 • Articles in national peer reviewed journals: 8 (still to be published in the Social Protection Review of the Research Institute) • Book with conference proceeding: 1 • Working towards the creation of an institute of social law (previously under centre for Human Rights) and a department of social protection
<p>Project 3</p> <p>PL: Gily Coene (VUB) and Carlos Manuel (UEM)</p> <p>Hosted by: Faculty of Arts and Sciences</p>	<p>To strengthen the capacity of the UEM in terms of research and teaching in gender, health and family issues and to increase and disseminate knowledge on the socio-cultural dynamics of HIV/AIDS and reproductive health by empowering communities on the basis of best practices and by informing policy-making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PhD: 6/6 (of which one still has to defend in 2018) • MSc: 3/7 completed (the status of the others is unclear) • Master course developed within Desafio: non (some support was provided for meetings to start with a new MSc course in Social Anthropology) • Articles in international + national peer reviewed journals: 20 (of which 4 still under review) • Creation of a centre on women and gender
<p>Project 4</p> <p>PL: Kristien Roelens (UGhent) and Khatia Munguambe (UEM)</p>	<p>To understand the structural factors affecting the accessibility, availability and quality of services; To generate more knowledge on determinants of health seeking for maternal health and HIV; To identify the role of norms and values on risky behaviour for HIV/AIDS and maternal health including Family; To raise awareness of policy makers and decision makers; To sensitize communities; To increase awareness on neglected topics related to maternal health among health care personnel; To provide multidisciplinary comprehensive care for SGBV victims and other risk/vulnerable groups; To improve sustainability of reproductive health/ HIV/AIDS capacity building, research and extension activities at UEM; Strengthen academic capacity in the fields of maternal health and HIV/AIDS</p>

Hosted by the faculty of medicine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PhD: 0 of 8 that started (1 PhD will defend in 2018, 5 other PhD's might defend in 2019, 1 PhD was cancelled and of one other, the status is unclear) • MSc: 7 of 23 that received a scholarship for a MSc completed (11 MSc were cancelled, of 5 that started, the status is unclear) • Master course developed within IUC: module of Reproductive Health within Masters of Public Health (already 9 cycles) • Developed reproductive Health/HIV curriculum for undergraduate medical students • Establishment of a research unit (in 2013) • Articles in international peer reviewed journals: 13 • Articles in national peer reviewed journals: 0
<p>Project 5 (transversal)</p> <p>PL:</p> <p>Mieke van Herreweghe (UGhent) and Natasha Ribeiro (UEM)</p> <p>Hosted by: scientific directorate, dept. Of post graduate studies</p>	<p>To develop UEM's capacities for Research through the operational development of UEM's Research Policy (RP); To develop UEM's capacities related to Academic English; To develop UEM's capacities related to teaching; To overview the postgraduate studies process (involving the Centre of Academic Development, the Scientific Directorate and the Language Centre).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PhD's: 2 out of 4 that started have completed (a 3rd one might finish in 2019, 1 PhD was cancelled) • MSc's: 3 out of 6 planned (three MSc have been cancelled) • Functional language centre (at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences)
<p>Project 6 (transversal)</p> <p>PL:</p> <p>Marc Aerts (UHasselt) and Rafika Razac (UEM)</p> <p>Hosted by the unit for statistics (in the department of mathematics and informatics)</p>	<p>Bio statistics and modelling. To develop statistical tools for the analysis of sexual and reproductive health data in Mozambique; To develop research activities in the department, in partnership with government institutions, industry, NGOs and the society in general.</p> <p>The latter needs to be understood as focusing on statistical methodology (from the design of studies up to the analysis of resulting data) (clarification by Flemish PL)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PhD: 1 completed out of 4 that started (three others are expected to finish in 2019 or 2020, with extra funds from UHasselt) • MSc: 4/5, 5 received scholarship for a Master of Statistics at UHasselt, one did not graduate • Master course developed within IUC: realised for 80%, is now taken up further for completion) • Articles in international peer reviewed journals: 8 • Articles in national peer reviewed journals: 0 • Working towards the creation of a Centre of Statistics

Conclusions – The following conclusions are related to the whole of the IUC programme.

The relevance of the programme is firmly confirmed but stakeholders should be supported to improve result-oriented formulation and monitoring of projects which would improve the documentation and monitoring of change processes and which would better link the personal changes to the institutional change processes. One important issue that seemed to be missing in the programme design was the attention to experimenting and facilitating the multi-disciplinary approach which was key in the programme: academic staff was expected to get themselves organised in a different way and to develop a new 'way of doing' in collaborating around a shared research agenda, which was easier said than done and for which little specific support was provided.

Effectiveness was good in the thematic projects. The evaluators found that the Desafio programme increased the academic capacity for research and teaching, provided that PhD's that are expected to finalise before the end of 2019 actually do so. A first and valuable experience with multi-disciplinary

collaboration was realised though not yet institutionalised. Changes in personal academic competences and a better understanding about what constitutes 'research' (beyond the capacity for technical assistance and advice), mainly gained through the scholarships form the basis on which a research culture can further develop.

Effectiveness was less strong for the transversal projects P5 and P6 that aimed to create a favourable environment for multi-disciplinary research and innovative teaching. For P5, the lack of clarity on the mandate of the Scientific Directorate and its weak performance as department explains the weaker results. P6 has led to a strong core of statistical knowledge and expertise in a unit that had almost no capacity; however, its capacity and its importance in the UEM strategy to evolve towards a research-led university was not sufficiently acknowledged and supported within UEM (at the level of faculties and the rectorate). The development of the language centre (as part of P5) presented a strong case of a unit that was able to take maximum advantage of Desafio and developed into a unit with a sustainable package of services for UEM academics and target groups from outside the university.

Reach and effective influence on society cannot be fully appreciated due to a lack of data. However, it is clear that the thematic projects have developed new knowledge that is useful for society. More in particular P1 and P2 have developed research that is amongst the first available research in Mozambique on the topics of Human and Social Rights, which is accessible in Portuguese language.

The **efficiency** and more in particular project management and the realisation of intermediate results (the outputs as planned) is the weakest link in the Desafio programme. The relation between means and results is weak when considering the relations with planned intermediate results. However, this relation is quite good when considering the Desafio budget (compared to other donor programmes) and the effect of Desafio on UEM, which can be derived from the annual UEM report of 2017. The evaluators also found that each project is able to present a success story from which other faculties and projects can learn. The decision to integrate the PSU in the Office of International Cooperation and to involve the central financial department did not contribute to a more efficient project management, because of the gap between high management and execution level and because project leaders did not invest sufficient time in the management of their project.

The interpersonal relations and communication contributed to a general sense of good partnership, although a number of very specific issues have put pressure on the quality of partnership. Two important issues were: (i) the lack of clarity in decision making and role division between VLIR-UOS and Flemish Universities, (ii) the need to resolve the (formal) recognition of UEM co-supervisors (at UEM and within the partnership between UEM and the Flemish Universities).

Institutional sustainability is ensured in faculties where leadership (deans) demonstrated more ownership (P3, P4 and P6). The creation of a management team at UEM level ignited the interest of Faculties in Desafio, but their ownership was mainly the result of personal interest. Finally, it needs to be acknowledged that the general path towards being a research led university will most certainly be continued at UEM, thus offering a strong basis for sustainability. The **financial sustainability** of results is under pressure: P2 and P3 have been able to secure external funding (P2 through the existing partnership with UHasselt), but in general access to external funding and development of appropriate strategies to attract funding is still weak in all faculties concerned.

Desafio had some impact on the wider UEM environment. To start with, it should be noted that P5 has stimulated efforts to bring more clarity in the UEM framework for post-graduate studies. The lack of this framework explains the difficulties to realise the number of PhD's and MSc graduates planned for. Actual implementation of tools and mechanisms developed could improve this, provided that a number of

governance issues, more in particular related to the position of the Scientific Directorate within UEM, are addressed and gradually solved.

The evaluators were able to appreciate the fact that various individual lecturers, active in the Desafio programme had access to decision makers through double employment and consultancies and as such are able to influence them. Maximising impact and policy influencing based on the research results, was hampered by the fact that UEM was largely invisible at the main spaces where issues, such as gender and social protection are being discussed with all stakeholders involved and the fact that other channels (other than individual personal contacts) to link research to public debates are not yet used.

Recommendations – The following table presents an overview of recommendations at the level of VLIR-UOS and the level of UEM (and partners):

Recommendations at the level of VLIR-UOS	Support academics in formulating change-oriented road maps (either as logical frameworks, or using other approaches) and in doing so, clarify the expectations at institutional level and the link with changes at personal level.
Recommendations at the level of UEM (and partners)	Be more explicit from the start about the meaning of the concept partnership: what do each of the partners find important, how do they wish to be recognised.
	Ensure the development, provision and monitoring of a more coherent <i>package</i> of support in capacity building to academic staff enrolled in post-graduate programmes.
Recommendations at the level of UEM	Actively 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 practice scientific writing. Supporting this culture starts with leadership and the dean of the faculty.
	Resolve the institutional and governance stumble blocks and ensure a proactive 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 in managing research and post-graduate programmes and to valorise these before presenting a top-down solution.
	Create spaces for learning where all governance levels can meet (to reduce the distance between management and execution) 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.
	Develop further the approaches, rules and guidelines for scientific supervision, increase the involvement of UEM academic staff in the execution of sandwich PhD's.

	<p>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.</p>
	<p>Reflect upon and create various venues and channels to influence on policies besides technical assistance and scientific conferences. Right from the start of the research, UEM and academic staff should engage with decision makers and with other institutions and organisations (instead of waiting for research results to be ready) to shape the research design. Of course, a scientific park (as planned by UEM and studied under P5) is important to increase opportunities to apply research to societal problems, but more 'soft' mechanisms of exchanging and engaging with society and decision makers are equally important.</p>

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

1.1.1. What is an IUC?

The ToR (in annex 1) clearly describe what an Institutional University Cooperation (IUC) programme is. It is defined as a long-term (12 years) institutional partnership between a university in the South and Flemish universities and university colleges. The programme supports the partner university in its triple function as provider of educational, research-related and societal services. It aims at empowering the local university as to better fulfil its role as development actor in society.

The objectives and content of an IUC partnership between one partner institution in the South and Flemish universities and university colleges in the North are outlined in a partner programme (technical and financial file). All IUC programmes combine objectives of institutional strengthening and strategic thematic capacity building (linked to both institutional priorities and developmental priorities in a specific country). Each partnership consists of a coherent set of interventions (projects) geared towards the development of the teaching and research capacity of the university, as well as its institutional management.¹

A **generic Theory of Change for all IUC programmes** is developed, which summarizes the expected output, outcome and impact of the supported change processes and which highlights the importance of the partnership and collaboration between the educational institutions concerned and the interaction between sub projects. Output refers to deliverables related to education improvement, research deliverables, strengthened research or education capacities, improved infrastructure and equipment, and deliverables related to extension. These outputs are assumed to contribute to outcomes related to improved research practices, improved education practices and new knowledge, applications or services that are also taken up by relevant stakeholders. In the long term, the IUC partner programme aims at contributing to development changes.

1.1.2. The IUC with UEM

Description of the IUC with UEM - Subject of this end-term evaluation is the Institutional University Cooperation programme (IUC) implemented in partnership between University Eduardo Mondlane and the universities of Hasselt, Ghent and Brussels.

Desafio (phase 2) was subdivided in 6 projects, 2 transversal projects and 4 projects revolving around a central topic, Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights and HIV. During the first phase (from 2008-2012) investments were done in libraries and equipment, outreach activities were undertaken and work on strengthening the academic capacity of the faculties involved through scholarships. In Phase 2 (2013-

¹ The two paragraphs are taken from the VLIR-UOS ToR, page 3.

2017), the number of projects was reduced from 7 to 6 (merger of the two projects in medicine). In phase 2 the focus on scholarships, research and on publications of research was ongoing. Outreach and attention for sustainability were emphasized in the design of Phase 2. Quality of education and innovation of learning received much less attention in Phase 2. Because of delays in the progress of PhD's it was decided in 2017 to orient all (financial) efforts towards the PhD's and to delete some of the planned activities. A quick overview of the projects and the main outputs is provided under 2.2.1).

In 2012, a mid-term evaluation took place. The conclusions of this evaluation lead to a number of adaptations in the execution and the management of the programme, more in particular:

- There would no longer be a permanent technical assistant based at UEM from Belgium,
- Change in the management structure at Mozambique side with the establishment of a Management Team. This team, which would be under the overall responsibility of the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs, would be composed of the Cooperation Office, Scientific Directorate, Finance Directorate, Internal Audit Office and Programme Support unit (PSU) of Desafio Programme (Local Coordinator, programme manager and administrative staff) and will be responsible for the overall implementation of the VLIR-UOS supported programme in accordance to the Management Guidelines which combine VLIR-UOS and UEM procedures. The Management Team would be coordinated by the Cooperation Office and act as an executive working group, responsible for coordinating, at the level of central administration, the overall cooperating programme and the daily research and administrative activities performed at UEM, having as the focal points the project leaders (PLs).
- Start training on acquisition (proposal writing)
- Give more attention to planning and reporting
- More intensive support and tighter monitoring of postgraduate students by the local supervisor
- decision of UEM to reduce the administrative and teaching load to strengthen investment in research
- Invest more in outreach and extension based on an inventory of relevant stakeholders, also outside of Maputo.
- Develop better criteria for selecting people for PhD scholarships.
- Develop an evaluation framework to measure progress of PhD students
- Have project leaders at UEM that are not at the same time pursuing a PhD
- Improve ownership by linking the PL to the Faculty and the Dean through the Scientific Directorate of the Faculty.

The table below gives an overview of the funds provided through this IUC:

Year 0 (inception) 2006-2007	211.500 EUR
Phase 1 (y 1-y5) 2008-2012	745.000 EUR/year, 500.000 EUR in 2008
Phase 2 (Y6-Y10) 2013-2017	570.000 EUR/year, 400.000 EUR in 2017
Out phasing (Y11-12) 2018 – end of 2019	115.000 euro

The budget repartition between the projects is different by design. When looking at phase 2, the budget division is the following:

Project	budget
Project 1 on right to health and sexual and reproductive rights in the context of HIV/AIDS (from a legal perspective)	347.769 euro
Project 2 on social rights/social protection (from a legal perspective)	346.810 euro

Project 3 on research and teaching in gender, health and family issues and dissemination of knowledge on HIV/Aids and reproductive health	346.467 euro
Project 4 To understand the structural factors affecting the accessibility, availability and quality of services; To generate more knowledge on determinants of health seeking for maternal health and HIV	478.475 euro
Project 5 (transversal) on capacity for search, academic English, teaching and postgraduate school	288.310 euro
Project 6 (transversal) on bio statistics and modelling	351.093 euro
Project 7: Project Support Unit (PSU)	521.076 euro

1.1.3. Terms of Reference of the evaluation

The ToR have formulated following evaluation purposes: (1) learning (what worked well, what didn't and why? (ii) steering (supporting decision making processes), (iii) accountability (assessing performance of the programme and validating or complementing monitoring data). The evaluators chose to focus on learning first and then accountability.

The specific evaluation objectives are the following: (i) assessment of performance according to the OECD criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability) + scientific quality. For this end evaluation the main focus will be on effectiveness/impact and sustainability.

There are two specific points of attention to be evaluated:

- Did the increased involvement of various faculties in phase 2 contribute to the ownership of the projects by these faculties (this question will be treated under sustainability at project and programme level).
- Did the Programme Support Unit actually perform better in phase 2, when it was absorbed within the office of international cooperation (this question will be treated under efficiency at programme level).

These points of attention have been integrated in the evaluation framework (see further).

1.2. UEM and its context

The evaluators have paid considerable attention to the context chapter, not only to be able to appreciate relevance of the Desafio programme, but also to put the results and execution of the Desafio programme into a broader perspective and to ensure that recommendations are sufficiently relevant and useful for the partners in Desafio, to start with, UEM. Following topics will be treated: government policies, UEM policies and UEM statistics.

1.2.1. Government policies

Several government policies are worth mentioning here, more in particular the Government's Five-year Plan (2015-2019), the National Basic Social Security Strategy (2016-2024) and the National Strategic Plan to respond to HIV and AIDS (2015-2019). The documents point at a need for policy research, access to data to support decision making but also clarify that uptake of research and using existing evidence is a gap.

The National Development Strategy 2015-2035² of Mozambique underlines the role of industrialization for the country's social and economic development and is underpinned by four pillars: i) development of human capital (focused on market oriented training, institutionalisation and expansion of professional training and improvement of health and social protection); ii) development of infrastructures for production; iii) research, innovation and technological development (creation of specialised research and development centres in agriculture, livestock, fisheries; energy; natural resources; water resources management and information and communication technologies); iv) and institutional articulation and coordination. In relation to higher education the strategy indicates the need for associating higher education training with optional and individual processes of certification of competencies to increase graduates' competitiveness. It also recognises the need for **better management of available knowledge** generated in the country.

The development of human and social capital is one of the five priorities of the **Government's Five-Year Plan (2015-2019)**, commonly known as Plano Quinquenal do Governo. Among other important initiatives the document underlines the need for ensuring assistance and integration of people in poverty or a situation of vulnerability, promotion of an inclusive education system, improvement of access to and quality of **health services, including but not exclusively reproductive health and HIV/AIDS, and the promotion of gender equality and equity**. With regards to higher education the plan does not have a specific component however, it identifies as priority actions the promotion of access to quality higher education, establishment of programmes and synergy-building between higher education institutions, technical-professional institutes, and research and technological institutes to stimulate innovation and entrepreneurship. The document further indicates the need for i) strengthening research capacity through greater access to postgraduate studies; ii) promotion of research and innovation funding to improve socio-economic development. In terms of specific research needs the document underlines research on prevention of natural disasters and environmental problems. Furthermore, the Five-Year Plan notes that the rule of law, good governance and decentralization are essential pillars for the country's development and within those it underlines the **need for increasing citizens' legal awareness through dissemination of information, provision of legal services to underprivileged citizens and research on matters related to access to justice**.

The National Basic Social Security Strategy (2016-2024)³ has three main pillars one (pillar 3) of which is the prevention and response to social risks that affect the following vulnerable groups: children,

² República de Moçambique (2014), "*Estratégia Nacional de Desenvolvimento (2015-2035)*", Maputo, Moçambique.

³ In early 2018, the Ministry of gender, children, social affairs and the United Nations (UNICEF and OIT) launched a three-year Joint Programme on Social Protection. The programme is financed by the Swedish and Dutch embassies and by the Department for International Development (DFID) of the United Kingdom. The World Bank is also funding a project on institutional strengthening and capacity building

women, the elderly, people with disabilities and people affected by HIV and AIDS. A fourth pillar focuses on building institutional capacity to implement the three other pillars, including strengthening intersectoral coordination and **monitoring the results of the implementation of the strategy**, through the National Council of Social Affairs – which involves the participation of civil society organisations and external partners and is chaired by the government. The respect for beneficiaries' rights and dignity as well as participation, transparency and accountability are among the strategy's twelve principles. While the document does not make any **reference to academic institutions**, there is a **role for their contribution to monitoring and evaluation of the strategy** as the document envisages besides the **collection of data** through the information management systems of involved institutions and the national surveys run by the National Institute of Statistics, **the use of specific surveys and studies to capture beneficiaries' perceptions, among others**. Equally important for academic institutions such as UEM, is the **outlined need for training of civil servants on gender, children and social affairs as part of efforts mainstream gender into interventions to prevent and respond to social risks and to protect the rights of people and households affected by HIV and AIDS, implemented by social affairs' services**. In terms of activities, the document underlines addressing **domestic and sexual violence** and discrimination.

The National Strategic Plan to Respond to HIV and AIDS 2015-2019 while noting **the importance of research (particularly operational) and evidence-based approaches** to deal with HIV and AIDS does not advance recommendations to improve the use of research findings. Yet, the **Evaluation of the National Strategic Plan to Respond to HIV and AIDS (2010-2014)** underlines the need for better dissemination and use of existing evidence. There is still a gap between research and policy. The evaluation report notes that while platforms such as the Scientific Days organised by the National Health Institute have been an important dissemination platform, these could be better aligned with the National AIDS Strategic Plan. The current strategy however is limited to the identification of **areas/themes that require further research** namely: i) on the **cultural and social factors** that may influence provincial variations in HIV infection rates; ii) on barriers to access and use of condoms, particularly female condom; iii) on the impact of community-level activities; iv) on building effective partnerships for sharing research findings and for their uptake; v) on health systems; and vi) on anti-retroviral treatment resistance. The strategy underlines the **role of operational research in monitoring and evaluation to optimise the use of HIV surveillance data, strategic planning and policy formulation**.

1.2.2 UEM Policies and Regulations

Introduction - The Eduardo Mondlane University is headed by a University Council, a rector and two Vice Rectors for Academic Affairs and Administration and Resources respectively. There are 28 directorates and Offices at central level, 11 Faculties, 16 schools of applied science and 8 research and advocacy centres. There are 135 undergraduate and 80 post-graduate programmes, linked to individual departments. The current number of academic staff members (November 2016) is 1,790 and the number of enrolled students is 39,078 with a staff:student ratio of 1:22.

to support the consolidation of the National Basic Social Security Strategy. There are also various working and coordination groups on social protection, gender, HIV and AIDS, rule of law and human rights which involve external actors, government and civil society organisations

In the following paragraphs, the evaluators highlight the current strategic plan, some relevant findings of the 2014 evaluation of the previous strategic plan and will briefly describe the research policy. The documents consulted tell the evaluators that UEM is serious about its ambition to be a research-lead university, but also that the thinking about the concretisation of this ambition has only started recently. It is also understood that the concretisation inevitably raises governance issues that are difficult to address and cannot be quickly resolved. These have to be considered as an indisputable delay factor in realising the ambitions to be a research-led university.

From the documents it appears that both Swedish Government, Italian Cooperation and VLIR-UOS have paid considerable attention to strengthening the coordination, management and facilitation of UEM research, among others, through support to the Scientific Directorate, SD.⁴ In relation to the SD, the Swedish focused on creating funds to support research activities and to train research management staff; the Italians on the office of quality, whereas the Desafio Programme focused more on organisational strengthening, as in: strengthening structures, processes and management systems in order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of organisational performance related to the management of research. The coordination between the various donors is organised through the Cooperation Office, established in 2013 and receiving considerable support from the Swedish government.

The current **Strategic Plan 2018-2028, 'Towards a Research-based University'**, developed in 2017 is structured along seven key areas: teaching and learning; research; extension and innovation; governance and cooperation; management, finances and human resources; assets and infrastructure; and crosscutting issues. The strategy seeks to address the following challenges:

1. *teaching and learning* - attracting and enrolling the best students, **innovation of teaching and learning** methods, through student-centred approaches and the incorporation of extension and research in the curricula;
2. *research* - strengthening the **link between teaching and research**; improving basic and applied research production, **productivity and quality** and adoption of structured mechanisms for dissemination of research outputs and findings;
3. *extension and innovation* – harmonisation, promotion and dissemination of extension activities and promotion of research-based innovation in partnership with productive sectors;
4. *governance* – adjusting UEM organic and academic structures in line with its new vision and fostering a **culture of planning, monitoring and evaluation and accountability**;
5. *cooperation* – maximising existing networks, partnership and cooperation agreements; management, finance and human resources – improving efficiency in the management of human resources, including attracting and retaining staff committed to research, and building resource mobilisation capacity;
6. *crosscutting issues* – developing a clear plan to address gender (including promotion of gender equity), culture, sports, environment, ethics, citizenship and health.

This **Evaluation of UEM's Strategic Plan 2008-2014**⁵ highlighted several challenges:

⁴ See also: Kruse, S-A; a.o. (2017), *Evaluation of Swedish government research cooperation with Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique 2011-2016*.

⁵ This Strategic Plan was approved in 2008; initially it covered four years (2008-2012) but in 2010 it was extended until 2014.

- In relation to **teaching** and learning the report indicates an **increase in the student/lecturer ratio** from 15,2:1 to 20,5:1 and **reduction of graduation rates from 7.2% to 5.8%**. It recommended the promotion of pedagogic innovation.
- In relation to **research** the report notes discrepancies between the information in the annual reports and budgets which indicate a higher number of projects than does reported by the implementing units. According to the report there was also some **confusion around the meaning of research, as some people did not distinguish knowledge generation from knowledge dissemination and application**. The main weaknesses identified concerning research are: weak commitment to long term definition and financing of research; the discipline-focused nature of the research vision; weak administrative structure to support research; weak institutional articulation between teaching and research; and absence of mechanisms to transfer knowledge from more experienced researchers many of whom are approaching retirement to early researchers.
- In relation to **extension**, the evaluation highlights **the need for clarification of what extension means** and recommends a categorisation of activities. It notes that the scientific directorate is the body responsible for extension (and research), through the department for research, extension and development. It appears that there was also **one single budget for both extension and research and lack of transparency about criteria for budget allocation for extension**. **Between 2008 and 2014, the majority of the extension activities undertaken were related to teaching and learning** (relation between theory and practice), followed by community development and service provision (consultancies and technical assistance). **It appears from the 2017 statistics (see further below) that this has changed considerably in the last 3 years:** 60% of all activities of extension carried out in 2017 are related to the provision of services and technical assistance.⁶ The **legal clinic of the faculty of law** is mentioned as one of the units that has sought to develop internal norms to regulate their extension activities, and the **faculty of medicine** as one that has begun monitoring the implementation of extension activities. The evaluation points out the need for obtaining international and professional certification for some of the short courses offered by the faculties and centres. **The fact that faculties are themselves developing norms and guidelines underlines a lack of guidance at the central level and a tension between central level and Faculties, some of which have a long history of being semi-autonomous teaching and research institutions.**

The evaluation of the strategic plan devotes a section to the discussion of governance issues within UEM, for instance, it indicates that the previous strategic plan did not include objectives related to governance (policies, legislation, norms and codes of conduct), but had some related to leadership, organisation and functioning, under the strategic objective related to administration and financial management. The evaluation notes the efforts to regulate and harmonise management processes and procedures including the development of new policies and regulations, since 2010. These include amongst others a publication policy (2015), research lines (2014), norms for access to the postgraduate Fund (2013), norms of the fund for equipment acquisition and maintenance (2013), postgraduate curriculum framework (2013), regulations for postgraduate courses (n/d), regulations for funding participation in academic events (2013), as well as a system to ensure academic quality (SISQUAL) and the Office for

⁶ UEM, Vice-Chancellors Annual Report 2017.

Academic Quality (established in 2013, supported by the Italian cooperation), which promotes among others the self-assessment of courses offered by the UEM (2013);

Finally, the evaluation identified in 2014, the negative effects of the absence of a cooperation policy such as weak articulation between the cooperation office and other units, difficulties in seeking and entering partnerships that respond to UEM strategic objectives, weak integration of sectoral projects and programmes with UEM vision and mission, absence of a database with information about all cooperation initiatives and lack of monitoring and evaluation of signed agreements. The report notes that poor financial and programmatic reporting, attributed to the insufficient management training of staff and inadequate dissemination of manuals of procedures, constitute a threat to UEM's partnerships.

UEM's Research Policy (2007)⁷ aims at encouraging scientific research and the application of science and technology to the country's development. The policy focuses on seven areas namely: excellence in research, postgraduate study programmes, research management, extension and consulting, publication and dissemination of results, ethics in research, and intellectual property and copyright. The document **indicates that health, gender equity and HIV/AIDS are strategic research areas**. Besides the policy there is also a guiding document which outlines UEM's main research lines: **health**; natural resources and environment; engineering and technological innovation; agricultural, forestry and animal production; governance, economy and **human rights**; territory, population and development; and culture, society and education. Relevant potential research programmes include **sexual and reproductive health and communicable diseases**; citizenship, democracy and **human rights**; and identity processes. The **responsibilities of the scientific directorate** as outlined in the policy are the following: i) **analyse** and approve research programmes and projects; ii) **coordinate** and evaluate research progress (the responsibility for research excellence is of the various organic units); iii) **facilitate** the acquisition of patents to protect intellectual property; and iv) **develop** UEM's research policy and research lines.

1.2.3 UEM Statistics

In this section, the evaluators highlight some relevant statistics from the UEM Vice-Chancellor's Annual Report of 2017. The statistics are related to the number of research projects, academic events and publications, university extension, university international cooperation and UEM finances, student mobility. Overall, **the statistics show that UEM's academic production and its extension work has increased over the years, but also that staff and student mobility is declining and that too little staff engages in research**. There is a considerable increase in extension services, predominantly in the category of service provision and technical assistance (consultancy), which is explained by the current economic crisis.

Number of research projects – In 2016 UEM had 421 research projects, in 2017 the number increased to 463, which corresponded to 10% growth. From this universe, 22% refer to projects undertaken within postgraduate programmes and 78% as part of collective projects developed by lectures and researchers

⁷.UEM (2007) Política de Investigação da Universidade Eduardo Mondlane.

in different Faculties, Schools and Centres, which underlines the practice of collaboration between faculties (read: individual lecturers). 67% of the existing research projects in 2017 had men as the lead researchers whilst 33% were led by women. This demonstrates that, although UEM's teaching and research staff is only comprised of 27% women, their academic production is slightly higher than their representation among university staff. (Vice-Chancellor's Annual Report 2017:15). **The majority of the research projects in 2017 was in human and social sciences (168), veterinary and agroforestry sciences (146) and fundamental sciences (75) (Vice-Chancellor's Annual Report 2017:16).**

Academic events - In 2017, **UEM organised 10 conferences, 71 seminars, 96 workshops and 7 scientific journeys days.** UEM lectures and researchers presented research findings in 110 scientific events inside and outside Mozambique. However, **only 6% of the total of UEM lectures and researchers has participated in these events.** The annual report states that this number may not reflect the reality as there are several **difficulties within the institution in collecting data** (related to inconsistencies of the data gathered by different units and lack of timely submission of data). Of the scientific events that took place within the institution, **4 events were highlighted, one of which was the 4th Regional Conference on Social Protection and Rights** (Vice-Chancellor's Annual Report 2017:17).

Academic publications – In 2017, **UEM's teaching and research staff published 301 works, against 227 in 2016, which corresponds to 33% growth.** Of these, **195 were published in scientific journals**, 26 books and/or book chapters and 80 other publications which include reports and papers presented in scientific events. In terms of disciplinary distribution of the publications, **the majority was from medical sciences** with 82 publications, followed by veterinary and agroforestry sciences with 78 publications and social and **human sciences** with 75 publications. However, **only 17% of the total number of lectures and researchers has published at least one work in 2017. This is extremely low**, considering the growth in the numbers of lectures and researchers with postgraduate degrees and our ambition to become to research-based university. (Vice-Chancellor's Annual Report 2017:18/19).

University extension – UEM currently distinguishes four types of extension work: i) link theory-practice; ii) service provision and technical assistance; iii) community development and technology transfer; and iv) social responsibility and civic awareness raising. In global terms, in 2017 **UEM conducted a total of 311 activities of extension, against 145 carried in 2016. This increase of 11%,** suggests that our interventions to improve our links with society and improve our capacity to document activities of extension have improved (Vice-Chancellor's Annual Report 2017:20). **The comparison of all four dimensions, indicates that provision of services and technical assistance was the most prominent, representing 60% of all activities of extension carried out in 2017, against 55% in 2016.** The activities related to social responsibility and awareness of civic consciousness corresponded to 17%, followed by activities to foster the link between theory and practice with 15% and lastly, **community development and technology activities, with 8%.** **The predominance service provision and technical assistance activities can be explained by the search for alternative solutions to mitigate economic and financial challenges in a context of austerity.** (Vice-Chancellor's Annual Meeting 2017: 19/20). Relevant examples of university extension work include: work on community development and technology transfer, such as the training of 550 volunteers from community radios and multimedia centres in the use of information and communication technology tools; **work related to social responsibility and civic consciousness awareness raising specifically, the training of 75 members of health committees, focal points from the Health Users' Office and directors from the district health services (from Maputo-City and Inhambane province) as part of an initiative of the Health**

Users' Office to inform about the law on the rights of people living with HIV/AIDS (the latter being related to the Desafio programme). (Vice-Chancellor's Annual Report 2017:22)

A study (Gonçalves et al. 2013⁸) on the relations between think tanks and universities in Mozambique underlined that **interactions/collaborations are among staff members rather than among institutions** as *“public institutions conduct, publish and disseminate few research results and private universities generally focus on teaching. Finally, these authors defend that “although universities remain credible institutions, donor funded think tanks are the more prominent research institutions in Mozambique”* (Gonçalves et al. 2013:15). Pointing out however, that former and current university staff members *“are the heads and lead researchers for most think tanks in the social sciences”* (Gonçalves et al. 2013:16). **This underlines the potential influence of university staff but also the potential conflicts of interests, with university staff not finding sufficient time to be engaged in teaching or research.**

University Cooperation and finances and funding⁹ – The majority of the partnerships in 2017 was with national and international higher education institutions. These include partnerships with higher education institutions in Norway, Italy and Portugal, in the areas of teaching, research, and university extension and management; with international governmental institutions from Sweden (Swedish research cooperation with Mozambique 2017-2021), Italy (Programme of Support to Academic Reform), Technological Innovation and Scientific Research (FIAM), Netherlands (NICHE programme), China, Cuba, Brazil and Portugal focusing on exchange of students and lectures and joint research. The partnership with China includes infrastructure development. (Vice-Chancellor's Annual Report 2017:24). Desafio is no longer mentioned in the annual report as a partnership programme.

In 2017, UEM was able to mobilise 2,987.04 million MZN, the equivalent to 91% of the resources budgeted (3,275.78 million MZN), due to a **reduction of funds from the State Budget**. The resources came from three main sources: i) State Budget; ii) Donations and iii) own funds. The State Budget remains the main source of funding with 74% (2,215.06 million MZN), followed by **own funds 17%** (506.18 million MZN); **donations amounted for 9% of UEM's funding** (265.79 million MZN). Compared to previous years, the percentage of own income went up and that of donors went down.¹⁰ As in previous years, Sweden was the largest donor in 2017, contributing with 57% of the total donations, followed by Italy with 27%, Holland, through NUFFIC, with 11% and **Belgium, through Desafio Programme II, with 5%**. Donors' funds were used in teaching, research, extension and institutional capacity development. State Budget funds were mainly (73.2%) used for staff salaries and remunerations. **Donor funds had an execution of 53% (slightly higher than the 45% of 2016 but less than the 57% in 2017¹¹)**. The low execution was, according to UEM related to i) the pluriannual nature of projects with execution spread across several years; ii) the late release of funds by donors and iii) the discrepancy between project execution and UEM's financial year which ends on the 31st of December. (Vice-Chancellor's Annual Report 2017:26/27)

⁸ Gonçalves, Euclides, Sandra Manuel, Anselmo Matusse (2013), “Think Tank – University Relations: Mozambique”.

⁹ Examples: cooperation with the Italian Government, within the and the partnership with the Netherlands, through the Programme NICHE.

¹⁰ Kruse, op.cit., page 65. In 2015: 16% was own income and 12% donor support.

¹¹ Kruse, op.cit., page 65.

Student Mobility – UEM has been investing in its internationalization through the mobility of its students and staff. However, in 2017 there has been a reduction of mobility compared to 2016. In 2017, only 21 UEM students (30 less than in 2016) went to higher education institutions in Brazil, North Korea, China, Belgium and Holland. In contrast UEM hosted 129 international students in 2017 (2 less than in 2016) from Belgium, Brazil, USA, Malawi, UK, Rwanda, East-Timor, Saint Tomé and Prince, Tanzania and Uganda. The students attended specific modules and disciplines and pursued their licentiate and master's studies. (Vice-Chancellor's Annual Report 2017:24)

Lecturer mobility - There has also been a sharp reduction in academic staff mobility. In 2016, 113 lectures and researchers went abroad, but in 2017 only 15 did so - to South Africa, Sweden, Portugal and Belgium – these were involved in joint teaching and research programmes in host institutions. In contrast, UEM hosted 49 lecturers and researchers, 8 more than in 2016. The academics came from South Africa, Brazil, China, Sweden, Italy, Portugal, Belgium and they were involved in teaching, research and student assessment in the faculties of Arts and Social Sciences, Education and Engineering. Technical and administrative staff also participate in mobility programmes, but the numbers have also reduced from 21 in 2016 to 4 in 2017. The staff took part in professional internships in Brazil and China. UEM received 5 technical and administrative staff from Italian, South African and Portuguese universities who participated in professional development initiatives and experience exchange with UEM staff. (Vice-Chancellor's Annual Report 2017:25)

1.3. Evaluation methodology and process

This evaluation was executed by a team with an evaluator from Belgium (Corina Dhaene from ACE Europe) and a consultant from Mozambique (Katia Taela). They have not been involved in any way in the formulation or execution of the IUC programme, nor did they have any contractual relationship, now or in the past, with any of the partners involved with the project/programme under review.

In the following, the report highlights the evaluation framework used by the evaluators, the activities undertaken, the limitations of this evaluation and quality assurance.

Evaluation framework - The evaluation was implemented in three phases: an inception phase, a phase of data-collection and a phase of analysis and reporting. During the inception phase an evaluation framework (see annex 2) was developed, composed of five evaluation questions related to the five OECD evaluation criteria. The evaluation questions were elaborated based on the evaluation questions formulated in the ToR and the assessment criteria used in the self-assessment reports. The evaluation questions consist of different judgement criteria and guiding questions or indicators. These indicators and guiding questions indicate what information would be looked for and as such guided the data-collection and development of interview guidelines. For each of the judgement criteria an appreciation scale was developed as requested in the ToR. A four-point qualitative scale is used.

Excellent	good	weak	Poor
-----------	------	------	------

This scale does not have the intention to cover all indicators/guiding questions (some of them are more important in the final judgement than others) but was above all helpful in formulating a balanced judgement in a transparent manner which is the same for all the projects. In cases where the evaluators found that the scores were somewhere in between, for e.g. from poor to weak, the weakest score is portrayed.

The four-point qualitative scale was not used to assess synergy and complementarity: these criteria have only been introduced after the formulation of the IUC programme and it was deemed unfair by VLIR-UOS to confront them with scores.

An overview of the main evaluation questions and their judgment criteria at project and at programme level is attached in annex. From the logical frameworks, ACE Europe understands that there is no difference between the logical frameworks at project level and the logical framework at programme level on. The logical framework at the programme level is the sum of the projects. ACE Europe will therefore treat the evaluation at the programme level as a synthesis of the analysis at project level and will add a number of specific questions at programme level where appropriate. The project related to the Project Support Unit will not be assessed as a project but under the analysis of the programme and more in particular under efficiency.

Activities undertaken – The activities consisted of document study, semi-structured interviews within UEM and focus group discussions with MSc students.

The evaluators have made optimal use of existing documentation and in particular of the self-assessment reports. The self-assessment reports have been studied and analysed before the effective data-collection in the field took place. During interviews with the project leaders in Belgium and in Mozambique, the self-assessment reports have been further discussed. Secondary sources have been consulted when relevant (see list of documents consulted in annex XX). Semi-structured interviews were conducted with a variety of internal and external stakeholders (Human Rights Commission of the Bar's Association, the Embassy of the Netherlands, NGO WLSA). The evaluators were also able to speak with the formal director of the Cooperation Office and the VICE-rector who were involved in the management Committee of Desafio until the end of 2017. In case, the respondents were more than three, the evaluators choose to have a focus group discussion on particular topics, proposed by the evaluator. Respondents were in all cases invited to add issues, the evaluators did not ask for but were felt important to them.

During the mission centres involved have been visited: The Centre for Human Rights and the Centre for Reproductive Health since they are already functional.

Two restitution and sense-making workshops were organised. One at the end of the field mission, based on a power point, in order to enable the members of the local steering committee to participate in sense-making of the data and to identify and exchange on the findings and conclusions. And one in Belgium (before drafting the final report), to discuss the results of the evaluation with the IUC programme coordinators and project leads from the Flemish educational institutions.

The combination of different sources (more in particular: interviews, focus group discussions, self-assessments, documents) allowed for sufficient triangulation of information.

It should be noted that at the time of the evaluation, Desafio was in the phase of phasing out. Many respondents had the sentiment that the programme already ended (end of 2017) because funds in the phasing out are considerably less. Many of the PhD's planned were not yet finalised and received the message, beginning of 2017 that Desafio funds would no longer be available to finance the finalisation

of the PhD. Different modalities were 'invented' to address this situation. For PhD's that were well advanced and made good progress, a decision was taken to reorient some of the funds and to cancel a number of outreach activities, for other PhD's UEM has taken the responsibility to finance a last visit to Belgium (of max 1 month), other PhD's have received support from the Flemish partner university (P2 and P6) and some PhD's received the message that they have to finalise at their own cost.

Limitations of the evaluation - Limitations were the following:

- The evaluators have not been able to speak to the current or former dean of the scientific directorate, not with somebody from the Faculty of Education or somebody from the Department of Academic Development (CDA), which made it difficult to understand well the achievements and the difficulties of project 5 on capacity building.
- Monitoring in the annual reports is done based upon indicators related to the logical framework and the key result areas (research, teaching, management, human resources development, infrastructure and management, mobilization of additional resources/opportunities, extension and outreach). Due to the short period available for the evaluation visit, it was not possible to verify all the data provided by the PSU on these indicators. The evaluators also preferred to document "what has emerged", instead of controlling the existing monitoring data. The indicators and the KRA were not always that clear or did not always seem very relevant, for e.g. good monitoring of effects on the broader university community and society is not done.
- The evaluators did not obtain update information of the total number of PhD's and MSc's, that is on a contract with the university (full-time and Part-time): the evaluators requested this information for each hosting department but the data were not readily available. This makes it difficult to assess the overall added value of Desafio to the strengthening of the academic capacity of UEM. If data are available they will be mentioned, if not, the assessment of added value is only based on interviews.
- Unfortunately, there is no consolidated list of articles published, which makes it impossible to assess quality by using an internationally acknowledged ranking system (for e.g. Scopus) to assess the quality of the articles. This being said, the evaluators did not receive any indication that the quality of the articles would not be good. The current repository of UEM (which is accessible through the internet (<http://www.repositorio.uem.mz/>), is not updated and does not contain the articles or PhD thesis of the graduates from the Desafio Programme.
- The evaluators were not able to obtain a consolidated overview of numbers of students (M/W, typology, ...) enrolled in the newly developed MSc or modules: the programme was not requested to provide this kind of data for purposes of monitoring. Some projects mention data in some of the annual reports but not in a systematic and consequent manner. Such data could have contributed to a firmer conclusion of the assessment of success and sustainability of MSc courses and short courses. The evaluators are not aware of tracer studies to analyse the careers.
- The evaluators were not able to obtain a consolidated overview of numbers of UEM staff/faculty that enrolled in the short courses provided through Desafio (Academic English, English for specific purposes, short courses on gender, research methodology). Some projects mention data in some of the annual reports but not in a systematic and consequent manner. Conclusions on access to courses is therefore mainly based on interviews.
- The evaluators expected these data to be available. The lack of data makes it difficult to assess to what extent the thematic focus of Desafio on sexual and reproductive health have penetrated the teaching and the staff at UEM (at faculties involved in Desafio and others).
- There was a clear tension in the evaluation between appreciating results against the logical frameworks (and the expected results as formulated) and appreciation the results and changes as such. The evaluators have tried to highlight both and to identify explanatory factors and good practices.

Quality assurance - Quality was assured by the evaluation team and its careful preparation in consultation with the stakeholders at UEM: the feasibility of the programme for the evaluation visit was checked; the evaluators considered constraints and adapted the programme accordingly. The inception report was shared with the IUC stakeholders (coordinator and PSU) prior to the field mission to allow them to assess the approach, which is thought to contribute to relevance and to a buy-in of the stakeholders in the evaluation. Because the report was only sent one week before the mission, the evaluators took sufficient time at the start to present and discuss the evaluation approach.

1.4. Structure of the evaluation report

In the following the reader will find under 2.1. the assessment of the IUC programme on programme level, using the data and appreciation at project level. The detailed assessments at project level, follow under 2.2. Conclusions and recommendations are treated under point 3.

2. Evaluation

2.1. Evaluation of Desafio at the programme level

2.1.1. Relevance

To assess relevance, the evaluators looked at three aspects at project level: response to local needs, synergy with other projects (from Desafio and other donors), and the quality of the intervention logic. At programme level, the evaluators looked at synergy between the projects and appreciated the added value of the combination of the projects for the institutional strengthening of UEM.

The evaluators are positive about the response to the needs but are more critical in relation to the intervention logic as reflected in the logical frameworks of the projects.

	Project 1	Project 2	Project 3	Project 4	Project 5	Project 6
EQ 1.1. Responding to needs						
EQ 1.2. Synergy	NA					
EQ 1.3. Intervention logic						

Table xx: Overview of the scores for evaluation question 1 on relevance at project level

Responding to needs – Analysis of the current challenges in the Mozambican context (see section on context), the strategic plan of UEM and its ambition to become a research led university confirm the relevance of the Desafio programme and the various projects. An interview with the Dutch Embassy confirms the need for facts and evidence collected through academic research to be used in discussions about policies in the areas of gender, social protection and health/reproductive rights.

More in particular following elements deserve to be underlined to stress relevance (effectiveness and even impact):

- The overall attention in Desafio for the strengthening or the creation of centres in projects 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 is found to be relevant: a centre can facilitate collaboration between departments, provides a structure for research projects with other actors, enhances visibility of activities and research and can more easily attract specific donor funding (as has been proven in P4 for the Unit for Reproductive Health at the faculty of Medicine).
- The appreciation by beneficiaries, for e.g. of newly developed MSc courses (P1 and P2) that were interviewed by the evaluators confirm the relevance of the topics for the practitioners (with a legal background and other). The students/practitioners feel they have been exposed to new perspectives and knowledge which is not offered elsewhere in Mozambique and which makes them more relevant for their employers/organisation and/or helps them to perform better in their activities and act with more authority.

- The focus on multi-disciplinary research was said by UEM to be rather unique¹² and was appreciated to be important and relevant by all respondents. The coherent design of Desafio around one focus (HIV and SRHR) made sense and increased the visibility of the programme in UEM. **Proof of that is the fact that the 2017 UEM annual report refers to several activities and results of Desafio as being relevant for UEM even though Desafio only provides a small budget. As such Desafio has been playing above its league. It was also mentioned by several respondents at higher management level that Desafio as such influenced the Swedish programme to pay more attention to multidisciplinary work.** Despite its relevance, the focus of the programme made it difficult, especially in phase I to have a broad involvement of all faculties implied in the programme and could not always be maintained, for e.g. in the MSc scholarships.

The evaluators have **one critical comment related to the relevance of P5** (and looking at the design from hindsight): given the importance attached to multidisciplinary research in the Desafio programme, the evaluators would have expected more attention in the activities to the creation of necessary conditions and mechanisms to support collaborative research processes between entities and individuals that are not used of doing this (including attention to and management of the risks connected to it). The multi-disciplinary ambition of Desafio in fact cross cuts traditional ways of organising activities in a department or faculty and challenges as such governance and existing (power) relations within and between faculties involved. People and entities are expected to get themselves organised in a different way and to develop a new 'way of doing'. This was not properly analysed as a risk to be addressed, either in phase I or at the start of phase II of Desafio. The creation of a management team to coordinate the execution of Desafio (towards the end of phase I) was a useful, but typical managerial intervention to ensure more buy-in and ownership but it was not sufficient to address in a satisfactory way the (weak) capacity for collaboration. Activities within P5 were mainly targeted at developing policies and management tools and at developing a training offer aimed at individual academic staff, but did not support the need to experiment and facilitate a new 'way of doing together'.

Synergy at project and programme level – Synergy between projects was realised thanks to the multi-disciplinary design of Desafio but collaboration with programmes from other donors (Italian, Swedish, ...) was limited.

The overall programme description for phase II of Desafio underlined the ambition to increase collaboration between Desafio projects and to seek synergy with other actors (both scientific and societal, both in Mozambique and in the region) and donor programmes. Both the Cooperation Office and the Scientific Directorate were expected to play a role in this.

Within Desafio, the collaboration was certainly noticeable. The project leaders and participants in the various projects were planned to coordinate and execute some specific activities together, for e.g. organisation of outreach (P3 and P4) and coordination of moot courts (P1 and 2), integrating lectures on gender in the module for SRH in the Faculty of Medicine (P3 and P4), working together on data-analysis in the framework of PhD research (Projects 4 and 6). This collaboration took place. Planning during joint steering committees greatly facilitated collaboration between the projects and the follow-up during the joint steering committee ensured that collaboration took place. On a personal level, team members have experienced the relevance and added value of collaboration. Some of them will also continue this in the

¹² Even though the context description shows that 78% of all research projects in 2017 at UEM are said to be 'collective' and developed by lecturers and researchers in different faculties.

future (for e.g. P) despite the fact that the institutional environment overall did not evolve and thanks to support of deans of the concerned faculties.

Donor coordination is organised by the UEM Cooperation office, it takes place once a year with a focus on investments in infrastructure. It is not clear to the evaluators to what extent VLIR-UOS as donor is represented in these meetings; the lack of local representation by the way, was indicated by UEM management and PSU to be a weaker point of the Belgian donor. Real coordination beyond sharing of information between donors is very limited and not facilitated by the Cooperation Office. There is no evidence of a deliberate strategy to coordinate donor programmes in such a way that their execution strengthens synergy and serves better the ambitions and objectives of UEM.

Desafio is an important but a smaller donor and only represents 5% of the total external funds at UEM (see description of context). UEM does not have a consolidated overview of external funding per faculty. As such, the evaluators cannot analyse the added value of Desafio (in terms of budget) for the faculties or departments concerned (Law, Medicine, Arts and Social Sciences, Statistics).

Synergy with other (donor-funded) programmes at UEM aimed at strengthening the capacity of academic staff and outreach could be noticed in only two cases:

- At the Faculty of Law (P1 and P2): activities on rights have integrated attention for people living with disabilities. This was facilitated by the Centre for Human Rights that receives external funding (Open Society Fund and Oxfam), for example to develop activities related to rights and disability. This example underlines the relevance and potential of centres to facilitate synergy. More synergy however could have been realised between P1 and P2 on the one hand and the legal clinic established by the Faculty of Law on the other hand, for e.g. the projects could have developed a strategy with the legal clinic to pro-actively identify particular cases, for e.g. on Rights and HIV Aids and to orient them towards the legal clinic. This was not the case, the legal clinic did not change its way of identifying cases (cases were identified by civil society organisations and brought to them).
- At the initiative of VLIR-UOS there has been only one workshop on gender with Belgian NGO's and members of project 3 (the evaluators did not receive any further information on this).

The Cooperation Office and the Scientific Directorate in any case did not play a significant role in the above-mentioned collaborations, nor in connecting Desafio to other (donor-funded) programmes. Moreover, it should be noted that at least three donors (Swedish, Italian and Belgian) have targeted the Scientific Directorate (central in P5) over the last years with the aim to strengthen the capacity for the coordination of research at UEM, but that synergy between the three could not be noticed by the evaluators. A recent evaluation of the Swedish programme clarifies that performance level of the Swedish programme was very low (Kruse, 2017: 67), which probably made it difficult to seek synergy.

Finally, the evaluators expected to see more synergy between the Faculty of Medicine and the ICRH in Maputo (which was established by the ICRH in Ghent and financially supported by Flanders). However, little collaboration in practice took place: scientific meetings were organised (stimulated by UGhent) but efforts were not maintained and collaborative projects did not emerge. This was a missed opportunity to work with already existing data of ICRH in order to facilitate data collection for PhD research.

Intervention Logic – The intervention logic of the projects was summarised in a logical framework per project. The frameworks mentioned indicators to be used to demonstrate progress and realisation in planned results and objectives and identified assumptions.

Overall, the evaluators have found the formulation of objectives too ambitious (aimed at effectively changing government policies and policy documents), and the view and understanding of how change happens rather simplistic: for e.g. it is not because research was done on reproductive rights that programmes and policies will be (re)formulated and will automatically create a better environment for respecting reproductive rights (see the logical framework at programme level). Another example: policy briefs do not necessarily engage stakeholders to reduce the incidence of maternal mortality or HIV (logical framework P4). The programme stakeholders agree with this finding, they stated they felt it was expected to be ambitious (in order to get the funding) and they did not take the opportunity (for e.g. with the formulation of Phase II) to adapt this.

In addition, the evaluators find that the link between expected outcomes at institutional and personal level, the differentiation between the two and the relations between them were not clearly described in the programme document (Phase II). Assumptions about the effect of personal changes at institutional level were not explicit. For e.g. a number of contextual dynamics clearly prevented UEM lecturers from giving the expected contribution to their institutions (having multiple jobs), which means that from the start it was clear that changes at institutional level through changes at personal level would be limited.

The quality of indicators defined in the logical frameworks can be questioned as they give little insight in changes or results. For e.g. some indicators are in fact descriptions of activities (for e.g. the organisation of workshops and courses in the community, P3). There are some quantitative indicators that capture steps in a process of change within UEM (such as numbers of PhD and MSc scholars, number of scientific articles), but qualitative indicators that indicate to what extent academic staff starts acting in a different way, how they are using the knowledge acquired, ... are not formulated. There are few indicators that give insight about the number and type of stakeholders/beneficiaries that was reached which makes it difficult to understand how the Desafio activities have penetrated the UEM. For example, there is no consolidated overview of who was reached by all the short courses provided by Project 5. Because the monitoring and reporting of Desafio is mainly concentrating on the indicators, it is probable that relevant changes that were not planned have not been recorded or used to orient and adapt project planning: for e.g. insertion of academic staff in regional networks for research and teaching have been mentioned by Desafio project members to the evaluators but these results are not systematically recorded in the reporting. Because of these findings, the evaluators conclude that the logical frameworks did not support the project leaders in being result oriented.

Project leaders admitted that they only used the logical frameworks for reporting and considered them to be administrative tools. As such, the logical frameworks have not really been worked on and have not been updated (risks, indicators) in the course of the programme. The lack of having a clear guidance as to where you want to go with a project, makes it difficult to monitor as a team and to appreciate results (if you do not know where you are going every change is fine). The evaluators had to consider this tension when appreciating results (see also under limitations).

Added value of the combination of projects within the IUC – One central topic acted as a read thread in the Desafio Programme. The four thematic research projects (P1, P2, P3 and P4) were developed to focus their activities towards the central theme in different domains: legal, medical and socio-

anthropological. The choice to design the programme around the specific topic of sexual and reproductive rights and health and AIDS was strongly suggested by the Flemish counterpart at the start of the Desafio programme in 2008 (the International Centre for Reproductive Rights (connected to UGhent) in consultation with UEM's Faculty of Medicine). As such it was not recognised at the start as highly relevant by other UEM faculties involved in the programme. The evaluation mission however confirms that gradually the focus of Desafio was appreciated by the main beneficiaries as relevant to stimulate multi-disciplinary in research and to develop a critical mass of research that allows to address current problems in Mozambican society from different and new perspectives. It is understood that combining different angles can increase opportunities to develop for more effective solutions to current problems. Respondents have hereby demonstrated ownership over the Desafio approach.

Desafio was designed to support this thematic research and teaching focus by a transversal project (P5) that aimed to strengthen an enabling environment for research which could also benefit other faculties in the university. As such, Desafio provided an interesting and well demarcated experimental environment to learn about the conditions and the operationalisation of the strategic ambition to be a research led university. A clear opportunity was there to upscale experiences from Desafio to the overall UEM level. Unfortunately, as will become clear in the section of 'effectiveness', this opportunity was not yet fully grasped by UEM.

2.1.2. Effectiveness

To assess effectiveness, the evaluators looked at the realisation of academic objectives and development objectives as formulated in the logical frameworks and at emerging results, quality of research and education. The scores are based on the assessment of changes with regards to the objectives as formulated in the logical framework (with less attention to the indicators), however, in the narrative, the evaluators will highlight also other changes that were not explicitly mentioned in the frameworks but were felt as important by the respondents and were validated through the field mission.

The effectiveness of the four thematic projects is found to be good, despite the weaker performance that will be highlighted under the section of efficiency (appreciation of the realisation of intermediate results). Seeds for change have been planted at individual level, but are not yet fully supported by institutional changes (that follow a different rhythm, are more difficult to realise and generally take more time). Critical comments on the realisation of the academic and institutional objectives are therefore formulated for projects 5 and 6 and are mainly related to institutional stumble blocks. The appreciation of numbers of completed PhD's and MSc's will be addressed under efficiency (looking at intermediate results). The realisation of development objectives was more difficult to attain in the thematic projects, except for project 2. Quality of research and education was ensured to a large extent. Several factors explain the results and are important to understand that effectiveness has greatly benefited from personal commitment of many of the Desafio stakeholders at project level.

	Project 1	Project 2	Project 3	Project 4	Project 5	Project 6
EQ 2.1. Realization of academic/institutional objective						
EQ 2.2. Realization of development objective					NA	NA

EQ 2.3. Quality of research and education						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 7: Overview of the scores for evaluation question 2 on effectiveness at project level

Realisation of academic/institutional objective – Most of the formulated objectives for the various projects refer to **increased academic capacity for research and teaching**. The evaluators find that the Desafio programme has definitely contributed to that.

To start with, the Desafio project members have acquired **first experiences with multi-disciplinary projects and research**, their effort was courageous and innovative given the weak tradition in the majority of the faculties involved.¹³ The multidisciplinary approach is well understood and is strongly developed at conceptual level, but also good concrete examples have been realised, for e.g.:

- Through P3 and one of the PhD's, lectures on gender are integrated in the module on Reproductive Health (in the Masters of Public Health, MPH, P4);
- PhD scholars in statistics (P6) have been involved in the design of the research of PhD scholars in medicine and have used data collected by the latter to develop and test statistical models;
- The MSc on social protection (P2) included the topic of Sexual and Reproductive Rights and HIV/AIDS;
- There are some examples of individual PhD scholars (from one project) that took the initiative to seek advice and feedback on chapters of their PhD thesis with scholars (from another project);
- PhD scholars (and their supervisors at both sides) had to make an effort to integrate various topics and topics that were quite new to them (given their educational background) into one PhD or MSc research: a lawyer as such had to talk about health issues, a statistician needed to understand very specific medical topics (that would never have been the first choice otherwise), a sociologist in P3 had to combine not less than 4 disciplines, ...

According to the evaluators, **it is in particular the changes in personal academic competences and the creation of a new educational offer (MSc courses) that are really making a difference in a stronger academic capacity of the faculties involved**. They are the basis on which a research culture can further develop. This is further supported by the development of a vision and policy on research and the acknowledgement by UEM that this is the way forward, a process that was supported by Desafio and other donor programmes. Of course, this is on the condition that PhD's and MSc that are expected to graduate before the end of 2019 will actually do so! Changes in the way of teaching, for e.g. case-based training (in the Faculty of Medicine) or student-centred learning (beyond some individual initiatives) on the contrary were not reported.

Looking at changes in personal academic competences first: the PhD's and the MSc that have (almost) completed their studies all shared with the evaluators their **sense of empowerment** for research and for teaching. Some of them even expressed their **appetite for research**. They are sensitive to ensure an **ethical approach** in their research and try (in varying degrees and noticed more strongly within P3) to **revolve the results** of the research to the communities that were involved. The PhD students and

¹³ This was confirmed by the Swedish evaluation (Kruse: 2017, 58) which states that cooperation across faculties is very rare.

graduates more in particular emphasized their **feeling of increased legitimacy and credibility to engage with other academics in national, regional and international networks, to seek partnerships and to apply for (research) funding**. Their **skills for writing have been strengthened (although still not estimated as really strong)** as is the importance they attach to publications and publishing. More articles have thus been published towards the end of Phase II and there is evidence of co-authorship (UEM and Flemish academics). Given the increasing importance attached to publications in the future UEM policies for career development (according to information from interviews), these academics are now one step ahead. Already, most of them confirm that their studies have advanced their careers. The exposure they received through Desafio (and the meetings with the management team including rector and vice-rector) increased their visibility and there is no doubt that they have the capacity to influence on their department.¹⁴

One module and two MSc courses have been created during the lifetime of the programme¹⁵ (Human Rights, Social Protection and module on Sexual and Reproductive health) and a MSc on Bio Statistics is about to be launched in 2021. Desafio also facilitated to a very limited extent the realisation of a new MSc in Anthropology. All of this adds to the educational offer of UEM and attracts for each edition on average between 15 to 20 students who are often practitioners¹⁶.

Thanks to the PhD and MSc graduates among UEM academic staff, UEM can gradually take over lectures from foreign professors (which is already 100% the case for the module in Public Health, P3) and can enrich and improve the content of the courses. PhD's of project 2 for example are now reviewing the curriculum to better contextualise it and to review the support to MSc students.

Following factors have contributed to the above-mentioned results:

- Commitment and (personal) investment of the majority of team leaders and co-team leaders/PhD students, both in Flanders and at UEM;
- The external expertise that was mobilised by Desafio from Flemish academics and academics from South Africa, Brazil, ...
- The organisation of international and regional seminars (P2, Desafio) and the organisation of national moot courts (P1+ 2) and participation in regional moot courts (P1 + 2) are at the basis of strengthened (individual) networks;
- The constant stimulation and invitation to publish. The example of P1 should be highlighted here: P1 created a Human Rights Law journal and stimulated students to submit articles by granting accepted articles with a sum of money;
- Courses provided by the doctoral school of UGhent that supported capacity for research and scientific writing.

¹⁴ This result is remarkable: the Swedish evaluation revealed that most PHD do not expect to advance their careers (Kruse: 2017, 74)

¹⁵ On the basis of the results framework of UEM's strategic plan, the evaluators conclude that these courses, as is the case with most of the UEM postgraduate courses have not been accredited. The results framework mentions the ambition to have 50% accredited by 2027. This is essentially a procedural issues, not one respondent highlighted this as a risk.

¹⁶ This finding cannot be substantiated with concrete data, the finding is based on partial information from Desafio annual reports and interviews with students. Comments from VLIR-UOS clarified that this number of enrolled students is similar to average enrollment of students in new MSc courses in other IUC programmes.

The respondents did not highlight a significant role for P5 and P6 in strengthening academic capacity, with maybe some exception for the courses of Academic English (to a smaller extent). Yet, these projects were partly designed to do exactly that. P5 combined a variety of specific project interventions and developed courses to support academic staff of UEM and more in particular Desafio beneficiaries to strengthen their research and teaching competences and their Academic English. P6 offered support in quantitative data-analysis (technical advice and training). It appears that the majority of Desafio project members did not participate in the trainings offered, mainly because they were not able to attend when the courses were organised and/or the offer was not sufficiently appealing to them. To add to this, there was also some resistance to change the way of teaching: efforts to change the way of teaching have been very much associated with reforms by a previous rector who wanted to implement the Bologna Agreements but encountered a lot of resistance after which a new rector decided to put halt to the process in 2011. This has negatively influenced further attempts to innovate teaching at UEM.

Although it is too soon to state that active research teams have been established, the evaluators acknowledge the **attempts to jointly organise and plan the development of research initiatives** for e.g. in P4 (that already has the space to convene exchange between academics) and in P3 (benefiting from a stronger tradition in research in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences). Clearly, these attempts are strongly stimulated by external factors (such as motivation by a Flemish team leader or opportunities for funding). **The evaluators conclude that research teams do not automatically emerge from increased numbers of postgraduate students nor as a result of donor funded projects**, but depend on the emergence of a research culture which needs time to develop.¹⁷ The dean of the Faculty of Medicine summarised what is still needed to foster this culture at the individual level: PhD students and lecturers need to invest more in reading, need to practice more their writing skills and deepen research approaches (in depth research).

As a critical comment related to the thematic projects, the evaluators would like to mention the following two points: the fact that multidisciplinary collaboration remains a challenge and that there is less evidence of research beyond the technical assistance type of research:

- Given the fact that Desafio was running for more than 10 years, the evaluators would have expected that the multidisciplinary approach was much more operationalised. They conclude that the necessary conditions for multidisciplinary research and research teams, such as stimulating leadership (from heads of departments and deans), supporting mechanisms and spaces, are not yet in place.
- The evaluators also would have expected that there was already more evidence of research beyond the PhD research and the 'technical assistance' type of research (that is most often executed under the heading of 'extension activities'). Although some of the faculties involved are responding to external opportunities (see for e.g. two research grants secured by the Centre for Reproductive Health) they are not yet giving evidence of endogenous research agendas. Post-graduate studies are thus not yet linked to proper and home-grown research lines based on an analysis of Mozambican context and academic competitors. Finally, there is little evidence of joint research between Flemish and UEM academics (with the exception of co-authorship, for e.g. in P3 and P2), which could be a strong instrument to build research capacity.

¹⁷ See also the 2014 UEM evaluation of its strategy, where it is stated that there is general confusion about what research is and what the difference is with extension.

The overall effectiveness of P5 and P6 is weaker when compared to the other projects and when assessed against the logical frameworks: the scores for P5 on the realisation of the academic and institutional objective received the score weak. Although many activities have been undertaken in P5 and some output has been realised (see further under efficiency), the project that was led by the Scientific Directorate never reached the stage of actual implementation needed to support the ambition of the university to be a research led institution: ideas and plans were never translated into UEM owned mechanisms to ensure an effective management of postgraduate studies, to operationalise the overall research policy and to support the faculties in developing endogenous research lines, or in navigating amongst available funding opportunities, etc. In the part on efficiency, the evaluators will point at the good performance for the Language Centre (part of P5) however. For P6, the evaluators would like to highlight however that the progress in the statistical unit concerned has been the most remarkable of the Desafio project, as the capacity at the start was almost zero. As such the relation between means and results was positively appreciated (see further under efficiency). Even if the score is weak, the detailed analysis of the project shows that a lot is to be expected, depending on the positioning of the statistical unit within UEM and the actual realisation of the statistical centre. As already suggested in the introduction the weaker effectiveness for these projects is related to institutional stumble blocks:

- The evaluators have understood that the leadership of the Scientific Directorate is not ready to assume a central and constructive role in operationalising the research policy in collaboration with the rectorate and that the SD works in 'splendid isolation' having limited relations with academic units at UEM (which is, in all fairness, also related to the poor responsiveness from those units of which many have a long history of being semi-autonomous).
- In relation to Project 6, it is understood that UEM and other faculties (except for the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine) do not yet recognise the professional capacity of the Statistics Unit and its central role in (and potential for) operationalising the research policy. Having an established centre (which is expected to be soon, since venue has been identified, computers are there, which is an important achievement of the project) might help to improve on this.

On the stronger side of P5, the evaluators acknowledge that UEM and the Director of the language centre have been able to use Desafio to strengthen the Language Centre which is now a school offering a package of language courses and access to a resource centre throughout the year.

Realisation of development objective – Most of the activities and results related to the development objective are connected to the extension activities of UEM, which have received considerable attention in the Desafio programme. The importance of extension activities is acknowledged and integrated in the UEM strategy. One of the categories is related to 'technical advice' which is currently the most common amongst academic staff (and is partly a result of the economic crisis in the country as already described in the context part). In the future, extension activities might become one of the criteria to move up in the academic career (as was shared with the evaluators during the interviews). An advisor and a team are currently working on the further operationalisation of UEM's extension policy.

The Desafio programme has not initiated this attention for extension but has largely contributed to it given the fact that from onset, extension was an important point of attention in the programme: in phase I, a number of activities were undertaken and the ambition of Phase II was to have more attention to and investment in extension. Unfortunately, the delay in the realisation of PhD's (and the increased use of budget to get them finalised) has led to the cancellation of a number of extension activities. The evaluators found it peculiar that the Desafio projects first wanted to end the PhD before they felt there was anything to share, as, from the point of view of the evaluators, involving right from the start the

relevant policy makers (and other stakeholders and allies) is part of extension and policy influencing. It also allows to consider (political) sensitivities and needs in the research.

The thematic projects have **developed new knowledge that is useful for society**. This should not be underestimated, for e.g. for P1 and P2 in particular, the research is amongst the first available and accessible research on the topics of Human Rights and Social Rights and responsibility written within the Mozambican context and in Portuguese. Amongst the MSc and PhD students a great deal of enthusiasm for the concept of Human and Social Rights was obvious. The thematic projects have also **raised awareness** on a number of topics with specific audiences: practitioners that have followed the MSc courses, participants in conferences, students during the Open UEM Days with access to HIV testing and information (P3), participants from other UEM branches, institutions and NGO's in short courses on gender (2-weeks courses offered by P3 with a certificate), on human rights and HIV/AIDS (P2), on quantitative data-analysis (P6). Unfortunately, it is not possible to establish the total number of people (and typology) reached and as such to assess the reach and influence of the Desafio programme (see also the chapter on impact).

The scores for P2 are better in comparison to those of the other thematic projects, because the formulation of the development objective was quite concrete and was attained to a large extent: to provide evidence-based knowledge and to raise awareness on the topic of social protection which is exactly what the project did. The efforts of P2 in phase II of the Desafio programme should be highlighted, more in particular the work they are doing with the Committee for Social Affairs in the Parliament (working on legislation for social protection), integration of Human Rights and HIV as a topic in the training package that was offered to the training institute of Magistrates, technical advice to the Human Rights Commission of the Bar's Association (on human rights, social rights, gender based violence, ...). An interview with a representative of the Human Rights Commission confirms that they feel well supported by this assistance and that this has given concrete direction to their policy influencing agenda (they are starting to prepare topical reports on the above-mentioned themes).

One critical comment is the fact that more knowledge could be realised if the Faculty of Law finds a way to better support MSc students in starting and finalising their MSc thesis (this is currently object of reflection within the Faculty), for e.g. in total 60 MSc students have followed the MSc on social protection but only 5 graduated. The figures for the MSc on Human rights are not available, but respondents confirm the same trend.

It should be noticed that various individual lecturers, that are active in the Desafio projects have access to decision makers through double employment and consultancies and as such can influence on them¹⁸, but this is outside of the particular project scope or the Faculty/UEM. An important stumble block to approach societal stakeholders and policy makers and share with them the research as a Faculty or institution, according to various respondents, is the fact that research results first need to be unpacked and translated to a non-academic target public and the fact that UEM or the Faculties involved first have to take ownership of the research results, as an institution. A first attempt with policy briefs could be noticed in P4 but is not wide spread. An interview with the Dutch Embassy reveals that UEM and its faculties are not yet using all available channels (when, where, how?) to link their research to public debates. The Dutch Embassy for e.g. states that UEM is largely invisible at the main forums/spaces

¹⁸ The flip side of this double employment is of course that they have to make a trade-off with regards to the time they spend on lecturing and research and the time they spend outside of the UEM.

where issues such as gender and social protection are discussed. The evaluation of the Swedish programme also reveals that external parties do not consider UEM to be an important or critical voice in Mozambican society or public debate (Kruse: 2017, 75).¹⁹ The evaluation also points at the fact that there are no real venues for academic opinion-making in Mozambique.

Development objectives were not defined for project 5 and 6 but the projects were involved in extension activities: with the organisation of regional and international conferences (P5) and through technical advice to the Ministry of Health in data-analysis (P6).

Quality of research and education – The evaluators as such cannot assess the quality of the research and the education provided as these have not been analysed. However, the following elements make the evaluators conclude that there is no reason to doubt the quality:

- The PhD's are well supported by their supervisors in Belgium. In 2013, supervisors were also appointed at UEM, which in many cases improved the guidance of the student (as was confirmed by the scholars). It should be noted that although the roles of the UEM supervisors and the rules of supervision have been detailed in the Desafio management manual, UEM does not yet have a clear policy on the rights and obligations of (co-)supervisors and their recognition, more in particular in the framework of international cooperation programmes. Local supervisors in the Desafio programme as such have not been formally recognised (which has caused some frustration, misunderstanding and demotivation as will be highlighted further in the section on efficiency). Some PhD's made comments about difficult access to the right expertise as they were not able to choose their main supervisors; in those case efforts important have been done by the Flemish PL to attract additional supervisors (in a committee).
- New courses are thoroughly prepared based on consultation of external stakeholders and analysis of market (for ex. P6). The module on reproductive health was developed through a joint process between Mozambique and other experts, based on a first proposal by the Flemish project leader.
- The MSc course on social protection is being revised to make it more context specific.
- MSc students that have been interviewed confirm their appreciation for the quality of the lectures. The fact that a number of lectures was provided in English was difficult for the majority of the students, but appreciated by some (it made sense to receive a lecture on international law in English, the exposure was a nice experience).

One critical remark relates to the way in which short courses were provided under P5: as on-off interventions that were difficult to plan and were not part of a capacity building trajectory tailored to the specific needs of academic staff that was enrolled in postgraduate programmes.

Positioning of UEM as a research led university – Based on the Desafio reporting and interviews at UEM and with Flemish project leaders, the evaluators do confirm that UEM has taken a number of steps

¹⁹ According to the evaluation this might be related to the lack of incentives, internal fear to speak out in the name of UEM or as professionals. The evaluation points at a number of initiatives, taken by UEM to disseminate research (such as publications and scientific conferences) but that that systematic data and information on wider effects are not available.

as a research based university over the last years, which also appears from the description in the context: for e.g. the formulation of a research policy, the increase in number of publications, the start of scientific journals, the establishment of a Scientific Fund (for UEM research projects, funded by SIDA). These are most probably partly influenced by Desafio (and by the Italian and Swedish partners) and by the study visits that introduced UEM to examples of scientific directorates and doctoral school in Belgium and in South-Africa. Specific activities, such as the conferences organised by P1 (2013 and 2015) and P2 (4 regional conferences), the scientific Desafio seminar in 2015 and the scientific conference in 2016 (under the lead of P5) have injected a new approach in the organisation of UEM academic conferences: situating the research within a regional and international context and highlighting one specific topic has strengthened the visibility of the UEM amongst specific target audiences (and more in particular the alumni network).

The evaluators conclude therefore that Desafio most certainly has contributed to making more concrete the research policy and to raise ambitions²⁰. However, changes in how the Scientific Directorate operates and assumes a constructive role at the service of the whole university are needed to capitalise on what has already been accomplished and to build further on the research results and the increased competencies of academic staff in order to become stronger as a university institution.

2.1.3. Efficiency

To assess efficiency, the evaluators looked at four aspects at project level: the realisation of intermediate results, the relation between means and results, the project management (EQ 3.3. and 3.4. will be discussed together) and partnership. At programme level, a specific question was added in the ToR, more in particular: did the Programme Support Unit perform better in Phase II of the Desafio programme, when it was absorbed within the office of international cooperation?

As announced in the introduction, focus of this evaluation was mainly on effectiveness and efficiency. The evaluators have thus not analysed efficiency and more in particular (financial) project management in detail but present a qualitative analysis.

The table with the scores below immediately clarifies that the efficiency of the Desafio Programme was its weakest link in the programme, with some exceptions, mainly related to P2 and P6 (explained by the relation between means and results and quality of partnership).

	Project 1	Project 2	Project 3	Project 4	Project 5	Project 6
EQ 3.1. Intermediate results have been delivered						
EQ 3.2. Relation between means and results						
EQ 3.3. Conductive project management						

²⁰ According to the evaluation of the Swedish programme ambitions might be even unrealistic, the evaluators argue that more emphasis should be on the consolidation and improvement of current activities and responsibilities. (Kruse: 2017, 57).

EQ 3.4. environment for project implementation						Cannot be judged
EQ 3.5. Quality of partnership						

Table 9: Overview of the scores for evaluation question 3 on efficiency at project level

Realisation of intermediate results – As appears from the description of the projects, the level of realisation of planned intermediate results is weak. The evaluators would like to start with highlighting that a considerable number of PhD's and MSc students, part of UEM academic staff will graduate before the end of 2019, that 2 new MSc courses were developed (on Human Rights and on Social Protection for on average 15 students per year), that a module on Sexual and Reproductive Rights exists already for more almost 10 years in the MSc course on Public Health and that over 40 scientific articles have been published of which 23 in international peer reviewed journals, mostly from P4 and P6).

For each of the projects, it is possible to identify a positive or success story:

- P1 realised moot courts (increasing regional visibility of academic staff) and a scientific journal and was able to stimulate academic staff and students to write (in Portuguese) as such increasing access to research;
- P2 organised successful regional seminars that showed what academics are doing with regards to social protection and they have enhanced the regional profile of UEM and strengthened the networks of academics;
- P3 and the research has contributed to a research track record for the VUB (and the supervisor) and has stimulated various new initiatives in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences;
- P5 has the language centre as a good example of how to develop a coherent and marketable package of services and courses. As such it could serve as an example for P6 and the unit for Statistics.
- P6 started with very limited capacity and knowledge and will soon have 4 PhD's!

The weak performance in the realisation of the PhD scholarships and the MSc scholarships received most of the attention in the steering committees of Desafio and in the self-assessments as the numbers of scholarships were understood to be key in contributing to the academic capacity of UEM. The overview is the following:

- PhD's: 11 out of 31 funded scholarships are completed and 11 are ongoing (expected to finish before the end of 2019). This is a success rate of 35% only, which might increase up to 70% by the end of 2019. P3 was the most timely and successful in realising the PhD's;
- MSc's: 22/42 completed (or 52%), a number of these MSc were followed in Belgium or in South Africa;
- 3 PhD's were cancelled, as were 14 MSc scholarships (of which 11 in P4);
- Graduation rates for the new MSc developed are particularly low (for e.g. 5 graduates for in total of 60 students enrolled for the MSc in Social Protection) and is related to students not starting/handling in their thesis.

This weak performance is not typical for the Desafio programme, but it is for UEM, as is also confirmed by the evaluation of the Swedish programme that was finalised in 2017²¹.

Following factors explain the difficulty in realising the targets related to PhD's:

- UEM rules mechanisms and tools for selecting, supporting and monitoring post-graduate students/scholarships were not well developed under Phase I of the Desafio programme. As such, candidates lacking commitment and appetite for research were selected in Phase I and were insufficiently stimulated by UEM to take their responsibility. The Mid-term evaluation of the programme urged UEM to take measures, which happened and partly improved on the situation. However, still today, both PhD graduates and PhD students testimony that the framework is still not sufficiently clear and that support is not well organised. Delays in the realisation of results under P5 that was aiming to improve the follow-up of the PhD's partly explain why the problems persist. Clearly, some faculties that have not waited for UEM rules to get organised and portray a better result, for ex. P3 within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.
- In phase I, project leaders for Desafio were at the same time PhD scholar, it proved to be very difficult to combine both (in terms of time management). In P1 and P2, this remained an issue: even though the dean of the Faculty of Law was appointed as PL, the work was de facto executed by the PhD's.
- The Mozambican context: the attention for research is recent at UEM, many academic staff had no clear idea about what research is and what constitutes a PhD and were not ready to perform as expected, there is no mechanism or culture at UEM rewarding investment in research (this started to change only recently, but till today, people are not really held accountable for what they achieve as researchers), staff selected to scholarship had to manage conflicting interests (dealing with teaching obligation within UEM, other jobs and family obligations) and found it very hard to focus on the PhD (juggling family and PhD was particularly hard on the women scholars). It was possible for academic staff to diminish their teaching, but, that also meant less income (more in particular if evening courses were dropped, since these come with a bonus on top of the salary).
- It is also true that some PhD only started late in the Desafio Programme: one third (13) started their studies in 2014 (of which 3 in 2015), which meant that they had less than 3 years left to finish within Phase II. The evaluators already established the fact that the multi-disciplinary approach did not make it easy for students to get their research started.
- It should be noted that P4 did not consider the opportunity to work with already existing data at the centre for sexual and reproductive rights (outside of Maputo), which might have made it easier to organise the research, clearly, as data collection was hard to plan and took a lot of time and effort.

The factors that explain the weaker performance for MSc (both UEM staff and students from outside of UEM) are mainly related to weaker capacity of the students to conceive and write a paper. As a thesis was often not required by the employer, students invested primarily in getting higher grades (especially for the modules being taught in English, they made efforts to upgrade their marks) and did not continue or took a very long time. Moreover, support and supervision for MSc students is not (yet) organised at

²¹ The report refers to a general realisation of 46%; the mode for realising the PhD was 7 years (mean time was 6,3 years).

the faculties involved. This is of course a weak point, as a thesis contributes to better integrate knowledge acquired.

Specific factors that have supported the realisation of the targets are: personal commitment (both on the side of some PhD students and their Flemish supervisors) and the access of PhD students to the doctoral schools/courses offered in Belgium as this made a difference in their understanding of research and in their efforts to organise their research (focus and methods) and was in particular the case for PhD students from P2, P4 and P6. The measure to urge scholars to invest more in their research and to increase the length of stay in Belgium has helped students to focus better and to make progress.

The weak performance was not only visible in the realisation of the scholarships: all projects were confronted with considerable delays in realising other intermediate results (which was the most visible in P5 and P6) and even had to cancel activities that were planned. This was the case for all projects and their extension activities (to a lesser extent for projects 5 and 6) towards the end of Phase II in order to use the budget for increased length of stay of PhD students in Belgium (from 2017 onwards). However, this was not the only explanation, as we will describe after the overview of activities that were cancelled.

Following activities were cancelled:

- P1: no cancellation but weak performance in assisting cases at the legal clinic,
- P2: did not realise the website or the module on Human Rights at the undergraduate level,
- P3: was not able to realise the interdisciplinary research papers (4 planned) outside of the PhD research, MSc of education was not realised, development of modules to qualitative research methods (aimed at academic staff of P1, 2 and 4),
- P4: working on capacity and skills of health workers, service delivery for specific target groups at the UEM clinic, replication of the module on SRH in other UEM branches, annual meetings with decision makers,
- P5: various workshops to strengthen academic writing skills.

Cancellation of these activities have diminished the effects of Desafio on strengthening the teaching and academic capacity. For P4, the channel to influence on policies was cancelled. Following factors explain why various activities and intermediate results were not realised:

- Availability of people with respect to ambitious planning: all activities had to be performed by a smaller group of people that simply did not find the time to organise things. This was in particular an issue in P4 and P5. P1 managed to organise a lot of things with students, which explains that less activities were cancelled.
- Governance and institutional issues (P5)
- Planning and coordination issues, more in particular where activities depended upon a request from other projects and Faculties. This was in particular the case in P3 and P5: if the demand was not coming, activities were not organised, there was no strategy to stimulate and organise demand.

Relation between means and results – Set against the description of the UEM statistics in the introductory chapter, the evaluators conclude that despite delays, lower performance and cancelled activities and the smaller budget (compared to other donors), Desafio has been an important programme for UEM:

- The programme has stimulated reflection at the higher levels about how to better organise management of programmes. This contributed to an increased capacity of the office for International Cooperation to negotiate terms of partnership and organisation of PhD scholarships with for e.g. the Swedish partners.
- The programme has delivered its part of student and staff mobility and the increase of research projects and scientific articles and scientific events, which appears from the UEM annual report 2017.
- The programme has created two new MSc courses. Figures from the evaluation of the Swedish programme show the number of MSc programmes increased from 8 in 2011 to 22 in 2015 (of which 2 with funds from Desafio).

However, considered the planned results and the available budgets, the relation between means and results was weak and the weakest in projects 4 (especially given the fact that this project had the largest budget) and 5. A better performance in P5 would really have contributed to a better support for academic staff enrolled in the Desafio and other post-graduate programmes. Projects 2 and 6 scored relatively well. For P2, this is mainly because the expected results were attainable and not overly ambitious. For P6, the project has realised major steps for the strengthening of the capacity of the statistical unit with the MSc and PhD trainings. Overall, UEM has lost considerable time, money and effort in phase I of the Desafio programme to take maximum advantage of the Desafio means and opportunities. And, although UEM has also learned a lot from this experience, important issues related to institutional organisation and governance hampering efficient programme management are still not resolved (see further under the point for project management).

To further appreciate the relation between means and results, the evaluators would like to highlight three specific points: the management of the sandwich modality, choices in strategy and the 2017 overspending of the budget:

- Management of the PhD sandwich modality: overall, all PhD students and graduates from the Desafio programme that were interviewed appreciated this modality, some of them confirm that they would not have started a PhD if it would have meant to stay full time in Belgium. The majority of the students state that the modalities (what were they entitled to) were not well explained to them by UEM, many of them discovered issues on the way and had to invest a lot of time to find out things. The investment that was required to conceive the research and to execute it came as a shock for some and a surprise for many of the scholars. They had to conclude that their readiness in terms of previous writing experience, data analysis and proficiency in English was not assured. As such, there was a general feeling of being ill-prepared. The combination with the stress to finalise in time and before the end of 2017 (which was for many of them not clear until the beginning of 2017), pressured the PhD's. In addition, they suffered from the weak management by UEM as not all of them will be able to finish their PhD on the same (financial) terms. An effective mechanism for local co-supervision or at least organised support (a necessary condition in a sandwich modality) did not realise; there still is no formal recognition of the supervising function (see also under the description of P5) and the follow-up of the students was not organised in a pro-active way. This caused frustration and lack of motivation both on the side of the student as on the side of the Mozambican supervisor. Finally, the appreciation of the relevance of the main supervisor in Belgium and his/her contribution to the PhD was mixed (over all projects), except for projects 2 and 6 (overall positive appreciation). Factors that

negatively influenced: difficulties to connect the fields of research and expertise, resistance to choose a topic that was relevant for Desafio, but less for the student, ...

- Choices in strategy: for a number of projects, the evaluators find that opportunities are missed or means could have been better used. Some of them are related to synergies that were not realised (see for e.g. in the above, related to P1 and the work with the legal clinic). Other choices that diminish a good ratio between results and means are the following: offering courses for free (P6 and P3, weaker attention in P6 for capacity strengthening of other staff at the statistics unit which has caused a lot of envy within the unit, lack of capacity building strategy in P5).
- Overspending: after years of underspending (something which was also recognised in the evaluation of the Swedish programme), the 2017 financial report of the Desafio programme ends with an overspending of more than 30.000 euro. The main factor of overspending seems to be the fact that UEM accepted to cover costs for activities of PHD's from P4 and P3 that would only be executed in 2018. The reason why this overspending was not detected in an earlier phase was because the decision was taken rather late and there was a lack of timely oversight of forecasted costs. The PL's of P4 and P3 did not manage the project budgets and were urged very firmly to ensure that PhD's could be finalised. The PSU did not ensure the financial monitoring as financial management was shifted to the financial department. It was brought to the attention of the evaluators by VLIR-UOS that the budgetline E2 offered opportunities for the UEM to create a buffer (through saving) that could have been used to cover this kind of overspending. This budgetline was clearly not used in that respect. UEM confirmed during the evaluation visit, that it would take its responsibility and cover the overspending from proper funds.

Conducive project and programme management and appropriate environment – Desafio was managed by a Flemish and a UEM coordinator, supported by PL's and a PSU unit (at UEM with a programme manager). At UEM, the programme, starting from the 2nd phase was hosted by the Office of International Cooperation at the rectorate office and guided by a management team. This changed the financial management compared to Phase 1: project budgets were no longer managed at the project level but at the central level and the Finance Department and all UEM rules, for e.g. with regards to procurement were followed from that moment on. At the start of Phase II, the basic VLIR-UOS management manual was further developed to clarify various roles and responsibilities and requirements for financial and narrative reporting within Desafio.

Another difference with phase I was the fact that VLIR-UOS and the Flemish counterparts were no longer represented on the ground by a Flemish technical assistant who used to be involved in planning, monitoring and reporting.

It was assumed that the centralisation at the level of the Cooperation Office and the fact that UEM coordinator and programme manager would be embedded in a larger structure close to the rectorate, would contribute to a more efficient execution, read: better planning, follow-up and realisation of activities and intermediate results. This assumption was not realised. Therefore, the question from the ToR, 'Did the programme Support Unit perform better in Phase 2, when it was absorbed within the office of international cooperation?' has to be answered negatively. The evaluators believe that the root causes of the lack of performance were not addressed and that the decision even worsened some issues. The evaluators give two examples: (i) much more bureaucracy entered the programme which in some cases had led to cancellation of orders (for e.g. the language lab for the language centre), (ii) the PL's did not longer have oversight of budget and budget spending at project level. While some of them might have

appreciated that this responsibility was no longer theirs, it took away from them one of the key instruments to manage a project. PL were informed about budget absorption in % ('you have used 25%' but without specifying the budget) but this information did not come on a regular basis. All stakeholders within a project were now responsible for their individual requests for budget to plan their activities, for e.g. field missions to collect data, which had to be approved at the Faculty level first and then had to go up to the international cooperation office. Although the evaluators believe that an international Cooperation Office is an essential attribute for a university dealing with various partners, the management solution was not the most appropriate for the execution of the Desafio programme.

It is in the evaluation of the Swedish programme, that the evaluators have found a quote that summarises quite well one of the major stumble blocks for efficient project management and also explains why the programme coordinator and programme manager at UEM only had limited power to improve the quality of project management: '*The combination of top heavy management and a decentralised academic structure with staff describing the Faculty as their 'institutional home' has an impact on the institutional coherence and effectiveness of management*', also for the management of international cooperation programmes.²²

In relation to appreciation of project management, it should be added that overall, a lack of time for the PL is another factor that explains why project management was weak: the PL did not invest sufficient time in planning, planning of budget, timely provision of (complete) information to the programme manager. It is clear that project management (although far from perfect) was best organised in project 3, with a PL involving project stakeholders from various departments in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, thus involving the whole Faculty and sharing the burden for project management. This has in turn contributed to a broader ownership for Desafio. It is in this Faculty that a collaborative model for joint research is taking shape, most probably based on the experiences with the already existing research centre for Policy analysis: taking stock of the how and the results could inform other faculties about how to better organise themselves in the future.

The environment was the least conducive for efficient project management in P1 and P2 (lack of ownership of Faculty leadership, de facto project management by the PhD's) and in P5 (governance and institutional issues related to the position of the Scientific Directorate).

Partnership – Overall, respondents at UEM feel that Belgian partners/partner universities have been very understanding for the context in which UEM has to operate and have demonstrated a lot of flexibility. It has always been possible to discuss in a frank and open manner problems and issues during joint steering committees. The self-assessments also demonstrate a sense of critical reflection at both sides. The joint evaluation and planning of next steps during joint meetings was very much appreciated.

One important issue that has hindered, more in particular the PSU and the PLs at UEM is the fact that role division between Flemish Universities and VLIR-UOS remains unclear: some negative experiences with agreed costs that were not accepted by VLIR-UOS have raised questions about who is actually taking decisions?

At UEM side, partnership relations have been particularly appreciated in P4, P2 and P6. For P4, this is related to the following factors: commitment of the deputy coordinator of the Desafio programme in Flanders both as supervisor of PhD students and in stimulating reflection at the research unit for Repro-

²² Kruse: 2017, page 53. The evaluation adds to this that UEM is a politicised university and that interlocutors state that the political impact has increased with the last two presidents.

ductive Health (for e.g. support in organising the research team), the student mobility programme (Flemish students coming to UEM), the joint collaboration in developing the SRHR module in Phase I and the relation with the Centre for Reproductive Health in Ghent and organisation of support to PhD's of UEM as a team. The longer history between the partners probably contributed to the positive experience and it will continue in the future (commitment for collaboration is already signed and will also include the other Desafio Faculties). For P2 and P6, both with UHasselt, the interaction at a personal level was very much appreciated, the efforts of UHasselt to seek solutions for the financing of the PhD's that are not yet finalised, securing of additional funds for the MSc in project 2, the recognition of expertise of UEM scholars (for e.g. PhD's from P2 being invited to teach at the UHasselt as an academic and a researcher) and the co-supervisor.

Issues that have most hindered partnership relations are the following:

- Flemish coordinator and PL's in Belgium in general would have welcomed more pro-activeness in the management, execution and follow-up of Desafio by the UEM PL's and PSU.
- At UEM side, it was felt that the burden of reporting was not equally shared, even though most activities are executed in Mozambique, it is understood that there is a shared responsibility (as partners) for achieving the results and this would also include monitoring and description of changes. UEM respondents and PL in Flanders do not appreciate reporting formats (with KRA's and tables with indicators) and do not monitor in such a way as to efficiently collect data to be included in the report. Reporting is only done against the deadline. It is argued by the evaluators that the formats of reporting are not conducive for Flemish partners to take up a role in reporting.
- The recognition of Mozambican (co-) supervisors: it is true that UEM is not clear about the recognition of UEM supervisors in partnership programmes, on the other hand, the recognition of Mozambican supervisors involved in the Desafio programme has not been well discussed or decided upon amongst the partners either. The management manual of the Desafio programme explains what the role of the UEM (co-) supervisor is, but this appears not to be sufficient. It should be clearer when and under what conditions a UEM supervisor is considered to be a genuine co-supervisor whose name will be mentioned on the thesis of the PhD. There is one particular case at UEM where the supervisor felt she was entitled to be mentioned and where this expectation was not clear at the Flemish side. Although this is related to only one particular case (as far as the evaluators know), it has been discussed by all Desafio stakeholders at UEM and it raised (quite rightfully) questions about respect and recognition that need to be discussed amongst partners.

2.1.4. Sustainability

To assess sustainability, the evaluators looked at academic/institutional and financial sustainability. The ToR asked the evaluators to answer an additional question: *'Did the increased involvement of the various faculties in phase II contribute to the ownership of the projects by these faculties?'*

As mentioned in the introduction of this evaluation report, focus of the end evaluation was on effectiveness and sustainability. From phase II onwards, sustainability was clearly present in the programme design and its importance was understood by all respondents. Overall, the sustainability of projects 3, 4 and are rated as good, mainly because of the level of ownership at the level of Faculty leadership. It

should be noted however that various planned results have not yet been attained which makes it difficult to be conclusive on the issue related to sustainability.

	Project 1	Project 2	Project 3	Project 4	Project 5	Project 6
4.1. Level of academic and institutional sustainability						
4.2. level of financial sustainability						

Table 11: Overview of the scores for evaluation question 4 on sustainability at project and programme level

Academic and institutional sustainability – To start with, the evaluators would like to highlight the fact that UEM has a vision which places research at the heart of the institution, this vision will most certainly not be turned back and safeguards an evolution towards a research led university, however much slower than anticipated and probably not fully realised for another decade.

For all projects, the evaluators believe that the majority of academic staff that was enrolled in PhD programmes will remain at the UEM, even if only in Project 4 (and with the newly selected PhD's) a formal commitment to stay at UEM had to be signed by the graduates. One of the reasons is that people want to remain a lecturer at the university for the prestige connected to this title.

The PhD's that have graduated have seen their academic career advance. In the current situation of economic crisis, where UEM has decided to freeze promotions, this is a worry for the new PhD graduates, but it does not seem to pose a risk for retainment for the time being. This academic staff can now use its enlarged network, the new research results and overall experience with research to consolidate and further improve quality of teaching, scientific supervision of students, taking over classes from foreign lecturers. Starting up new research is clearly much less evident (and concrete initiatives for the near future have not been mentioned). Some examples to underline institutional sustainability:

- PhD's of P1 and 2 replace foreign lecturers in the newly created MSc courses;
- PhD's from P2 are revising content and approach of the MCs on social protection;
- PhD's of P6 improve the quality of their teaching on statistics at all levels;
- In all projects, except P5, relations with other universities in the world have been developed and will be maintained, more in particular relations with Portugal, South Africa and Belgium;
- Academic staff in P3 is developing a new MSc course on gender based on the experience with Desafio (and the short course on gender provided during the Desafio programme).

Strengthening of scientific supervision within the faculties concerned is still a challenge but it is said that the current Swedish programme will pay attention to this through training. The UEM strategy mentions its plan to establish a Forum of Research, Extension and a forum for Postgraduation Deputy Directors which might offer a platform to further discuss the issue of supervision.

The main risk for the sustainability of these results is the availability of the academic staff to teach or to conduct research given their other obligations, this is clearly an issue for P1, P2 and P4 and will not be solved easily.

Although sustainability of results is strongly connected to the individual academic staff, there are indications of increased ownership at faculty level, where leadership is already committed to use the results

of Desafio and to consolidate them. This is most visible at the level of P3, P4 and P6. The ownership of P5 (Scientific Directorate) and P1 and P2 (Faculty of law) is not (clearly) articulated.

It is also in the same projects (P3, 4 and 6) that discussions at faculty level have been organised about the centres and how best to ingrate them thus ensuring their sustainability.²³ In all three cases, there is an understanding that integration of the planned centres as research units in existing centres is the best option. It is no coincidence that the concerned faculties (more in particular Arts and Social Sciences and Medicine) have already developed several guidelines and rules without waiting for them to come from the central UEM level.

The future plans for the research centre are most concrete for project 3. There is not yet evidence of home-grown research agenda's as these centres resulting from Desafio (although there are some ideas in P2 for collaboration with colleagues from P3) but readiness for research increased and the research unit at the Faculty of Medicine (P4) already attracted two research projects. These kind of success experiences are important to motivate academic staff to invest more in research and it can attract academic staff with a real appetite for research.

The evaluators believe that following activities will be maintained as much as possible (maybe in a more modest form): scientific events and conferences, scientific journals (may be only online), sensitization on HIV/AIDS during the UEM open days and the programme of the language centre, the new MSc courses developed (with more doubts about the MSc on social protection. Following lessons can be identified from this:

- The importance of seeking a collaborative model when designing specific activities: within P3, the project members organised the sensitisation activities around HIV/AIDS in collaboration with the students and with the Ministry of Health, these activities will continue because the partners remain engaged. In contrast, P3 and P6 organised short courses, respectively on gender and data-analysis as free of charge activities. Based on interviews, the evaluators conclude that there is little chance that these courses can be continued, unless if they are integrated in another donor funded programme.
- The importance of developing a home-grown agenda for teaching and research: the language centre has been stimulated to develop its own offer and to seek market for it. It is a successful example of the Desafio programme.

It is almost certain that outreach activities will be discontinued because of the lack of funds. The Faculty of Medicine and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences having a longer track record with extension, might have a stronger position to further invest in outreach at the level of communities and as part of research projects.

The ToR explicitly asked to analyse to what extent the management team of the Desafio Programme has contributed to ownership over the programme. The management team was created at the start of Phase II and is comprised of representatives of the rectorate, SD and the deans of the Faculties. The assumption was that this team would make the deans more responsible for the project(s) in their faculty and that this would support efficient execution. Clearly, this decision lead to a general understanding amongst the faculties involved in the Desafio programme that this programme was not only a programme for the Faculty of Medicine but that benefits were pursued for the other faculties as well. As

²³ In P2, the Faculty of Law is not against the establishment of the centre for social protection but will not take measures to support or sustain.

such, the general attitude towards the importance and meaning of ownership was positively influenced. It has brought on board some of the deans (see the above-mentioned projects 3, 4, 6). The initial commitment was further strengthened but this was more the result of a personal commitment than the merit of the management team. This can be explained by various factors: the management team was very high level and far from the actual implementation of the project's venue; because it was high level, it was very difficult to gather the people in one meeting; as such the number of meetings was very limited. Moreover, meetings were no longer organised after 2017 which was considered to be the end of the programme.²⁴ As such, the management team did not play a major role in the definition and execution of the phasing out, which is an important phase to ensure sustainability.

Finally, to sustain the results and use them as stepping stones to become a research -based university, first institutional and governance issues need to be resolved (positioning of the Scientific Directorate vis-à-vis the faculties), secondly, the university should improve on making the research results more accessible (beyond the scientific events), for e.g. through the repository in order for other academic staff to build further on this.

Financial sustainability – The financial sustainability of various results is under pressure. Already, some of the activities offered are discontinued (see in the above). The MSc in the Faculty of law will have to find additional funding or will have to cut down on the number of foreign professors. This is not yet the case for P2, which has been able to secure external funds through the UHasselt and Erasmus+ for the next two years). There is however no longer support for the centre. Since the projects have managed so far, the Faculty of Law has never financially contributed, has never budgeted any contribution and has no intention to do so in the near future. As with P2, also P6 can count on some financial support for the near future (through the collaboration with UHasselt) but this will not cover all the current activities.

Overall, the stakeholders demonstrate little investment so far in identifying and attracting additional donor money (with the exception of some first attempts in project 2 and 3): they are little pro-active, have little knowledge about the channels, are not developing any strategy nor are they actively marketing research results. This is worrisome in a context where funds for research are going down and the Desafio programme is not renewed. Little support is provided by the higher management or the Scientific Directorate in assisting Faculties to attract external funds. The latter only channels request for collaboration (in funding programmes) to the respective faculties.

To some extent, the collaboration within the Swedish programme might be helpful to sustain some of the results or to realise some of the results that were planned but not yet attained.

2.1.5. Impact

For impact, the evaluators have been looking at two elements: indication of impact at academic level (level of wider Faculty and university) and indications of impact at development processes.

²⁴ The IUC programme does no longer provide funding for meetings as the Phase out is supposed to be the finalisation of last activities and not, as was the case in Desafio as an extra year to fund the finalisation of PhD's. However, as this was the case in Desafio, the lack of meeting space and opportunity was not helpful.

Despite the weaker efficiency and effectiveness and although it is probably too early to expect a lot of impact given the weak realisation of a critical mass of PhD graduates, some thematic projects can present indications for impact, both at the level of the wider university community and on development processes.

	Project 1	Project 2	Project 3	Project 4	Project 5	Project 6
EQ 5.1. indications of impact at academic level						
EQ 5.2. Indications of impact at on local, regional or national development processes					NA	NA

Table 12: Overview of the scores for impact at project level

Indications of impact at academic level – More in particular in P1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 (language centre), the evaluators can notice the emergence of a (Desafio-)network of academic staff that has been connected around a multi-disciplinary topic and knows where to find appropriate partners within UEM to discuss experiences or new opportunities; for e.g. staff from P2 and P3 share a desire to undertake joint action (for e.g. on the mapping of gender violence, or taking part in each other's workshops with a presentation), even though not always very concrete.

In P4 and P3, it is clear that the Desafio experience is influencing and inspiring other initiatives in the Faculty, such as the adaptation of the undergraduate programme at the Faculty of Medicine and the development of a new MSc on gender at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

Gradually and under pressure of the Desafio programme and the need to increase the success rate of PhD and MSc graduates (and avoid mistakes from phase I), discussions in the joint steering committee and the management team have led to the formulation and clarification of some rules for being enrolled in MSc or PhD programmes (age, basic knowledge of English, minimum availability, ...). This impact on wider UEM regulations was felt to be important by the various respondents at UEM because it contributed to transparency (although they are the first to admit that rules are not always enforced). Respondents confirm that this also influenced negotiations with other donors, for e.g. with the Swedish on the organisation of the sandwich modality for PhD's.

A final example of impact at academic level is provided by P1, where the MSc on Human Rights has been copied by two other universities in the country.

Indications of impact on development processes – It would be too much to expect new policies and legislation influenced by Desafio (as was mentioned in some logical frameworks and in the programme logical framework), given the delays in execution. It was also noticed by the evaluators that, UEM is not very much present in the public debate about the issues that are central in the Desafio programme. UEM academics involved in Desafio are however undoubtedly connected to broader development processes through the UEM alumni network or personal contacts. They tend to play the role of advisor or technical assistant. It is not clear to what extent this is a deliberate choice (for e.g. to avoid being caught in political discussions which might negatively affect the UEM or their position at UEM, a fear that is sadly all too real as examples in the recent past have proven). In any case, being an advisor clearly offers opportunities to increase the income.

Several examples of successful technical assistance can be provided, for e.g. P2 and the Commission on Social Affairs in the Parliament and the HR Committee at the Bar's Association, P6 and the Ministry of Health (data-analysis), P1 and the HR Committee at the Bar's Association, P4 and its policy briefs. It should be noted however, that P4 planned to do more, but, because of the difficulty to realise the PhD's less attention went to policy influencing (see cancellation of yearly meeting with decision makers). The evaluators have been able to interview the president of the HR Committee (an alumnus of the MSc course on Human Rights) who stated that the assistance provided by UEM improved the quality of the reports and oriented the Committee towards more specific topics to address, such as gender-based violence and social protection. Only one example was provided of influencing on development processes through extension work and field work related to traditional healers (PhD of E. Mariano, 2013): the way in which the study was conducted has contributed to new relations between traditional healers and care takers (not verified in the field by the evaluators).

The evaluators believe that the following factors have played a role and are strengthening the position of UEM as development actor:

- The choice for 'trendy' topics, such as human rights and social protection or SRH: MSc students confirmed they very much appreciated this choice. The fact that they received opportunity to study these topics from an academic perspective enabled them to perform in their jobs with more authority. Also, they had the feeling to be part of something innovative and many of them were extremely enthusiastic about the topics. The fact that UEM has been able to mobilise them for this evaluation is additional proof of that.
- The UEM scientific conferences on gender, social protection, reproductive health increased the visibility of the academic work done at UEM
- The MSc and PhD graduates will certainly influence on their environment through the (often important) positions they currently hold (outside of UEM).

The evaluators would like to highlight one specific issue: various respondents claim to have influenced through short courses (P3 and P5 and 6) people from outside of UEM. However, UEM did not keep track of nor document any effect, which makes it hard to substantiate the claims. More interviews with external actors might be necessary to collect data; however, this was not possible within the timeframe of the evaluation.

The overall academic and developmental objective of Desafio was to strengthen the UEM as a developmental actor in Mozambican society in the domain of reproductive health and HIV/aids, to improve Reproductive Health in society and to contribute to the national fight against HIV/AIDS. The evaluators conclude that Desafio has strengthened the academic capacity and relevant research results were produced and made accessible through scientific events, conferences, journals and technical assistance. The focus on reproductive rights and HIV/AIDS has allowed to produce multi-disciplinary research and to approach important challenges and problems from various angles. Academics have thus understood that looking at existing problems from a different angle, influences reflection and creates opportunities for alternative solutions. The MSc and modules contribute certainly to a group of professionals that have better understood the notion of 'rights' and can as such influence within their working environment. Last but not least: several UEM academics are at important positions in society (law, health sector) and there is no doubt they have the competence to infuse their ideas in policies and programmes. As a critical remark, the evaluators would like to highlight that UEM is not yet sufficiently marketing this multi-disciplinary research (beyond the conferences), does not enable easy access to all documents produced

and has not used Desafio or the phasing-out to reflect upon a joint research agenda that allows to consolidate on the research. The evaluators do not see a direct link between Desafio and improved reproductive health in society and a more effective fight against HIV/AIDS at this moment. More data collection amongst external actors, their appreciation and how they are using knowledge acquired through MSc, short courses, scientific journals, would be necessary. UEM and the Faculties concerned could consider more efficient data collection in the future, for e.g. through tracer studies.

2.2. Evaluation of Desafio at project level

2.2.1. Overview of the projects: description of the main output

This chapter starts with an overview of all the projects and the main outputs (according to the indicators in the pre-defined result areas for academic capacity building at objective or results level of the logical frameworks).

Based on the overview below, the evaluators understand the following about the main outputs²⁵:

- In the course of Desafio, men and women have been equally selected for PhD and MSc scholarships.
- PhD's: 11 out of 31 funded scholarships are completed and 11 are ongoing (expected to finish before the end of 2019). This is a success rate of 35% only, which might increase up to 70% by the end of 2019. P3 was the most timely and successful in realising the PhD's.
- MSc's: 22/42 completed (or 52%), a number of these MSc were followed in Belgium or in South Africa;
- 3 PhD's were cancelled, as were 14 MSc scholarships (of which 11 in P4)
- 5 research units have been established (next to the existing centre of HR), of which 1 (at the Faculty of Medicine on SRH) is already functional;
- Articles in international and national peer reviewed newspapers have been published: in total 40 articles were published with 12 still under review (at least 23 articles in international peer reviewed newspapers, articles have been mainly published under P 4 and 6, medicine and statistics). In 2017 there was a clear increase, due to the increased rhythm of PhD execution.

Project	Objective ²⁶ and topic, main output (phase 2)
Project 1 PL: Eva Brems (UGhent) and Armando Di- mande (UEM) Hosted by: Faculty of Law, department of HR	UEM is enhanced as a major provider of knowledge and competences on the right to health and sexual and reproductive rights in the context of HIV/AIDS , awareness and expertise on Human Rights has improved and a rights-based approach with respect to reproductive health and HIV/AIDS is adopted by governmental and non-governmental actors. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• PhD: 1 PhD might finish in 2019 (of 4 that started, 1 is cancelled, the realisation of two others unclear/uncertain)• MSc: 4/5 completed (of 1 status is unclear)• Master course developed within Desafio, 4th edition: Master in Human Rights (runs every two years)• Articles in international peer reviewed journals: 0• Articles in national peer reviewed journals: 1• UEM human rights law journal (5 volumes): 32 articles• Further development of an existing Centre for Human Rights

²⁵ The figures are based on an overview of funded scholarships received from the project, final calculation was done by the evaluators.

²⁶ The formulation is taken from the logical frameworks

<p>Project 2</p> <p>PL:</p> <p>Petra Foubert (UHasselt) and Armando Di-mande (UEM)</p> <p>Hosted by: Faculty of Law, department of HR</p>	<p>To develop and social rights/social protection and to ensure UEM provides evidence-based knowledge and expertise to key stakeholders and contributes to the increase of public awareness of social rights/social protection issues in general, with a particular emphasis on rights related to HIV</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PhD: 1 finished of 2 started (the other one will finish soon but no date set yet, with extra funds from UHasselt) • MSc: 1 completed of 2 started (status of the 2nd one is unclear) • Master course developed within Desafio: master of law in social law (is being reviewed, evening courses) • Articles in international peer reviewed journals: 2 • Articles in national peer reviewed journals: 8 (still to be published in the Social Protection Review of the Research Institute) • Book with conference proceeding: 1 • Working towards the creation of an institute of social law (previously under centre for Human Rights) and a department of social protection
<p>Project 3</p> <p>PL:</p> <p>Gily Coene (VUB) and Carlos Manuel (UEM)</p> <p>Hosted by: Faculty of Arts and Sciences</p>	<p>To strengthen the capacity of the UEM in terms of research and teaching in gender, health and family issues and to increase and disseminate knowledge on the socio-cultural dynamics of HIV/AIDS and reproductive health by empowering communities on the basis of best practices and by informing policy-making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PhD: 6/6 (of which one still has to defend in 2018) • MSc: 3/7 completed (the status of the others is unclear) • Master course developed within Desafio: non (some support was provided for meetings to start with a new MSc course in Social Anthropology) • Articles in international + national peer reviewed journals: 20 (of which 4 still under review) • Creation of a centre on women and gender
<p>Project 4</p> <p>PL:</p> <p>Kristien Roelens (UGhent) and Khatia Munguambe (UEM)</p> <p>Hosted by the faculty of medicine</p>	<p>To understand the structural factors affecting the accessibility, availability and quality of services; To generate more knowledge on determinants of health seeking for maternal health and HIV; To identify the role of norms and values on risky behaviour for HIV/AIDS and maternal health including Family; To raise awareness of policy makers and decision makers; To sensitize communities; To increase awareness on neglected topics related to maternal health among health care personnel; To provide multidisciplinary comprehensive care for SGBV victims and other risk/vulnerable groups; To improve sustainability of reproductive health/ HIV/AIDS capacity building, research and extension activities at UEM; Strengthen academic capacity in the fields of maternal health and HIV/AIDS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PhD: 0 of 8 that started (1 PhD will defend in 2018, 5 other PhD's might defend in 2019, 1 PhD was cancelled and of one other, the status is unclear) • MSc: 7 of 23 that received a scholarship for a MSc completed (11 MSc were cancelled, of 5 that started, the status is unclear) • Master course developed within IUC: module of Reproductive Health within Masters of Public Health (already 9 cycles) • Developed reproductive Health/HIV curriculum for undergraduate medical students • Establishment of a research unit (in 2013) • Articles in international peer reviewed journals: 13 • Articles in national peer reviewed journals: 0
<p>Project 5 (transversal)</p> <p>PL:</p> <p>Mieke van Herreweghe (UGhent)</p>	<p>To develop UEM's capacities for Research through the operational development of UEM's Research Policy (RP); To develop UEM's capacities related to Academic English; To develop UEM's capacities related to teaching; To overview the postgraduate studies process (involving the Centre of Academic Development, the Scientific Directorate and the Language Centre).</p>

<p>and Natasha Ribeiro (UEM)</p> <p>Hosted by: scientific directorate, dept. Of post graduate studies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PhD's: 2 out of 4 that started have completed (a 3rd one might finish in 2019, 1 PhD was cancelled) • MSc's: 3 out of 6 planned (three MSc have been cancelled) • Functional language centre (at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences)
<p>Project 6 (transversal)</p> <p>PL:</p> <p>Marc Aerts (UHasselt) and Rafika Razac (UEM)</p> <p>Hosted by the unit for statistics (in the department of mathematics and informatics)</p>	<p>Bio statistics and modelling. To develop statistical tools for the analysis of sexual and reproductive health data in Mozambique; To develop research activities in the department, in partnership with government institutions, industry, NGOs and the society in general.</p> <p>The latter needs to be understood as focusing on statistical methodology (from the design of studies up to the analysis of resulting data) (clarification by Flemish PL)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PhD: 1 completed out of 4 that started (three others are expected to finish in 2019 or 2020, with extra funds from UHasselt) • MSc: 4/5, 5 received scholarship for a Master of Statistics at UHasselt, one did not graduate • Master course developed within IUC: realised for 80%, is now taken up further for completion) • Articles in international peer reviewed journals: 8 • Articles in national peer reviewed journals: 0 • Working towards the creation of a Centre of Statistics

2.2.2. Project 1: on the right to health and sexual and reproductive rights in the context of HIV/AIDS

In the following, the evaluation team gives an overview of the assessment of project 1. It is based on the guiding questions in the evaluation framework (see annex), which also refers to the indicators of this project as formulated in the logical framework.

EQ 1 – To what extent is the project relevant?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
1.1. Responding to needs Score: excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly relevant because it meets a need of deeper knowledge on HR from academic perspective Practitioners active in the field (from Ministry of Health, International NGO's, lawyers and some of them at important positions, such as President of the Human Rights Commission at the Bar's Association) had now access to international and new academic knowledge. Offering a MSc provides people with an academic qualification which can be important for their future career, the requirement of a thesis allows to better integrate the knowledge, especially if it is research based and to be able to use it afterwards Participants of MSc courses confirmed that the rights issue in Mozambique is not yet well explored, more and more organisations are saying they are adopting a rights-based approach but is often donor language, this project can unpack what it actually means (beyond superficial information) The investment in writing and documenting responds to a clear need of having access to systematised knowledge and bibliographies (accessible information, for ex. Journal), the publications provide important starting points and contribute the access to information The strategic plan of UEM does not mention AIDS/Human Rights: the link between HR and HIV/AIDS is made in the National AIDS Strategy but not in UEM's strategic plan. The university's research lines identify both communicable diseases and human rights separately.
1.2. There have been efforts to ensure complementarity and synergy with other projects/other (Belgian) actors No score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within Desafio: there have been some interactions with other project beyond project management. Collaboration with the legal clinic happened: on request of MSc students involved in P4, they could be involved in case handling with the clinic. This clinic does not have a pro-active strategy to attract specific cases for e.g. on SRR and HIV aids, cases are brought to them. Through other funded programmes (SIDA and Oxfam), specific attention for disability within the MSc was noticed. Individual relations exist for e.g. with Ministry of Justice, High Court, Bar's Association
1.3. The intervention logic of the project is coherent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptation of objectives after MTE: remains equally ambitious (or even more ambitious): the understanding of how a university can influence policies was not developed as a pathway: the idea was that

<p>Score: weak</p>	<p>the availability of research and conferences would automatically influence policy, but policy change is a bit more complicated than that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicators at objectives level: difficult to measure, no evidence from the evaluation that there is a strategy to measure contribution • Indicators at results level became more realistic (downscaling of expectations), more oriented towards outputs and less on changes <p>Explanatory factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1: not clear who was involved in the conception of project, first draft was done at UEM, this was used for match making. • It took some time for the Mozambique counterpart to understand the project logic
<p>Overall judgement on relevance of the project</p> <p>The project is very relevant to contextualise and unpack the topic of HR in relation to AIDS, re-search (within PHD scholarships) and MSc course gives access to practitioners that are dealing with rights issues on a daily basis.</p> <p>There is no evidence of strategic approach towards collaboration with other actors, besides the provision of training modules to NGO's in Phase 1. The project was able to rely on a network of individual contacts in important gremia.</p> <p>The project is too ambitious at objectives level and would not be able to measure clear contribution.</p>	

EQ 2. To what extent the project's specific objectives have been achieved (effectiveness)?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
<p>2.1. The specific academic/institutional objective has been realised:</p> <p>Score: good</p>	<p>Objectives were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enhance UEM as a major provider of Knowledge and competences on the right to health and sexual and reproductive rights in the context of HIV/AIDS • To improve awareness and expertise on Human Rights with respect to Sexual and Reproductive Rights and HIV/AIDS within the Faculty • To increase research and student practice in Human Rights <p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has created spaces for students of the faculty of law to be involved (writing articles for the journal, participating in moot courts) • The main focus was on human rights, issues related to SRR and HIV AIDS were clearly touched in publications, for e.g. the topic chosen for MSc thesis. A publication of the Faculty of Law (from 2012) about labour law and social protection in Mozambique and Macau includes an article on HIV and workers' rights in Mozambique; there was also a publication (in 2015) fully dedicated to sexual and reproductive rights and HIV and AIDS, which has one article about SRHR of LGBTI people, one violations of SRHR and HIV in the context of domestic violence, one on the need for an effective legal framework to protect SRHR, one on SRHR and gender equality, one on SRHR and cultural practices, and one that maps actions to promote SRHR by the government and NGOs. • There is increased visibility of the centre for HR and focus on HR in the Faculty (e.g. the project influenced on the course of

	<p>fundamental law at the undergraduate level, which is now called 'HR and fundamental law')</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The publication of the journal should be applauded as it gives more access to new knowledge in Portuguese • The amount of knowledge and research produced is still modest. • The stimulation of students through a research grant and the moot courts was relevant and effective and should be applauded. • Within the framework of consultancy type of work, advice (not research) is provided (see under impact). <p>Explanatory factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delays in the realisation of PhD's and MSc: more in particular MSc fail to finalise their thesis and do not complete • Little research was done outside of the PhD's and MSc's. Advisory work is not the same as research.
<p>2.2. The specific development objective has been realised</p> <p>Score: weak</p>	<p>Objectives were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To adopt a rights-based approach with respect to reproductive health and HIV/AIDS by governmental and non-governmental Actors; • To Increase access to justice in relation to Sexual and reproductive Rights <p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives as described in the logical framework have not been reached (too ambitious). These objectives mention that SRHR and IDS would be more on the agenda of government or approached in a different way. The evaluators would say that there is certainly an increased rights-based approach, more in particular in relation to reproductive health and HIV (as compared to sexual health), however the evaluators do not think this can be attributed to the work carried out under this project specially if we consider what it seems as distance between the faculty of law and HIV and AIDS bodies and actors. • Nonetheless, with target groups directly connected to the project and its activities, there is clearly more attention and enthusiasm for the concept of human rights, people understand that it is a different angle to development problems and as such offers new perspectives to address these problems (this was firmly confirmed by MSc and PhD students) • Support to the existing centre helps to increase visibility of UEM as an institution with whom third parties can work with (signing MoU's) which increases opportunities to influence development processes • Interview with the embassy of the Netherlands and the NGO WLSA reveals however that the centre of HR or the project and the research output is not yet very visible. Collaboration with other stakeholders weakened in the second phase: for e.g. WLSA found that many MSc came to visit the library of the NGO this phase but was not aware of any project, nor the contents of research or publications <p>Factor that contributed to the results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of people that have been trained through the LLM. (although many of them did not write their thesis)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 conferences (2013 and 2015 for respectively 110 and 216 participants which increased visibility for the faculty and URM as a total)
2.3. Research and teaching developed and provided through the IUC is of good (academic) quality Score: good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The content of the teaching changed with the introduction of the new MSc. All students evaluated well the quality of the course and the lecturers, but confirmed problems with understanding English lecturers. The working with students, involving them in project spaces and stimulating their research was a real paradigm shift in the faculty Using professors from abroad in the MSc has exposed lecturers and students to different styles of teach. It is not very clear what qualifies as research (especially outside of a PhD): there is a need to be clearer about that and to organise the faculty to make it happen
Overall judgement on effectiveness of the project <p>The project indicators were too ambitious and have not been used to come to an assessment. The topic of HR has become more visible in the faculty, through the new MSc and the research work and the topic of HR is now also integrated in the undergraduate course. The project has created spaces for students to be very much involved and to look for their interest in human rights. Through the MSc, the project has been able to influence on practitioners that enrol in the course: they confirm an increasing enthusiasm for the concept of human rights, people understand that it is a different angle to development problems and as such offers new perspectives to address these problems.</p> <p>The focus was not always explicit on HR and AIDS</p> <p>The faculty is not yet very visible outside of its alumni network.</p> <p>There is a need to better define what in the faculty of law qualifies as research.</p>	

EQ 3. What is the level of efficiency in the projects?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
3.1. Intermediate re-sults have been delivered. Score: weak	<p>Intermediate results were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research output on Human Rights with respect to Reproductive Health and HIV/AIDS is increased Improved capacity of UEM through improved academic training and qualifications of staff Improved awareness and expertise on human rights with respect to reproductive health and HIV/AIDS within the university community Resource Centre on Human Rights with respect to reproductive health and HIV/AIDS is made available at the Faculty Improved expertise, awareness raising and advocacy skills on human rights with respect to RH & HIV/AIDS of the key society stakeholders and relevant professional groups Access to justice for victims of HR violations in the sphere of RH & HIV/AIDS improved <p>Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the intermediate results were also included at the level of objectives, see the above. PhD: 1 PhD might finish in 2019 (of 4 that started, 1 is cancelled, the realisation of two others unclear/uncertain)

<p>3.2. Relationship between means and results achieved and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSc: 4/5 completed (of 1 status is unclear) • Through the UEM Human Rights Law Journal: 32 articles were published in Portuguese which increased access to the topic • Access to literature (library) • MSc courses started in Phase I and was continued • The academic training has changed people and particular the way they now read reality: this was confirmed by PhD students (even those that did not continue but now have HR in their heart and continue as volunteers at the centre of Human rights) and by MSc students (Desafio funded and others). • From interviews, the evaluators understand that the number of MSc students in the MSc on HR are on average around 15. • Both PhD and MSc found it difficult to complete the study. For the MSc (both those with a Desafio scholarship and others), the finalisation of the thesis was a big stumble block • Knowledge of English improved, with 8 members of staff in the department of human rights now having good command of English, however it appears that even for some of them the use of English remains a challenge • The amount of knowledge and research produced is still modest. Within the framework of consultancy type of work, advice (not research) is provided (see also under impact). • Exposure of lecturers and students through the organisation of Moot court competitions (national, last one in 2014 in which 1 UEM lecturer and 2 MSc students participated and participation in international moot court, for e.g. 2017, with 2 students) • Victims assisted in the legal clinic: not more than 6 for the whole period (topic not known) • Joint work was done with AMODEA, with HR league and other NGO's, mainly in Phase 1 and as extension/ service delivery (training modules of women groups, # 5, all before 2013). It was not clear to what extent these modules strengthened advocacy capacity at the level of women groups. Data have not been collected by the project <p>Explanatory factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence of a clear mechanism or strategy to stimulate students to take up cases within the legal clinic • Research competition grants scheme to stimulate students to write a paper that can be published for students and lecturers (last time in 2014: 4 articles from 10 submitted were chosen) – this mechanism is in line with what exists at UEM level (but at UEM level it is not very well managed). This contributed to the journal and the production of articles • For the delays in realising PhD: inappropriate selection process in phase 1 (assessing the appetite for research), lack of priority setting (influence by other tasks and need for additional jobs in order to ensure and improve livelihood) • Little experience both at PhD and MSc in how to start and shape a research paper • There was no specific support at MSc level for their thesis writing. • A MSc, completed with thesis was in some cases not necessary to have a new or better job. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of realisation of PhD's is low as is number of articles in peer reviewed articles + cases treated at the legal clinic. On the other hand, good results related to journal, moot courts.
--	--

objectives (qualitative assessment) Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FR 1017: in general underspending (because of 1 PhD student did not travel) There was a lot of flexibility possible There was positive feedback about support from North (especially in relation to the PhD's who were allowed to write in Portuguese. There is one with one exception to this: a more critical appreciation of support is related to the fact that this person was also responsible for project management (co-project leader) and did not experience support from the PL in the North or the South Some complaints from MSc students about the timeliness of their marks
3.3. Project management is conducive for efficient and effective project implementation Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management manual was revised in 2013 but was not really used at project level The division of tasks and responsibilities between project leader and coordination was not explicit or clear P1 managed to do many activities through involvement of students: working with people that get things done: working with MSC and other people to execute tasks Management was not result oriented and the project was not a continuous one (not integrated in the daily business): execution was focused on getting the activities done with little space for reflection Most of the work in project management was done by one of the PhD (who has also important other responsibilities outside of UEM) without a lot of support from the official project leader/dean or the PL in Flanders No tools for systematic follow-up on indicators: weak investment in the reports <p>Explanatory factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reporting formats were not motivating at all
3.4. Environment for efficient and effective project implementation was created Score: weak (but efforts to organise and get things done should be appreciated)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little support from the dean of the faculty: no leadership to sit together as team or to be supportive towards PhD students. Little support for the PhD who was actually managing the project Several MSc students rather than the PhD candidates were involved, each of them responsible for a number of activities were involved: they were aware of the content but did not function as a team. This was a good solution for the PhD, she interacted with them on a bilateral basis UEM topped up the salary of the formal PL, but this was not used to reward the one doing the job Discussion about data (timelines and validity/quality) related to indicators; lack of adapted M&E system at programme level. A lot of turnover of people (getting other or additional responsibilities) <p>Explanatory factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lecturers at faculty of law are part time: they want to keep a link with the university but their main jobs are outside of the university. They do not prioritize research.
3.5. Quality of the partnership N-S Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no general feeling of being in a partnership with joint responsibilities towards project management. The evaluators would have expected attempts to have joint research, but this did not happen The partnership will continue between Ghent and the faculties of law, medicine and Arts and Sciences/

Overall judgement of efficiency of the project <p>The level of realisation of the scholarships, more in particular for PhD is low. The main output from Desafio is the MSc on HR, the integration of HR in the undergraduate courses and, for phase 2 the publication of the journal. The attention for advocacy and assisting victims was no longer on the agenda and actually few activities were done in phase 2. The project management was not well embedded in the faculty, the PhD that managed the project (as co-team leader) organised activities on a bilateral basis with students which was a good solution.</p>	

EQ 4. To what extent the project results will continue after the IUC programme is completed?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
4.1. Level of academic and institutional sustainability Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PhD and MSc that received a scholarship are not necessarily retained (they did not sign a contract that obliges them to stay for a number of years). A number of UEM lecturers have taken over some of the classes of foreign lectures in the newly created MSc course. UEM will continue to collaborate with the Centre for Human rights of the university of Pretoria and the Centre for Human Rights and Multidisciplinary research of the Minho University in Portugal and University of Coimbra. At the period of the evaluation: there was no evidence of having a research team with a specific research agenda but this might be established within the Centre for Human Rights if an opportunity arises. Interesting initiatives were not taken forward, for e.g. outreach with women's groups (on advocacy), research grants for students, ... (although planned according to the logical framework, but not mentioned in the annual reports) <p>Factor that contributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of leadership in the faculty to capitalise on what has happened
4.2. Level of financial sustainability Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MSc are partly paid by the tuition fees. Recently fees have gone up (as well as the fee to upgrade your marks by taking a new exam) which is not appreciated by the students The evaluators question the sustainability of the MSc, given the limited number of students and the costs for the professors abroad, further funding needs to be secured The project is aware of the challenge and is thinking about it and has taken following measures: initially the masters was only funded by Desafio but from the third year the project invited other donors and also started paying some bills with student fees. This is now a challenge: the faculty does not want to budget the costs: for the last 10 years they did not contribute financially, it was understood that the project has done some fundraising and should continue this and be self-sustained. The centre for HR has experience with attracting external resources, it is the only one at the Faculty at the moment that has some financial autonomy, is not depending on the faculty and can run with its own fundraising. However, the evaluators do not see how this unit (which received some support in equipment) will own the results of this project, it is a separate unit and it was not really integrated in the project.
Overall judgement of sustainability of the project	

The sustainability of the results of this project is under pressure: continuation of MSc, publication of journal. The attention for HR at the undergraduate level might continue. Activities for outreach will certainly not be on the agenda unless there is a funded programme. Already the activities from phase I have not been continued. The centre for HR has experience in attracting funds but does not really own the results of project 1.

EQ 5. Impact and longer-term effects

Judgment criteria	Comments
5.1. Indications of impact at academic level Score: good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stronger internal network of researchers and lecturers involved in the programme • The visibility of the lecturers and students has increased and they have been able to extend their network • Copy of the MSc course: the MSc has been copied in two other universities with the assistance of the PhD involved in the project
5.2. Indications of impact on development processes Score: good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No data available on the evolution of cases (number and topic) treated within the centre of human rights • Through MSc graduates and their current job positions, the evaluators do not doubt that their enthusiasm for a new topic such as HR will motivate them to seek appropriate employment where they can integrate new knowledge or do that in their current employment. • There is evidence that external actors ask the centre for human rights for input, for e.g. The human rights commission of the Bar's Association, for e.g. For the draft of the shadow report, they also acknowledge that this improved the quality of their report. The capacity of the HR centre allows them in the future to address much more specific issues and to become less general (for e.g. they are planning a report on premature marriages) – see also P2 (linking the situation of debt in the country with the violations of social and economic rights). They are clearly integrating a HR discourse. The bar's association does not have relations with other academic institutions providing similar activities. • There is a clear demand to receive more training on HR issues
Overall judgement of the impact of the project It is too early to judge impact. However, there was a clear need to have more academic input on the issue of HR. The understanding that the attention for HR offers a different reading of problems and their solutions has convinced people that HR is the way they would like to proceed.	

2.2.3. Project 2: to develop and strengthen the academic capacity of UEM in the field of social rights/social protection and to ensure evidence-based knowledge and expertise

EQ 1 – To what extent is the project relevant?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
1.1. Responding to needs Score: excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no explicit reference to social protection and social rights within UEM's strategic plan. The research lines talk about human rights, including working relations. However, social protection and social rights are high on the government agenda and new policies and strategies have been developed recently. Social protection agenda is pushed by various donors, DFID, WB, The Netherlands, Ministry of Gender, social affairs and children, there is a multi-donor working group, many programmes are emerging Donors would welcome academics that contribute to the dialogue, provide research and alternatives Decision makers are looking for researchers that provide information and engage them in information sharing: facts, mapping of practices, laws and cases in Portuguese
1.2. There have been efforts to ensure complementarity and synergy with other projects/other (Belgian) actors No score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efforts to exchange information through the local steering committee of Desafio + collaboration with academic staff of the Faculty of Law through the Centre for Human Rights: but this was rather superficial/individual base Experience to exchange as team when in Ghent The evaluation team has no information about current other funding programmes dealing with capacity building (unless PhD scholarships through the Swedish programme) Funding from Westminster Foundation to provide training to various commission in parliament: an old draft law on access to information was used as example and this led to concrete steps to have the law adopted in parliament
1.3. The intervention logic of the project is coherent Score: good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptation after MTE: no big changes were made in the logical framework, formulation is appropriate at the level of objectives. Indicators have been changed, more output oriented with focus on the new MSc course Change at the level of intermediate results? From 9 intermediate results to 4, which makes it easier to manage Intervention logic: research, disseminating (conferences), attracting consultancy work: the practice makes sense Indicators at objective and results level overlap Hypothesis are related to the commitment of stakeholders and MSc students that conclude their study and retainment of staff Focus mainly on execution of activities
Overall judgement on relevance of the project Relevance is strong when considering the needs.	

This project is fully in line with the current trend of paying more attention to the social agenda amongst Mozambique decision makers and donors. The social protection angle is very new, promoting research on this topic gives the opportunity to increase understanding and to have access to contextualised information and analysis in Portuguese.

There is no evidence of deliberate synergy with other projects (for e.g. at the level of the Centre for Human rights), although there are individual connections between staff members.

EQ 2. To what extent the project's specific objectives have been achieved (effectiveness)?

Judgment criteria	Comments
<p>2.1. The specific academic/institutional objective has been realised:</p> <p>Score: good</p>	<p>Objectives, planned for were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To develop and strengthen the academic capacity of the UEM (research and training) in the field of social rights/social protection <p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic capacity has been strengthened in this field with (almost) 2 PhD and 2 staff members that obtained their MSc (in South Africa) and are teaching at undergraduate level Particular emphasis on rights related to HIV was noticed at the level of PhD Understanding of project members that centre is important to give visibility to social rights as a very specific domain <p>Explanatory factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff was supported through short visits, for e.g. Lisbon to study other experiences with running a research centre
<p>2.2. The specific development objective has been realised</p> <p>Score: good</p>	<p>Objectives, planned for were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure UEM provides evidence-based knowledge and expertise to key stakeholders and contributes to the increase of public awareness of social rights/social protection issues in general, with a particular emphasis on rights related to HIV. <p>Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Making available in Portuguese what exists as such improving access to information: the PhD's are writing the first academic papers on social protection from a legal perspective HIV was one of the topics, other topic that was important: disabled people (there has been a lot of advocacy in Mozambique on this topic) The HR commission of the Bar's Association is aware of the research and will use it Conference in 2017 on social corporate responsibility: UEM introduced the issue of social corporate responsibility and is now working with the commission on legislation (see also impact). Through training with the Centre of Legal and Magistrate training, the topic of human rights was introduced with a specific chapter on HIV Aids (training is based on an MoU between the centre and UEM) PhD find it not that easy to approach decision makers and donors outside of the current network (it takes a formal decision

	<p>within UEM and requires that the university owns the research results and defines objectives of policy influencing)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of MSc graduates diminishes effectiveness: writing a thesis is not a formal requirement: is it necessary to ensure that knowledge is integrated and that more research is becoming available. • Effect of the regional conferences: these regional conferences tend to be high profile and attract considerable attention from local actors, in this sense they are important policy influencing spaces.
<p>2.3. Research and teaching developed and provided through the IUC is of good (academic) quality</p> <p>Score: good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching: appreciation of content and the international perspective by MSc students, but English was difficult (no specific support provided) • However: receiving lectures in English about international law made sense according to the respondents and some students actually liked the exposure to English • MSc: based on consultation of Ministry of Social Affairs and the National Institute for Social Action, analysis of professional options • Research is available through PhD mainly which is a first stepping stone • A limited number of articles have been published and research results were presented in regional conferences
<p>Overall judgement on effectiveness of the project</p> <p>Effectiveness is reasonable. The project ensures that an important societal issue can now be looked at from a legal perspective and this can be used to give input into the dialogue and debate. This is already happening through a limited number of activities, such as with the Commission of Social Affairs in the parliament. A basis for more research is being laid but is still modest.</p> <p>The MSc course was well prepared and developed and its content is appreciated by the student and by practitioners</p> <p>The lack of MSc graduates diminishes effectiveness: writing a thesis is not a formal requirement: is it necessary to ensure that knowledge is integrated and can be effectively used and that more research is becoming available.</p>	

EQ 3. What is the level of efficiency in the projects?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
<p>3.1. Intermediate results have been delivered.</p> <p>Score: weak to good</p>	<p>Intermediate results planned for were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The embedding of the law faculty and the research institute on social law, social rights and social protection in the societal debate on social protection • A strengthened management of the activities related to social rights and social protection within UEM • A strengthened academic capacity in the field of social law/social protection through the establishment of a sustainable Master of social law, social rights and social protection at UEM • An enhanced networking between the academic world and society, and the obtention of the status of a knowledge and expert centre in the field of social law, social rights and social protection in the SADC region

<p>3.2. Relationship between means and results achieved and objectives (qualitative assessment)</p>	<p>Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project staff is embedded in the context, they are able to mention actors and initiatives related to what they are doing, however mainly related to their own (alumni) network as appears from an interview with the Dutch Embassy: involvement in societal and public debate is limited; the work with the Commission in the parliament is not yet very visible • There are contacts with the Commission of Social Affairs in the parliament • Not yet a functional institute or centre of department: evolving towards a department of social protection with a centre of social law. Centre has been formally agreed by the Faculty and an office space was allocated. • The MSc is there with a mix of lecturers (Mozambique, Belgium, South-Africa) and is currently being revised, according to rules and procedures within UEM. The work is done by the PhD graduate and the PHD student: they are contextualising content and reviewing support to MSc students. First course in its kind, includes a module on HIV and human rights, 1/3 of courses is currently taught in English, PhD's (graduate and student) teach in the course and act as assistant of professors from abroad • One PhD more than planned will graduate end of 2018 (maybe 2019) • 60 MSc students have been enrolled in the MSc course but only 5 graduated. Typology of students is not analysed in the project, MSc respondents in the evaluation were all practitioners, some disappointment with the lower marks for topics taught in English • 4 regional conferences were organised • Access to literature (library) • Changes at personal level: deeper understanding about social rights and their violations (for e.g. understanding that it is possible to violate without illicit deeds such as choices in economic policy), a different reading of what is happening in the country, improved knowledge contributes to teaching ('no longer being a second level lecturer'), increased appetite for research (one PhD), improved career prospects for UEM staff <p>Not realised: website and specific modules at undergraduate level (due to a change in strategy of the UEM, modules were being prepared but after the decision not to continue with the Bologna model, further investment in this stopped).</p> <p>Explanatory factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are various reasons of not graduating: thesis is not considered to be essential for employers (but following a MSc is sometimes a condition), students have no experience in writing a scientific paper, no support was proposed, MSc first concentrate on having better grades for particular courses • PhD training in Ghent helped a lot to progress and finalise PhD • Professor from Ghent with connections in South-Africa assisted in the design of the MSc course <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited participation of PhDs in the offer in academic writing or English: not possible to participate when course was organised • FR 2017: overspending in operation costs (-5.000), in general overspending of 4.000, not related to scholarships • Multidisciplinary approach (information from 1 PhD): not easy to understand how the specific PhD research topic could be linked to the overall thematic, this took some time which was underestimated. On
--	--

<p>Score: good</p>	<p>a personal level and personal initiative: exchange with PhD students from project 3 to understand social sciences perspectives and to give input on legal aspects. The PhD student gave colleagues from project 3 chapters of her thesis and requested explicitly to have feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions of project team related to budget: limited opportunities to pay for involvement of external stakeholders
<p>3.3. Project management is conducive for efficient and effective project implementation</p> <p>Score: weak</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a real team but more focal point approach: various people could respond to questions about the project at the local steering committee • Managed to use what was there: working with students and junior staff. • No formal structure to manage the project, when tasks had to be done, people were mobilised • Questions about the performance of the PSU (clarification of rules of eligible costs)
<p>3.4. Environment for efficient and effective project implementation was created</p> <p>Score: weak</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dean was not active as PL. • The 'acting' PL had to appoint a deputy PL because of too many tasks outside of UEM • Difficulty to manage project with tasks at UEM, more in particular, colleagues taking over teaching when PhD is in Belgium. • Lack of exchange on research content within the faculty of law: risk for overlapping and missed opportunities: for e.g. one PhD student in project 1 was writing about informal sector and had to address the lack of access to social protection: this could have been discussed with PhD from project 2. This could have been solved by organising PhD exchange within the faculty of law (not only for Desafio) • Lack of harmonisation with other PhD schemes at UEM led to confusion
<p>3.5. Quality of the partnership N-S</p> <p>Score: excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisation of supervision in Belgium was very much appreciated: training at doctoral school in Ghent was offered, accommodation and office space (no longer isolated, being part of a research community), time to discuss, to understand together the link with social protection and human rights and sexual and reproductive rights • Having the opportunity to teach at UHasselt: sense of being valued, being able to contribute (boost of confidence as academic) • Relations with continue <p>Explanatory factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One explanation for the quality of the partnership might be the scale of the UHasselt and the voluntarist posture of the Flemish academics involved.
<p>Overall judgement of efficiency of the project</p> <p>Efficiency is quite good when considering the execution of planned activities and the quality of the partnership and collaboration with the universities in Belgium (UHasselt for coordination and content and UGhent scholars for content and new MSc). The efficiency is rather weak when looking at project management: the project offered an opportunity to work as a team (which could then evolve into a research team), but this opportunity was not taken, due to the fact that the space was limited: the faculty of law and its way of working is not yet conducive to that kind of working, social rights was not on the agenda and there was no specific department. Opportunities to organise exchange with PhD students from other projects in Desafio were not taken.</p>	

EQ 4. To what extent the project results will continue after the IUC programme is completed?

Judgment criteria	Comments
4.1. Level of academic and institutional sustainability Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PhD who was leading the project, is still part time lecturer but was nominated as Judge Counselor at the Supreme Court as is no longer very much available to work at the Faculty (although still feeling very much connected to the work on social protection) Other staff will remain at the faculty (in fact there was no turn-over of staff during the project) Teaching capacity increased (MSc and PhD realised or almost realised), UEM staff is gradually taking over parts of the MSc classes (3 PhDs are now involved) and will soon take responsibility for 50% of the course. They will continue to collaborate with the Centre for Human rights of the university of Pretoria and the Centre for Human Rights and Multidisciplinary research, Minho University in Portugal and University of Coimbra The creation of a structure for future research (the centre for social protection) has been approved within the Faculty of Law. Ownership at the level of the Faculty of the research results is not very articulated There are ideas to develop collaboration and research projects with the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences but not yet concrete (may be something on 'legal language') There is a need to have somebody with decision making power full time on board to manage politics within the university: this is not secured.
4.2. Level of financial sustainability Score: good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSC: faculty is not yet ready to put in a lot of funds. However, from year 3 onwards, the Faculty has attracted some smaller donors to cover payment of professors abroad. Thanks to UHasselt a new project has been secured (Erasmus+) and will provide funds for the next two years to continue the MSc (but not the centre) Further funding needs to be secured to continue with the centre, the centre is formally established but there are no funds to further develop it. Lack of knowledge about the channels to use to attract new funding
Overall judgement of sustainability of the project <p>The sustainability of the project is weak because of lack of ownership at the level of the faculty. Financial sustainability is thought of but there is not yet a strategy to secure funds and knowledge/expertise about how to go about is not present at the level of the PhD's. The financial sustainability is scored as good because the MSc will be able to continue for at least two years, thanks to external funding.</p>	

EQ 5. Impact and longer-term effects

Judgment criteria	Comments
5.1. Indications of impact at academic level Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some concrete plans for further multidisciplinary working, for e.g. mapping with the Faculty of Arts and Social Science on gender-based violence and preparation of a workshop with same faculty (not based on any funding programme, desire to add a legal component)

<p>5.2. Indications of impact on development processes</p> <p>Score: good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With social commission in the Parliament: ideas to develop law on social corporate responsibility (not yet a concrete plan), this is an important step: parliament in Mozambique is not very propositive, it is rare that they draft their own bills, so this would be an important success story • Training for key institutions, such as the training institute connected to the Bars' Association can yield wider effects • Not yet: new policies or new legislation • The positions that many of the PhD hold outside of UEM will certainly influence • Knowledge is used for outreach work with the Centre for Human Rights
<p>Overall judgement of the impact of the project</p> <p>The impact at academic level is limited, but wider effects on development processes are possible through the training provided, the positions held by the PhD outside of UEM and outreach activities with the Centre for Human Rights.</p>	

2.2.4. Project 3: strengthen capacity in research and teaching in gender, health and family issues, increase and disseminate knowledge (HIV/AIDS and reproductive health) by empowering communities and informing policy-making

In the following, the evaluation team gives an overview of the assessment of project 3. It is based on the guiding questions in the evaluation framework (see annex xx), which also refer to the indicators of this project as formulated in the logical framework.

EQ 1 – To what extent is the project relevant?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
4.1. Responding to needs Score: excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to address gender relations, including gender-based violence, as part of efforts to improve sexual and reproductive health and the HIV response has been expressed in several government policies and programmes. Both in policies as in the project there has been a great focus on maternal health, feminisation of HIV as well young people's and key population's (e.g. men-who-have-sex with men and sex workers) sexual and reproductive health, all of which underlines the relevance • At the Faculty, there was already Centre for policy analysis in which gender is addressed, this UEM project can strengthen the existing activities • The project can bring another academic perspective to medical issues and as such contribute to analysis and solutions; • Project members question the link with VUB: connection of the VUB department with development context is not yet strongly developed (but is developing and this underlines the relevance of Desafio for the Northern counterpart) • Specific focus of the programme was questioned by members of faculty: interest or added value was not understood at the start (was felt like excluding people from access to scholarships). Now people understand that it actually helped to create a nucleus of people developing knowledge on one topic from different perspectives • General need to build capacity of staff (role next to other funding programmes, 1/3 of new PhD were realised through Desafio)
4.2. There have been efforts to ensure complementarity and synergy with other projects/other (Belgian) actors No score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within Desafio: integrated in design but not as yet integrated in strategy of researcher/lecturer to seek complementary with other programmes ('we work on little islands'). • One PhD is teaching a topic on gender in the module on sexual and reproductive health on the MSc for public health in the Faculty of Medicine • Lecturers and PHD involved in Desafio not all aware of materials and research done within P1 (for e.g. existence of library and items on human rights that could be useful for MSc students) • No deliberate seeking of complementarity with other funded projects: however, results of the project will feed into a VLIR-funded ICP project (2017-2022) of the summer school (network of South-South exchange between researchers)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration with the Belgian embassy in 2015: facilitation of workshop on integration of gender with Belgian NGOs that work in Mozambique.
4.3. The intervention logic of the project is coherent Score: weak to good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adaptations after MTE: more attention for outreach (communities and policy makers), more attention for interdisciplinary research • Intervention logic makes sense: from individual research and joint research generating knowledge that can be disseminated, supported by a better structure and increased competences in English and scientific methods and design of curricula. • Pathway of change towards promoting change of attitude in communities and with policy makers: a bit simplistic ('stakeholders make use of the information'), but the Faculty can surely inform them • Assumptions are maybe not real assumptions but pre-conditions: they emphasize the need for commitment from UEM and the stakeholders within the faculty • The link with education is not clear/explicit • Result orientedness is weak: focus is mainly on output (see also indicators)
Overall judgement on relevance of the project <p>The project is highly relevant from the perspective of responding to needs. To challenge medics and the medical paradigms with a different perspective is laudable as it increases opportunities for more effective solutions having more attention to the socio-cultural dynamics of health and health care. The intervention logic makes sense, indicators are mainly measuring outputs rather than changes. There has not been a deliberate seeking of complementarity with other projects outside of Desafio.</p>	

EQ 2. To what extent the project's specific objectives have been achieved (effectiveness)?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
2.1. The specific academic/institutional objective has been realised: Score: good	<p>Objectives were:</p> <p>To strengthen the capacity of the UEM in terms of research and teaching in gender, health and family issues.</p> <p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 PhD's will result from Desafio (by end of 2019) (on 20 in total within the faculty, but specialised in the particular topics) • This number is a real boost for the faculty, according to the respondents and they are most proud of this. • 3/7 MSc scholarships have been realised, • 20 articles have been published (more in particular during the last years) • A research culture is emerging: formulation of research lines, looking for funding, mainly based on PhD (see also under sustainability) • New knowledge contributed to the teaching (there is an offer to lecturers to improve on their teaching but this is not part of Desafio) • Increased understanding of the value of multidisciplinary approach, which was new for the faculty, e.g. even PL from language centre states to have more understanding of gender issues. • Changes at personal level, for e.g. People taking on new and different positions towards topics can be clearly noticed (according to leadership of faculty), for the first PL and PhD (from phase 1): high influence on career: more influence as academic and on leadership

	<p>thanks to increased capacity and visibility. Another PhD student is using newly gained skills to coordinate a regional research project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The results are stimulating the faculty to further develop new courses and initiatives (dynamism) <p>Explanatory factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support for developing research skills through workshops (within Desafio), • support by supervisors (level of PhD) • the Faculty felt that the need for PhD was bigger, moreover, MSc did not come from inside the faculty, which made it difficult to monitor and orient the students.
<p>2.2. The specific development objective has been realised</p> <p>Score: weak to good</p>	<p>Objectives were:</p> <p>To increase and disseminate knowledge on the socio-cultural dynamics of HIV/AIDS and reproductive health by empowering communities on the basis of best practices and by informing policy-making.</p> <p>Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • self-assessment shows low degrees of realisation in phase 2. However: feedback of research results to communities was ensured • Short courses on gender-based violence were provided (in phase 1 and 2). Provided the UEM Campus in Chibuto (ESNEC) in Gaza Province, and in Inhambane and the UEM's Main Campus in Maputo. Each course ran for a week, and altogether it benefitted more than 150 people, among academic staff, students, participants from government institutions such as prison wardens, officials from the Ministries of the Interior and Justice, officials from cooperation partners, such as UN Women (Mozambique) and from NGO's, as well as Desafio members including P3 members and others. Courses integrated new insights from research, for e.g. on sexual harassment of girls in schools. • Several PhD students involved various stakeholders in their research (such as representatives of the Ministry of Health, Ministry of Social Affairs, ...) • Collaboration with CeCAGe, UEM's Centre for Coordination of Gender Issues, focused on research on gender-based violence. Faculty staff is also involved together with CeCAGe in the development of UEM's first gender policy, and in the preparation of an international women's conference that will be hosted by UEM in 2020. • In April 2018, the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences hosted the 2nd MenEngage Africa Symposium, the event was jointly organised by the MenEngage network, the Mozambican Network of Men for Change (HOPEM) and the faculty; it was attended by people from the faculties of law and medicine, government (Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Affairs), members of parliament, multilateral agencies (UNFPA, UN Women, UNICEF) and civil society organisations. Several faculty staff presented their work. E.g. Esmeralda Mariano took part of the panel on cultural practices and the SDGs. • Translation of the thesis of 1 PhD in Portuguese to facilitate dissemination
<p>2.3. Research and teaching developed and provided through the IUC is of good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research: supervision also at UEM level was provided • There have been a number of internationally peer reviewed articles (no evidence of a consolidated catalogue of articles and research papers)

<p>(academic) quality</p> <p>Score: good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSc and PhD graduates are infusing their newly gained knowledge in their courses • using video-technology to document practices in the field of traditional healing (rituals) and to use them in teaching, this is strengthening an emerging trend within the department of Anthropology to work more with media technologies to document oral history. <p>Factors that contribute:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • funds for video from Desafio
<p>Overall judgement on effectiveness of the project</p> <p>Overall effectiveness of the project in relation to the academic objective can be rated as good (except for the weak number of MSc students). A certain kind of dynamism within the faculty can be noticed to further proceed with multidisciplinary approaches and to use the research to develop new courses and to enrich the content of existing courses. Respondents have understood quite well the value of multidisciplinary work (even though it remains challenging). The realisation of PhD's has considerably increased the number of scientific articles. Outreach received less attention in Phase 2: initiatives have been taken that have reached a large number of people; but most of the contacts with other stakeholders was established in the framework of the PhD's. Quality of research was guaranteed by the supervision. Using new knowledge to improve the teaching was done on an individual basis.</p>	

EQ 3. What is the level of efficiency in the projects?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
<p>3.1. Intermediate results have been delivered.</p> <p>Score: weak</p>	<p>Intermediate results were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge on gender, health and family actors' experiences, as well as on the trends and socio-economic and cultural factors involved in sexual and reproductive health • Understanding knowledge from a multidisciplinary perspective • Strengthened organization and infrastructure within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences • Delivery and acquisition of knowledge and expertise in course design, curriculum development, research methods and academic English • Promotion of change of attitudes to enforce best practices in the communities and to have well informed communities and policies <p>Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit for research on women and gender is created and integrated in the centre for policy analysis • Explicit efforts to seek connections with other disciplines, more in particular medicine • Within PhD and field research: attention for community (ethics in research). • PhD on traditional medicine and professional health care: first steps in establishing dialogue between the actors: health workers did not know the number of healers, had no contacts, some are now taking initiatives to reach out • Short course programme (2 weeks, provided for 3 years) with certificate, linking theory to practice, contributing to a shared and deeper understanding of what gender is, reached at least

	<p>120 students and lecturers (their understanding was not assessed by the project, nor by the evaluation), funding from Desafio was stopped in 2017 (focus on PhD);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the short course on gender was also provided in one other branch of UEM (see in the above under effectiveness). Contribution to research track record of VUB through joint publication through Desafio: funds for facilitating meetings and consultations to develop the MSc of Anthropology were made available. Although the MSc in Anthropology was mentioned in the project, the respondents at UEM do not see much added value of Desafio; the MSc as such was not a result of the programme, but benefited directly from the newly gained capacity of 1 PhD financed through Desafio. The MSc started in 2016 and has run for 2 years with 19 and 23 students. 4 members of staff followed English class (of which 2 took the complete course) The evaluators have not seen evidence of interdisciplinary papers (outside of the scholarships) being published (4 were planned) <p>Not realised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a MSc in education (which would have required collaboration with the Faculty of Education) research outside of postgraduate scholarships was planned for but hardly realised: this was too difficult to organise (because it would involve the same people doing a PhD), an attempt to work with small grants to stimulate research did not yield sufficient results (staff prepared research but took the proposal to the scientific directorate where more money was available, including funds for field work – the offer of Desafio was not sufficiently competitive), effort was dropped. One respondent however states that attempts to submit at the scientific directorate were not successful (lack of transparent communication about selection and available budget – this was confirmed by respondents from two other projects). teaching of qualitative research modules in the MSc programmes of P1 and P2 and P4 was not organised as planned: there was no explicit demand from other projects and the faculty was simply not able to get it organised because the assigned people were too busy doing their PhD. Yet the PL states that 2 sessions were offered but that the interest was weak.
<p>3.2. Relationship between means and results achieved and objectives (qualitative assessment)</p> <p>Score: weak</p>	<p>On the organisation of PhD's</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PhD students felt that communication about what was possible (for e.g. participation in international conferences) and not (for e.g. costs for editing) was not sufficiently shared or clear. They did not feel sufficiently supported to engage with the Faculty of Medicine. PSU/programme manager was appreciated to helping out with specific and urgent problems. The budget did not sufficiently consider the means needed for field research and the rules that non-spent money went back to the donor did not consider the difficulties in planning of field research and data collection. One PhD in particular has to pay parts of the field work from his own pocket. Complaints about allowances arriving to late when coming to Belgium Within the PhD's it was quite challenging to consider the specific topic and various disciplines (for e.g. one PhD student with 4 co-

	<p>supervisors to ensure sufficient scientific approach covering various perspectives). P3 made first moves towards the Faculty of Medicine, contacts have slightly improved though some resistance remains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficulties to organise the PhD when having other tasks, for e.g. in the case of 1 PhD student, his topic 'sociology of health' was no longer taught, he will now take it up again. <p>Other points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FR 2017: big overspending, especially on scholarship: 28.000 euro, due to longer stays of PHD students in Belgium. It was agreed by VLIR-UOS that costs for scholarship could be raised but only at the extent of other costs being deleted (in this or other projects): overspending was not sufficiently monitored by PL and there were no explicit warnings from the finance departments The budget was designed to allow each PhD student to go to Belgium for 3 months/year, which was clearly not enough to make sufficient progress. Centralisation of programme management caused too much bureaucracy and delays Team at UEM felt they were doing the right thing, they were urged by the management team to invest more, they had no sight of possible overspending (there was no warning mechanism, as they were not managing their proper budgets, the system of project management was centralised). Last local steering committee was in June 2017 when overspending did not yet show.). Minutes of the local steering committee meeting at UEM of the end of June 2017 demonstrate that the PSU urged all PL to accelerate and do as much as possible to realise all planned activities and to urge PHD's to take more time in Belgium. Tickets for PHD's from the Faculty of Medicine were planned to be bought in 2017 for travels in 2018. At this time, a calculation of possible overspending was not done. The evaluators do not understand why short courses were provided for free. The evaluators question to what extent partners in the North (PL and ICOS) had good oversight of spending (in real time with forecasts) Joint research with the Faculty of Medicine would never have happened if it wasn't for Desafio The activities related to education were not well planned for
<p>3.3. Project management is conducive for efficient and effective project implementation</p> <p>Score: good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organisation of the team: P3 integrated people from various departments in the faculty (it was not hosted by a specific department in Phase 2) which was felt as a good thing by respondents at UEM. Interviews confirm that a research team dealing with gender and domestic violence is emerging PL is appreciative of support by PSU and overall programme management: things were clear and there was sufficient flexibility. He felt the members of P3 were working as a team with regular meetings and exchange. The monitoring and report writing connected to the project management was appreciated as too heavy. Realisation of inter- and multidisciplinary: because P3 integrated people from various departments in the faculty there was a lot of interaction and exchange (combining for e.g. linguistic and social issues).

3.4. Environment for efficient and effective project implementation was created Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Playing another role than just being an academic, for e.g. dealing with project management issues and reporting according to a logical framework was not easy (both N and S confirm), this took time which was not anticipated and it was difficult to accommodate this within the existing academic structures and tasks
3.5. Quality of the partnership N-S Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong feeling of inequality in the partnership from the side of UEM: for e.g. lack of recognition of the role of PhD supervisors of UEM (name on dissertation). This lack of recognition was also mentioned by the PhD students (even when not fully pleased with the input of the UEM supervisor) Respondents from UEM question if it is not possible to have more equal share in the burden of report writing (N-S), even if most of the activities are taking place in Mozambique (besides only a request when deadline is there to submit the reports) Defence for 3 PhD will be paid from the budget of the PL from VUB MoU is signed with the centre for reproductive health and rights in Ghent (together with faculty of Medicine and law). No concrete commitments from VUB. The fact that there was no modality allowing academics from UEM to go to Belgium (as was expected in an exchange programme), negatively influenced the idea of partnership Appreciation of supervision from Belgium is mixed: on the positive side, there was a lot of understanding about the level and difficulties of the PhD students, efforts to add co-supervisors to deal the challenge of multidisciplinary or specific demands of the PhD student. On the negative side: PhD students could not choose their supervisor. In general: planning and expectation management in relation to supervision could be improved
Overall judgement of efficiency of the project <p>Overall the efficiency can be rated as average. The efficiency with regards to the production of research results can be rated as weak although an increased effort to finalise the PhD during the last years of Phase 2 has improved the efficiency and the realisation of intermediate results. The activities related to MSc are much weaker and the planned activities on education or qualitative research methods have not materialised, which is a pity. In terms of project management, the self-assessment is appreciative. Respondents have many questions and critique related to the organisation of the PhD's. The lack of acknowledgment of one UEM supervisor in the publication of the final PhD thesis has negatively influenced the appreciation of the partnership and created a lot of unrest.</p>	

EQ 4. To what extent the project results will continue after the IUC programme is completed?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
4.1. Level of academic and institutional sustainability Score: good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PhD: there is no obligation to stay after graduation Strong pool of lecturers/researchers but retainment is not fully guaranteed (especially because UEM currently blocked career development because of crisis) Wise to integrate research in a unit of an existing centre, not creating a new one. 2 months ago, the creation of the unit was formally approved by the faculty board. Document that regulates how research would be managed, what would be the main research topics, membership, how to join, has been developed. Project members are now working on a strategic plan.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty is taking ownership of the research and the results; for ex. With input of faculty staff that was part of the Desafio programme, the Faculty is preparing a MSc course on gender • Short courses on gender (for UEM staff and students and people from outside have not been maintained because of lack of budget (courses were for free) • Creation of a Desafio management team contributed to more involvement and ownership at the level of Faculty leaders, more in particular with the deputy-dean for research and extension • A training for supervisors is said to be organised within a new Swedish programme to build further on the first experiences as scientific supervisors
4.2. Level of financial sustainability Score: good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit for research: first attempts to raise money (for e.g. with UNICEF) have started, a symposium will be organised with funds from the Bayreuth university • Not yet a clear strategy for resource mobilisation
Overall judgement of sustainability of the project <p>The evaluators find that the ownership of the research results at the level of the faculty, more in particular at the level of the deputy-dean for research and extension: involvement in the structure of the centre/unit, valorisation of competencies of PhD students involved in Desafio. There have been attempts to raise money, taking advantage of the experiences that are present within the research institute for policy analysis.</p>	

EQ 5. Impact and longer-term effects	
Judgment criteria	Comments
5.1. Indications of impact at academic level Score: good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project effectively inspired people and the Faculty to take the results of the project further but concrete results need to be awaited still. • So far, there are no strong indications yet of impact outside of the faculty, although the MenEngage Symposium and the short - courses have increased the visibility of the faculty's work on gender and sexual and reproductive health, which is an important stepping stone for influencing changes.
5.2. Indications of impact on development processes Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It might be too early to judge: so far, no strong indications yet of impact, there is no evidence yet of policy makers using results of the project. It is expected that the finalisation of the PhD's will be an opportunity to disseminate further the research results. • The evaluators would like to underline that the project made an assumption about the project's contribution to increase gender awareness and skills of civil servants who have attended the short-courses. However, the project did not try to keep track and to document any effect of the research and short-courses.
Overall judgement of the impact of the project <p>So far, no strong indications yet of impact, although increased visibility could be considered as an important stepping stone. It should be underlined that assumptions about effects of research and courses on the participants (some of which civil servants) have not been monitored, which limits both the project's and the evaluators' understanding of effect and impact.</p>	

2.2.5. Project 4: to understand structural factors affecting accessibility, availability and quality of services, generate knowledge on determinants of health seeking for maternal health and HIV, ...

In the following, the evaluation team gives an overview of the assessment of project 4. It is based on the guiding questions in the evaluation framework (see annex 2), which also refer to the indicators of this project as formulated in the logical framework.

EQ 1 – To what extent is the project relevant?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
4.1. Responding to needs Score: excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UEM's research lines, explicitly mention that infection diseases, such as HIV and AIDS, they are among the main causes of death in Mozambique. Government policies underline the need for an interdisciplinary approach to address the challenges. There is one research line on health, which includes sexual and reproductive health, (non) communicable diseases and public health. As such the project is relevant with regards to its own policies and government policies. • The UEM has the ambition to continuously improve on the content of the MSc programmes offered by the faculty, amongst which global health. Scholarships are a means to achieve that. • UEM and the Faculty of medicine felt a clear need for more expertise on research
4.2. There have been efforts to ensure complementarity and synergy with other projects/other (Belgian) actors No score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topical collaboration with other projects under Desafio: for ex. Participation in workshops of P1 (on gender based sexual violence in Gaza), through the national conference in 2016 with other projects of Desafio, more in particular with P3 + using developed expertise of new PhD from project 3 (topic in undergraduate courses) • Interaction with P6: provision of data to PhD's of P6, resistance to share data (although much improved in comparison to phase I and understandable as this kind of collaboration takes time to get institutionalised), lack of collaboration (also because some PhD students had access to expertise on statistics through their Flemish supervisor) • Not outside of Desafio (no specific examples) • Tradition of collaborating with the ICRH in Maputo (which was established by the ICRH in Ghent), academic approach is added value to the work in this centre. However, little collaboration in practice: scientific meetings organised (stimulated by UGhent) but efforts were not maintained and collaborative projects did not emerge. Missed opportunity to work with already existing data of ICRH.
4.3. The intervention logic of the project is coherent Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adaptations after MTE: reformulation of objectives, development objective became even more ambitious, attention for sustainability was integrated, less intermediate objectives, more ambitious in intermediate results (see the idea of providing care?) • Is a result of merging the projects (did not work out too well)? • Hypothesis assume that MSc and PhD are willing to commit time, that external actors are willing to collaborate, but do not analyse the risks connected to that, no provisions for managing these risks • No clear distinction between objective and results level

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators are output oriented or activities
Overall judgement on relevance of the project	
<p>There is no doubt about the relevance of the project (coherence with UEM and government policies). There has been effective and very relevant collaboration within Desafio, more in particular with project 3 but less with the existing centre for RH (outside of UEM) which contrasts with what could have been expected. The merger of two medical projects after phase I has led to a logical framework that is even more ambitious and weakly result oriented. There is no clear distinction between the outcome and the output level, which complicates appraisal of effectiveness and efficiency.</p>	

EQ 2. To what extent the project's specific objectives have been achieved (effectiveness)?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
2.1. The specific academic/institutional objective has been realised	<p>Objectives were:</p> <p>Knowledge and strengthened academic capacity</p>
Score: weak to good (if all PhD's will be finalised)	<p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectiveness is depending on number of PhD's that will be realised (6 are planned before the end of 2019). The evaluators have noticed a certain commitment amongst the students, 'now that we have come this far'. PhD research already contributes to the content of teaching offered Reflection on and creation of SRHR module in MSc Public Health This process also stimulated thinking about the content of the curriculum for the undergraduate students + reflexion on how to strengthen the research efforts of students in their MSc and for undergraduate students 8 MSc realised Research on various topics produced through PhD and MSc and published in 13 articles in international reviewed journals Serious efforts to establish a credible research unit, however difficulties remain to gather people around a common agenda and to sustain that effort. No system within faculty (or university) to disclose research results to other academic staff or students: for e.g. on demand of one PhD student some research results were put on the website of the faculty. This limits the access to research results The faculty and the current dean recognise the need to further support research culture, for e.g. doing more reading, improving on writing skills, deepening research approaches (in depth research): PhD students were too little aware of the individual efforts it takes to do a PhD (there is a common practice of outsourcing work, but in this case not all could be outsourced and the workload was not anticipated) <p>What influenced on results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to experiences in other countries, for e.g. SA (research unit) PhD's spending more time in Belgium, being together at the ICRH of Ghent, having contacts with other researchers in Ghent (see also under efficiency).

	<p>What hampered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Medical staff are combining various jobs outside of UEM.
<p>2.2. The specific development objective has been realised</p> <p>Score: weak to good</p>	<p>Objectives were:</p> <p>Raise awareness, provide multidisciplinary care and strengthen sustainability of UEM activities</p> <p>Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence or examples were provided with regards to the organisation of multidisciplinary care (on top of what was realised under phase I) Positive results obtained in the field of awareness raising with the open days for students + students have taken an interest to organise part of the activities themselves (for e.g. HIV testing). Numbers of voluntary testing are increasing. Network with decision makers in Ministry of Health established (starting from the own alumni network) Reflection about sustainability is present (see under sustainability)
<p>2.3. Research and teaching developed and provided through the IUC is of good (academic) quality</p> <p>Score: good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Careful process of designing the module Evidence that undergraduate programme is being revised considering, a.o. results of Desafio programme Increased attention for scientific guidance of research through local supervision Short courses and workshops (offered by P5) have contributed to improvement of research methods and scientific writing but not yet sufficient, difficulties to produce papers persist, as was confirmed by various respondents
<p>Overall judgement on effectiveness of the project</p> <p>If all PhD's will be realised, the academic capacity of the Faculty of medicine will be strengthened, already academic capacity is demonstrated by a higher number of publications. There is a lot of commitment to realise the PhD's, but success is not yet guaranteed. A challenge that remains is to improve access to research results and to use the potentially increased capacity for research at individual level for initiating (joint) research at the research centre. Currently it remains very difficult to gather people around a common research agenda and to sustain this effort. The effect on teaching is already obvious: there is the PhD research is already integrated in teaching and the creation of the new module on sexual and reproductive health sparked of a dynamic of improving teaching at undergraduate level and supporting MSc students in their research. Quality of teaching and research is guaranteed but further efforts are needed to support improvement of research methods and scientific writing. The initiative for awareness raising during the Open Days at UEM is a success. Evidence on changes in the provision of multi-disciplinary care have not been provided and do not appear in the annual reports.</p>	

EQ 3. What is the level of efficiency in the projects?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
<p>3.1. Intermediate results have been delivered.</p>	<p>Intermediate results were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge is increased Academic capacity in the field of reproductive health and HIV/AIDS is increased at UEM Health workers' skills about neglected issues related to reproductive health and HIV/AIDS are improved

Score: weak

- Policy makers are informed about priorities regarding reproductive health and HIV/AIDS
- Awareness about appropriate reproductive health & HIV/AIDS behaviours is raised at community level and among students in particular
- Reproductive health and HIV research and extension activities at UEM are sustainable

Findings:

- No evidence of improvement of health workers' skills: only through PhD and MSc research health workers have been informed about various topics.
- In Phase II the project supported the improvement of quality of service delivery to people living with aids/or SRH services to students in the UEM health clinic, but this activity was not very prominent in phase II. The clinic was closed down and reopened only in 2015, after which no specific activities were undertaken.
- There is specific attention to sustainability and increased readiness to response to requests for collaboration coming from other research institutes (see under the appreciation of sustainability).
- Module on reproductive health continued: 9 cycles have been provided. The evaluators did not obtain data from the faculty on the numbers of enrolment or typology of students. Increased awareness at the level of students the followed the module on sexual and reproductive health is understood by all respondents (but could not be verified by the evaluators)
- First steps to pro-actively inform policy makers about research results through policy briefs, but still limited (#2 briefs - one on awareness of contraception among men and the other on availability of adolescent-friendly services in Maputo City - of which one was disseminated by copies)
- There is increased openness for multidisciplinary approach (partly by default: PhD students who are not all medically trained were attracted because the project could not identify sufficient candidates amongst the doctors.)
- Personal changes: members of team, more in particular the PL became more visible and had opportunity to interact with UEM's rectorate structures, including UEM rector and vice-rector (exposure, for e.g. through participation in steering committee) and thus received access to new opportunities that advanced the academic career within UEM.
- Personal changes at the level of PhD's: better understanding of what research and PHD means: students see that UEM in the future will value more the PhD, previously, people did a PhD to get social recognition, not to become a better researcher or lecturer.
- Other personal changes can be mentioned at the level of MSc students: the scholarships provided by Desafio allowed masters students to do fieldwork and develop further their research skills. One student went on to doing a PhD she plans to complete in 2019; another student spoke about wanting to influence nutritional policies and support for people living with HIV and AIDS based on the results of his master's research. The project also allowed the formation of a small community fostered by the existence of a WhatsApp group, office space where students could work together and exchange ideas about their work. All students spoke about feeling empowered to publish and influence change in their respective fields of work; two mentioned being promoted after completing the masters.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The unit for Reproductive Health and Aids offers internships to a number of students from Belgium and states that this gives opportunities for capacity building of the own staff at UEM and of care takers. • Delays in the realisation of PhD, during the whole of the Desafio programme, 5 PhD students that were identified dropped out. • Establishment of a research unit (in 2013) • Increase in the number of articles published in international peer reviewed journals, because of progress in PhD studies. <p>What was not realised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific module on HIV aids for the MSc of Public Health: the faculty did not explicitly request for, the person who was assigned to it did not have a PhD and UEM rules prohibit that modules are elaborated by people other than academics holding a PhD. Another person was not immediately available. • Replication of modules and courses in other branches of UEM (outside of Maputo) • Annual meetings/conferences with decision makers: yet, there was a contribution to a conference of the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Gender on gender-based violence (in 2015, including PhD's from P1 and P3) • Workshops to strengthen competences of care takers: was postponed every year to take advantage of a PhD that was doing research on the education of medicine. The evaluators understand that the project team did not see how to organise this without having the results of the PhD. <p>Factor that hampered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of preparation of PhD candidates in phase II to start their PhD: they were a bit rushed towards enrolment (and they only discovered conditions of PhD over time) + no understanding from their side what it actually takes to do a PhD and difficulty to get organised once it was clear what was expected. More in particular difficulty to prioritise, sometimes (and for some) being 'distracted' by other opportunities • Not being able to take full advantage of courses that are offered for academic writing, academic English, statistics, ... • UEM rules and procedures
<p>3.2. Relationship between means and results achieved and objectives (qualitative assessment)</p> <p>Score: weak</p>	<p>On the organisation of the PhD's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New PhD's in phase II 'saved' the project but are under a lot of stress to perform: time was lost in the definition of the topic (connecting the background and interest of the PhD student to the topics proposed by the programme took some time) + time spent on data collection • Decision to introduce local supervision in phase II was a good decision and was very much appreciated by PhD students • Mixed appreciation of Flemish supervisors: for some PhD, lack of connection with the topic, lack of access to relevant expertise, in other cases very high appreciation of personal efforts from the Flemish supervisor to stimulate the PhD and specific expertise (for e.g. statistics). • Dean states that sufficient courses have been offered to support the students but that courses are not sufficient: the students should practice more and be more self-motivated. The issue is at first instance in commitment. Students are not sufficiently prioritizing the PhD (apparently, the same problem is there with the Swedish donor). The fact that funds from Desafio stopped and that the rest

	<p>of the PhD is mainly self-funded is only a part of the challenges but should not be the reason why the PhD cannot be finalised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What contributed to the realisation of the PhD was the collective participation in 2017 in skills building modules at the doctoral school of UGhent <p>Other issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FR 2017: overall overspending of 13.000 euro, in particular on operational and personnel costs. The evaluators have not yet been able to understand the nature of the overspending at the level of personnel costs and operational costs: unless it is related to the payment of PHD costs in 2017 for activities of PHD students in 2018? PL at UEM was aware of overspending: she was urged by the PSU and the programme coordination to invest in PhD (from 2014 onwards) and was told this could be compensated by underspending in other projects. Weaker performance related to PhD and MSc, which improved in the last years of phase 2 for PhD progress, however a lot of MSc scholarships were cancelled Activities to improve capacity of health care takers was not well planned, the ideas of having annual conferences with decision makers was not well thought through and difficult to plan Having one of the highest project budgets in the programme, the cost-effectiveness is rather weak. <p>Explanatory factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weak performance in PhD and MSc was related to the selection criteria used in phase I and the fact that many students did not prioritize the training.
<p>3.3. Project management is conducive for efficient and effective project implementation</p> <p>Score: weak</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues of communication and understanding all aspects of the programme and the reporting took a lot of time which was not really available. In theory, there was space to learn to understand the Desafio programme through the local steering committees: but understanding still took a lot of time and was also hampered by the turn-over of people involved) Too little investment in regular reporting <p>Factor that contributed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative help at the unit for reproductive health at UEM (preparing requests for the necessary funds)
<p>3.4. Environment for efficient and effective project implementation was created</p> <p>Score: weak</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The unit for sexual and reproductive health is not really organised/supportive to allow project management based on the logical framework approach and aiming to work towards changes (and to monitor that).
<p>3.5. Quality of the partnership N-S</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sense by main respondents of being in an unbalanced partnership: e.g. lack of acknowledgment of local supervisors (money, name on the publication, being involved in communication between supervisor in the North and PhD student...) - several respondents

Score: weak to good	<p>have better experiences with co-supervision in Spain and in Portugal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all duties for project management fall heavily on the PL in the South • Joint development of module in phase 1 was a very positive experience though: sessions of joint discussion and working, possibility for project team members to go to Belgium to work with their colleagues and to elaborate the various topics
<p>Overall judgement of efficiency of the project</p> <p>Overall efficiency of the project is weak. Compared to other projects, P4 has the biggest delays in realising the planned number of PhD students (only one of 6 planned is defending in 2018), which is partly related to the lack of time invested by the PhD's in their study, more in particular at the start. This has gradually improved thanks to an increased focus on the realisation of the PhD's in phase II. However, this has led to the cancellation of various activities (for example for extension). PhD's feel they were a bit rushed into their PhD and did not have all information about the process from the beginning. There is a mixed appreciation of the adequacy of support by Flemish supervisors. The balance in the partnership in terms of recognition of the added value and the input of local supervisors is questioned by UEM respondents. Continuous project management and monitoring was a challenge, overspending seems to be related to the payment of costs in 2017 of activities that will be performed in 2018 (related to PhD's).</p>	

EQ 4. To what extent the project results will continue after the IUC programme is completed?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
<p>4.1. Level of academic and institutional sustainability</p> <p>Score: good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability is strongly on the agenda of all respondents • There is ownership of the project results: dean is prepared to cover remaining costs for PhD from the faculty budget (1 trip of 1 month to finalise) but only if there is dedication to finalisation • Unit for research soon will be formally established, already the centre attracted two research projects in 2017 (with universities in Kwa-zulu-Natal and HAI Washington), involving former P3 and P4 members, coordinator and two staff members have been assigned to the centre (strategic plan is being developed, formal status of the centre not yet decided, current plan is to lodge it within another centre in the Faculty of Medicine, as a unit) • First research projects secured in the centre can be seen as a proof of capacity of academic staff and will contribute to motivation to invest in research • The centre for research might capitalise on the knowledge produced by the PhD and might valorise new competences and knowledge of PhD and MSc students • PhD students had to sign a contract with UEM and are obliged to stay a number of years after graduation • Open days with specific attention to RH and AIDS will continue (in partnership with students and Ministry of Health) • Efforts to connect with Ministry of Health offered exposure and can add to the credibility (condition for attracting new partners) • Student internship programme with Ghent will continue (was not part of Desafio but contributed to the relations in the partnership and the realisation of some results, no cost involved for UEM))
<p>4.2. Level of financial sustainability</p> <p>Score: good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to become more pro-active, for e.g. seeking exposure and going to donors, using research to demonstrate capacity (not only reacting on requests that they receive from the scientific directorate) • The module on reproductive health in the MSc of Public Health will be maintained as it is self-sustained through tuition fees

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity of research unit to accommodate requests for collaboration (and to receive finances).
Overall judgement of sustainability of the project <p>The importance of sustainability is high on the agenda of the respondents and the leadership of the Faculty. PhD students are planning to stay with the University after they finish their PhD. Measures are taken to embed the research unit for reproductive health in the existing structures and to continue the Open Days at UEM. Challenges will be to capitalise on the knowledge produced by the PhD. Financial sustainability will require a more pro-active attitude to attract funds, but the centre is already capable to accommodate requests for collaboration within funded programmes (as is demonstrated by two cases).</p>	

EQ 5. Impact and longer-term effects	
Judgment criteria	Comments
5.1. Indications of impact at academic level Score: good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribution to the revision of the undergraduate programme and new ideas about supporting research are being developed based on the experience of the project <p>Factor that contributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership of dean
5.2. Indications of impact on development processes Score: good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some windows of opportunity were used to influence on the gender policies: the PhDs and the Faculty assisted the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Gender, children and Social Affairs in organising two events: (i) the national level conference in 2015, on gender-based violence. Supported them in preparing the session and making them as dynamic as possible; PhD students facilitated group discussions and presented in plenary sessions. The conference was a key driver of the revision of the multisectoral approach to gender-based violence. One of the PhD's (R. Marlene) ministry's gender advisor and influenced a lot the conference programme and use the evidence that students were getting from the field. A contribution to the revision of guidelines might certainly be assumed. (ii) a national level conference in 2016 in the framework of a revision of gender policies. There is a need now to pick up and check the stage of the revision (according to the sources of the evaluators the revision was already concluded) Several examples of how individual faculty members are connecting with broader development processes and as such contribute to agenda-setting (national conferences), maintaining strong personal and institutional links with other national and international organisations involved in the delivery of sexual and reproductive and HIV programmes, visibility in UEM open days through provision of various health services (such as blood donation, HIV testing and condom provision), and extension activities, specifically fostering the link between theory and practice through the use of final year students who have been trained as HIV counsellors during UEM open days. There is a need to become more pro-active and to document better effects to strengthen claims about influencing development processes.

Overall judgement of the impact of the project

The evaluators note that the project and the creation of the module on reproductive health have stimulated reflection about the quality of teaching and some action to improve it.

Although too early to judge in a conclusive manner and hampered by the fact that UEM, the faculty of medicine and participants involved in the project have neglected a good documentation of effects of its work, the evaluators can conclude that P4, through project activities and through the individual involvement of some of its participants have been able to play a role in the development of national policies

The evaluators are not able to qualify the contribution. However, given the fact that an important actor as the Embassy of the Netherlands is not really noticing the presence of UEM in the public debate, the influence might be limited.

2.2.6. Project 5: to develop capacity for research, capacities related to Academic English, capacities related to education and to overview the postgraduate studies process.

In the following, the evaluation team gives an overview of the assessment of project 5. It is based on the guiding questions in the evaluation framework (see annex 2), which also refer to the indicators of this project as formulated in the logical framework.

EQ 1 – To what extent is the project relevant?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
1.1. Responding to needs Score: good to excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> P5 is fully in line with the ambitions of UEM to be a research led university (strategic plan and decision in 2013) and with the research guidelines (2007). The aim is to improve quality of teaching, have a better link between education and research. UEM statistics (2017) show that still too little staff is engaging in research and that measures to strengthen the capacity of individual lecturers for research remain relevant. UEM documents state that UEM structures need to be adapted and that a culture of planning, monitoring and accountability needs to be put in place. The current strategy planned to have a number of products²⁷ ready by 2018 (but this was not yet the case at the time of this end evaluation) Addressing changes in culture and changes in structures needs an endogenous approach: external projects cannot easily touch the heart of the matter. P5 quite rightfully choose to be supportive: showing what kind of structures are possible (study visits to Belgium and South Africa), stimulating P5 project participants to use this information to make the research policy more concrete, finance measures to develop necessary management tools to ensure follow-up and support for qualitative post-graduate education and develop an offer of courses to build capacity of individual lecturers with view to increased academic production and improved quality of teaching. (combination of organisational and individual capacity building) Right choice to put the lead of the project with the Scientific Directorate, given its tasks and mandate and to involve the Directorate of Academic Development and the Language centre given their tasks. One critical remark: lack of analysis of institutional capacity(-needs) related to the realisation of multi-disciplinary research and collaboration which was core to Desafio. This weakens the relevance of P5 + lack of analysis of specific needs per project
1.2. There have been efforts to ensure complementarity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within Desafio: project 5 offered support in development of research competences and Academic English to other projects. In reality, too

²⁷ Such as: approval of UEM revised statutes, analysis of the functioning of the current organic structure and design of a new structure, analysis of the function of the current academic structure within Faculties and Schools and design of a new academic structure, integrating a number of new management and governance forums, such as: Forum of Teaching Deputy Directors, Forum of Research, Extension and Postgraduation Deputy Directors.

<p>and synergy with other projects/other (Belgian) actors</p> <p>No score</p>	<p>little efforts were taken to diversify the supportive offer and to connect (and adapt) to the specific needs per project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The formulation of the project was in synergy with efforts taken by other programmes: Swedish programme was focusing on the Scientific Directorate and the cooperation office to develop funding and other incentives for research and to train research management staff; the Italian project was focusing on capacity building of the unit for quality. • However, there is no evidence of operationalising synergy with other projects during the execution (no efforts taken by donors or the Office for international cooperation), which is a missed opportunity.
<p>1.3. The intervention logic of the project is coherent</p> <p>Score: poor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adaptations after MTE were done: less attention for library²⁸ and for innovative teaching (but still some things related to that)²⁹, ICT component replaced by attention for a technology transfer platform/unit (idea of scientific park), more attention for the supervision of postgraduate students (mainly as a managerial solution to ensure a higher rhythm in the realisation of the PhD's) • Lack of coherence between the various topics, more in particular provision of various courses. Disarticulation between the various bits of P5 and a gap around the role and achievements of the scientific directorate. • Indicators to demonstrate change are in fact activities, lack of indicators at the level of objectives • Assumptions are related to staff being involved and taking responsibility, but there is no risk analysis and institutional risks have not been analysed (nor sufficiently discussed or addressed). Already in 2014, an evaluation of the UEM strategy highlighted the fact that the strategic plan did not clearly define roles and responsibilities related to its key areas. The evaluators of this evaluation find that this weak point persist in the new strategy, hindering its operationalisation and execution. Yet, this issue was insufficiently considered as a factor that would influence on the execution and effectiveness of P5. Clearly, the positioning of the SD, its capacity in terms of available HR, its leadership is a long-standing problem which was insufficiently recognised. According to the Flemish PL, the issue was not apparent for the Flemish partner at that time (although the formulation of phase II of the Desafio programme did recognise the fact that several positions were not filled, this was not sufficiently recognised as a risk in the execution of Phase II. • Logical framework: output oriented, not result oriented: for e.g. courses offered, not looking at number of participants and changes in their capacity, for e.g. organisational support to the SD, not identifying expected changes in performance. As such, PLs and Desafio coordinators lacked good evidence and data to discuss necessary adaptations in the project. • The interaction for joint execution of P5 (between SD, Directorate for Academic Development (CDA) and the Faculty of Education of which

²⁸ Progress was made in phase I of the Desafio project in relation to the library. One MSc student testified about his MSc scholarship in Western Cape supported by Desafio which resulted in a thesis (2014) on the role of library services in the research of post graduate students, now working at the central UEM library and the Directorate of Documentation Services under the rectorate.

²⁹ This was a recommendation of the evaluator of the Mid-term Evaluation as the Italian partner planned to focus on this.

	<p>it is part, Language Centre, Academic Council³⁰) was not thought through and was not translated into activities and indicators to monitor changes in interaction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should be noted that the Mid-term evaluation did not identify any issue related to the capacity of the Scientific Directorate.
--	---

Overall judgement on relevance of the project

A transversal project addressing organisational and individual needs was relevant considering the ambitions of UEM. However, relevance could have been stronger if needs (organisational and governance consequences) to realise multi-disciplinary research projects would have been considered and addressed. Offering support to individual lecturers involved in Desafio projects is also relevant but was not based on a clear needs analysis of those lecturers and not sufficiently connected to those needs.

Given the focus of the projects, financed by the Swedish and the Italian partners, synergy by design was possible and advisable but it was never realised due to lack of donor coordination and exchange on progress and lessons learned in the various programmes.

The logical framework did not demonstrate sufficient internal coherence (offering various courses for capacity building) and did not provide the PL's nor the coordinators with the tools to reflect upon the realisation of observable changes at the level of individual lecturers or the units involved in P5: there were no specific indicators allowing good monitoring. A more in-depth analysis of institutional and organisational risks linked to the Scientific Directorate and its functioning/positioning within the UEM at the start of Phase II would have provided more information and a better dialogue amongst partners about the stumbling blocks in execution and the best way to address them (in combination with other donor's input).

EQ 2. To what extent the project's specific objectives have been achieved (effectiveness)?

Judgment criteria	Comments
<p>2.1. The specific academic/institutional objective has been realised:</p> <p>Score: weak</p>	<p>Objectives of the project were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To develop UEM's capacities Research through the operational development of UEM's Research Policy (RP) • To overview the postgraduate studies process • To develop UEM's capacities related to teaching • To develop UEM's capacities related to Academic English <p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When looking at the first two objectives, all is still very much at the stage of design and reflection: this reflection was translated in a plan about research, extension and post-graduation management (period 2017-2021) that was submitted to the Swedish donor for support. This shows that the research policy is further clarified/more concrete in its ambitions, however without being operationalised.

³⁰ The Academic Council is a consultative body comprised of the Rector, the two vice-rectors, pedagogic director, scientific director and 10 lecturers, its mandate is to advise on curricula, creation of new courses, teaching-learning, and doctorate plans, The council meets three times a year. The faculty of Education (www.faced.uem.mz) has following research lines: teaching, learning and development processes, curricula and lecturers' training, education policies, management and evaluation and cultural and gender studies, ... The CDA received equipment and support from P5 to provide short courses.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only a basic level of operationalisation of the research policy is realised. Proof of this is the existing results framework (with targets) of the current UEM strategy³¹: at least this framework is urging UEM to ensure a follow-up on some ambitions and to reflect upon that (for e.g. in its annual reports). Interviews with (a limited number of) respondents confirmed that P5 was important for this operationalisation (together with the other partners). The study visits that were organised to Belgium and South Africa have played a major role in this. Also, internal discussions from 2016 onwards that were partly supported by the funds of P5 and initiated by the SD played a role. • The system to monitor post-graduate studies which was planned for in this project 5 is still not operational, post-graduate units have not been created, acquired (personal) knowledge about how to coordinate research teams and supervise students has not yet been integrated beyond individuals that participated in Desafio nor transferred/shared with the Faculties. As such, Faculties are left on their own, some of them have developed their own guidelines. • A post graduate unit is not established • A transfer technology unit is still very much in the phase of reflection, a recent idea is to establish a department for extension, which could host such a unit (sometimes referred to as a scientific park). • Interviews and documents do not provide evidence of significant changes in the domain of teaching • Capacity to provide academic English has been increased: little information about this is provided in the Desafio reports. From interviews with the leadership, more in particular the realisation of two PhD's and the provision of bibliographical materials have strengthened the centre. The short courses have assisted some of the Desafio PhD's and staff involved in the projects, proof of which was their capacity to present their research in English during the scientific conferences. The centre was urged by the Desafio programme to develop its own offer, not to wait for demands from faculties or lecturers, and to seek market for this within and outside of UEM: thanks to this a full year programme for various languages is being executed and provides regular income. A resource centre has been recently opened and the centre established valuable contact with American universities (to provide Portuguese language courses) and with UEM faculties (such as the Faculty of Agronomy). • The claim in the self-assessments prepared for this final evaluation that short courses and workshops improved the number of research projects and publications or graduation numbers cannot be strongly substantiated given the way trainings were offered and monitored (see under efficiency): lack of strategic approach, offered as on/off courses, lack of targeting and follow-
--	---

³¹ This results framework is looking at quality of teaching and research. Indicators on teaching are related to: the number of e-learning platforms, identification of good practices on student centered learning, implementation of quality insurance system (self-assessment of undergraduate and post graduate courses), targets to get the post-graduate courses accredited (none of them is accredited for the moment). Indicators on research are related to: the restructuring of the administrative structure, conception of a system to monitor research information, ...

	<p>up on results and changes at the level of participants. Respondents from other projects confirm the contribution of Desafio, but not in particular P5 (see also under efficiency)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluators would like to highlight the contribution of P5 to the visibility of UEM: the Desafio seminar in 2015 and the Conference 2016 were new initiatives within UEM the ways they were organised, as multidisciplinary events around 1 specific topic was atypical for UEM and has contributed to the visibility of the academic activity on the topic of Reproductive Health/HIV/AIDS, which was appreciated by the respondents. Another important result of the Desafio programme is the contribution to the creation of the UEM Revista Cientifica in 2011 that increases access to research (in comparison to international scientific journals). • UEM leadership and various respondents acknowledge that the transition towards a research-based university is going slow. The main complaints are related to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the lack of transparent functioning of the University scientific fund is far from optimal. The fund (15.000 MT/year) is run by scientific rectorate for promotion of faculty members and management of research established by Swedish + publication and participation in events, and equipment fund ○ the lack of pro-activeness of the SD in assisting faculties with a strategy to secure funds or with guidelines to operationalise research policy ○ There is a reward for scientific articles, but the communication is not organised in an efficient and timely manner. <p>Explanatory factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little progress in the domain of teaching: efforts to evolve towards the Bologna system were turned-back by the new rector in 2011. The efforts to meet the Bologna agreements met a lot of resistance and was more or less imposed and there was a lot of turbulence. In 2011, it was decided not to continue the PhD on this topic. • The Scientific Directorate never had the required number of people or the right qualifications to be able to perform. The evaluators have understood that the decision to improve this lies with the rector and the vice-rector of UEM, but things did not improve over the years. (See also Kruse:2017, page 56). Various respondents confirm that there are problems in realising effective and fruitful collaborations within all the various organs and institutes that are necessary to realise the ambition of being a research-led university and in which the Scientific Directorate should play a central role. (See also Kruse:2017, page 56) In reality, the management of research is still primarily vested at the individual faculties.
<p>2.2. The specific development objective has been realised</p> <p>Score: NA</p>	<p>Objectives were:</p> <p>None formulated</p>

<p>2.3. Research and teaching developed and provided through the IUC is of good (academic) quality</p> <p>Score: weak</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short courses related to research and teaching and aimed at academic staff were developed in collaboration with Flemish colleagues and afterwards taken over (for e.g. Academic English). • Evaluators were informed about positive appreciation of some of the courses offered. Appreciation of quality, for e.g. the courses on data-analysis, academic writing, ... was mostly good, but participants indicated that one course was not enough (need to move beyond introductory level) • Overall, respondents confirm they appreciate access to academic resources, such as libraries. However, UEM research is not properly registered or made accessible for UEM lecturers or students (see for e.g. the online repository on the UEM website which does not contain references to the PhD research developed within Desafio) • Quality of PhD's is ensured through (Flemish) supervision • No indications that quality should be doubted but the way in which the support to academic staff enrolled in post-graduate programmes was offered (see also under efficiency) affects the quality of the overall capacity building effort.
<p>Overall judgement on effectiveness of the project</p> <p>The effective result is quite weak when looking at the operationalisation of the research policy, capacities related to teaching and overview of the post graduate studies process: many activities and tools (that are almost ready to be implemented) have not yet yielded concrete implementation steps allowing the expected results to be realised and effective on the short term. UEM leadership and various respondents acknowledge that the transition towards a research-based university is going slow. Reference is made to the weak capacity of the Scientific Directorate and the way interaction between various UEM organs and Faculties is (not effectively) organised.</p> <p>Interview and documents do not provide evidence of significant changes in the domain of teaching, at least not in Phase II, mainly because of a lack of investment after the decision not to implement the Bologna Agreements.</p> <p>The result is better when looking at the capacity to provide Academic English as the Language centre has developed several offers, amongst which Academic English and is providing (paid) courses on a continuous basis.</p> <p>The evaluators conclude that Desafio has contributed to making more concrete its ambition to become a research led university. A plan was submitted to the Swedish cooperation to take this further. However, operationalisation is lagging behind. Most critical is the organisation of supervision of post-graduate studies and the organisation of (co-)supervision of postgraduate research, more in particular in international programmes. As is concluded under the efficiency question of other programmes, this affects the quality of the partnership.</p> <p>The quality of the individual courses was good, although they remained at the introductory level, the capacity building approach was only weakly developed and the evaluators cannot conclude on the basis of documents or interviews that this made an important difference in the capacity of academic staff (of the Desafio programme).</p> <p>To end with a positive note, Desafio has provided UEM with a successful model of scientific conferences/events and a scientific journal (in Portuguese) which contributing to the visibility of UEM as a research-based institution.</p>	

EQ 3. What is the level of efficiency in the projects?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
<p>3.1. Intermediate results have been delivered.</p>	<p>Intermediate results expected are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of expertise in developing an overall Research Policy (RP) • Development of capacities of staff to develop and implement Academic English and English for Specific Purposes (ESP)

Score: weak

- Enhancing performance of UEM staff enrolled in postgraduate studies program and the supervision role
- Provision of educational training to UEM academic staff as well as provision of training and infrastructure of ADC

Findings:

- PhD's: 2 out of 4 that started have completed (a 3rd one might finish in 2019, 1 PhD was cancelled)
- MSc's: 3 out of 6 planned (three MSc have been cancelled)
- Phase I primarily resulted in improvement of library and ICT and the further development of a language centre at UEM
- The overall performance of the project in phase 2 is poor, although lots of things have been prepared, the fact that new policies and mechanisms have not been implemented and their functionality was thus never tested is an important argument for this score

Related to development of expertise

- Strengthening expertise within the SD was very much limited to 1 person. She was absent for some time (sabbatical leave) and transfer of expertise within the SD did not yet happen.
- The SD initiated discussions about research lines and organisation of research programmes within academic units and facilitated the organisation of scientific events but was not able to position itself as central or key actor in the strategy of UEM to become a research led university.
- Study visits have greatly helped to understand and see how a research policy can be translated in practice.

Related to Academic English and other courses to enhance performance of staff including supervision

- From the reading of the annual reports, is understood that there has never been a consolidated, coherent programme of trainings and workshops to be offered to Desafio members and other academic staff enrolled in postgraduate programmes. Every year, some one-off courses and workshops were organised, Desafio members were not always able to participate. Courses were seldom repeated, for e.g. training on research methodology was provided once in 2015 and followed by a training on statistics (4 sessions for 112 people) in 2017 and 1 workshop on academic writing, but that was all on research methodology (the 2013 annual report states that that 7 workshops were provided but it is not clear on what). **As such, a clear trajectory of support to postgraduate students did not emerge.**
- Difficult to understand from the information in the reports how many people were actually reached by which courses and the extent to which this was helpful to them. During the evaluation mission consolidated data could not be provided.
- Interviews with project teams and PhD students clarified that few people (from Desafio) made use of the offer, any significant contribution of what was offered was not confirmed by respondents during the evaluation mission, except for Academic English (in P2 and P3 mainly).
- Academic English was provided in 2014 (by UGhent for a very diverse group and once by the language centre for 12 students from Desafio, who did not all complete the course. In 2015 and 2016, the

language centre provided Academic English to staff of the scientific directorate (of course, the language centre offered courses outside of Desafio against a fee, these activities were not reported under Desafio).

- A number of relevant workshops were cancelled (and not put on the agenda afterwards), for e.g. (project) management skills (instead 2 staff members for the coordination office were sent for training to Portugal in 2016), for e.g.; the workshop on supervision.
- The follow-up of post-graduate (Desafio) students was not pro-active, basically, the scientific directorate was waiting for their progress reports (which often did not come, for e.g. only 43% of postgraduate students under Desafio were submitting their progress reports in 2015). Towards the end, the Directorate organised meetings with the students, which was an important step to a more coordinated follow-up (but was not reported by any of the PhD students as a useful or supportive measure).
- The online tool for follow-up of (progress of) post-graduate students was not realised: the system developed was not sufficiently flexible according to the interview with the PL, and there was little input and collaboration from the projects to feed the system with information.
- Attention for supervision: developing guidelines for the (co-) supervision of PHD students was done as part of the management manual of the Desafio programme (rather than developing a UEM policy). It seems a missed opportunity not to develop these guidelines for UEM (or to connect to what is existing) and to see them mainly as a managerial issue. UEM's framework for Postgraduate Curricula talks about forms of student guidance and supervision but a clear policy or mechanism to regulate tasks and recognition for (co-)supervision, especially in the context of international programmes is not there, this issue was confirmed during the debriefing of the evaluation mission at UEM. The Swedish evaluation highlights the overall ineffectiveness of the system with Mozambican co-supervisors in terms of communication, transfer of knowledge, commitment and institutionalisation of research results afterwards. Often this is rooted in (i) poor planning of the partnerships and the PhD's where co-supervisors are asked to supervise fields outside of their own expertise (Kruse: 2017, page 62), (ii) lack of pro-activity amongst students (lack of initiative to involve co-supervisor), (iii) lack of number of lecturers at UEM that hold a PhD/are able to supervise (see also under efficiency in the other projects).
- A few reflection workshops were organised (but without very concrete output): on peer review processes, to discuss research lines

Related to educational training

- In relation to education (innovation), some activities were organised: workshop student centred approach (2013), student centred learning for 24 members of the faculty of Education (2014), workshop on sign language for 37 teachers (2015), workshop with 41 teachers to reflect upon a proposal for a MSc in Pedagogical Sciences. It is our understanding that lecturers from the faculties of Law, Arts and Social Sciences and Medicine were not (or only to a very limited extent and on a personal basis) involved in these workshops. Consolidated information about effects on participants is not documented.

Factors that have influenced on the realisation of intermediate results:

<p>3.2. Relationship between means and results achieved and objectives (qualitative assessment)</p> <p>Score: weak</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence of a clear vision on and strategy for capacity building of academic staff (enrolled in post graduate programmes) and the type of intervention/programme it takes to address this in a coherent way; • Difficulties for the scientific directorate to manage the collaboration with the language centre and the centre for academic development as being part of other Faculties (organisation of interaction, governance issues) • Lack of coordinated planning between the Scientific Directorate and the PL of other Desafio projects • Weak capacity at the scientific directorate (+ restructuring in 2014): having sufficient staff and sufficient staff with the appropriate qualifications, the PL of the project had the right qualifications but little support from the Directorate leadership and was absent for a longer time. • The selection of MSc and PhD was only weakly aligned with the needs of the scientific directorate (to become stronger in creating a favourable environment for research): none of the PhD topics chosen was aimed to support this. • The evaluators understand that university politics and power relations between the leadership of the Directorate and UEM Rectorate are hampering the establishment of a post-graduate unit but were not able to fully unravel this issue during the mission <p>Comments on the organisation of the PhD's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews reveal that several PhD were not sufficiently or timely informed about the terms of the PhD (what did it cover and what were they entitled to, the forms of a PhD, by thesis or by publication). Lack of information about the ending of the Desafio funds. • One case reported about the dispute with the Flemish promotor on the choice of the topic, but resolved by changing the PhD to a PhD in South Africa • Respondents referred to a lack of follow-up in phase I • Appreciation of the Sandwich model <p>Other issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FR 2017: overall underspending of more than 19.000 euro, more in particular on scholarships: one PhD stopped, another one did not travel. Underspending on operational costs as several activities were not organised • Weak planning of activities • Activities not sufficiently connected to an overall strategy at the Scientific Directorate for capacity building which diminishes their effectiveness (one-shot interventions without follow-up) • Funding of visits and activities to prepare for new policies never materialised in actual implementation and this is not expected in the short term • The language lab (and the equipment) was never established as it was planned <p>Explanatory factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination between the Desafio projects: it is in this project that a lack of joint planning between the projects becomes most apparent and problematic. P5 depended on the projects to make use of the offer of courses and to contribute to the development of policies, clearly, they receive too little input. • Bureaucratic procedures of UEM delayed the procurement of equipment for the language lab, after which it was largely cancelled.
--	--

<p>3.3. Project management is conducive for efficient and effective project implementation</p> <p>Score: weak</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Scientific Directorate was hosting the project, but had to collaborate with other units, such as language centre (under the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences) and the centre for academic development and the faculty of education. These units did not have experience in working together. The Scientific Directorate (or the Desafio local coordinator) was not able to force collaboration, although respondents confirm endlessly attempts of the programme manager to urge the SD to be proactive and engage the other units. • Coordination and joint planning between the institutions involved and with the faculties that had to send academic staff enrolled in postgraduate programmes to take benefit from the offer was a nightmare for the PL of P5. Project 5 thus experienced a lot of troubles in trying to re-plan activities with the different entities involved (after cancellations or delays). • The PL was absent for a longer period and not effectively replaced • Unfortunately, the team members from CDA and the Faculty of Education were not present at the interviews planned. • PL on Mozambican side pointed at room for improvement: to better clarify the rules of the game, more in particular: who is taking final decisions and based on what (example given is that of training in Portugal that was approved within the joint steering committee and then refused by VLIR-UOS as not fitting into the general spirit of the programme which aims at using Flemish expertise primarily). <p>Explanatory factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of staff in the scientific directorate in 2014 • Lack of staff: already in the description of the Desafio programme (phase II), it is mentioned that a lot of vacancies need to be filled. According to the former director of the Cooperation office, this never happened.
<p>3.4. Environment for efficient and effective project implementation was created</p> <p>Score: poor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even though the leadership of the SD was formally represented in the management team of the Desafio programme, this did not improve the communication or coordination between the SD and the other projects. This hampered an efficient organisation of any offer to the postgraduate students and Desafio members • The evaluators do understand that, on the one hand, the SD did not assume a responsibility to play a significant role, which would have been expected from a project that aimed to support UEM in its evolution towards a research-based institution. Unfortunately, the evaluators were not able to discuss this with the former/current leadership of the SD to confirm this understanding. On the other hand, the evaluators understand that, the academic vice-rector, who is also responsible for research, training and management of lecturers has not been able to influence on the situation, for reasons that are not clear to the evaluators.
<p>3.5. Quality of the partnership N-S</p> <p>Score: good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership and expertise from Flanders were appreciated: <i>'visiting UGhent and the doctoral school made us understand what is possible and what makes a difference, we understand urgency'</i>. The 'how to' to translate ambitions into operations was clearly shown and explained. • Interaction on a personal level has been very rewarding
<p>Overall judgement of efficiency of the project</p> <p>The overall appreciation of efficiency of P5 is weak. The evaluators acknowledge that a lot of activities have been undertaken, however:</p>	

- (i) the offer to support skills development for Desafio members/academic staff enrolled in post-graduate programmes was not used by them (difficulty to participate given other activities and priorities, lack of coordinated and joint planning between projects and despite readiness for e.g. of P6 to provide courses) and was not offered as a coherent package or trajectory for capacity building of post-graduate students and with various workshops planned that were cancelled,
- (ii) policies, mechanisms and tools prepared (on technology transfer, on operationalisation of research policy, on the post graduate school, ...) are not yet implemented and first analysis of their effectiveness and functionality thus is not yet available.

The fact that a postgraduate unit is not yet installed, partly explains the endemic lack of coordinated support and follow-up of PhD students. The evaluators understand that the lack of support from the Scientific Directorate leadership, the lack of coordinated and effective interaction with UEM higher management and faculty leadership, and the lack of initiative of the Faculties involved in Desafio and other Faculties to take advantage of the offer, to a large extent explains the weak performance of P5 in terms of efficiency. It should be noted however that the Language Centre has been able to maximum advantage of the input from the Desafio project to become a better organised and performant centre (thanks to leadership of that centre).

Partnership has been very much appreciated but comments were made on the lack of clarity about who is making final decisions: joint steering committee or VLIR-UOS?

EQ 4. To what extent the project results will continue after the IUC programme is completed?

Judgment criteria	Comments
4.1. Level of academic and institutional sustainability Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are not yet many results to consolidate: first, new tools and mechanism should be tested to verify to what extent they are effective. There is no evidence that tools and mechanisms that were designed within Desafio will be implemented soon, but they are now to a large extent part of the new programme with the Swedish partnership, MSc and PhD students from Desafio will be involved in this programme and are able to continue to work on the topic of their thesis The Desafio programme raises a lot of questions about the position of the SD within UEM and its role in the evolution of UEM towards a research-based university: this issue is not yet resolved within UEM All PhD graduates remained at UEM and are working in senior positions where they are able to use the knowledge and skills acquired. One of the PhD's forged a partnership with researchers from Kings College of London on research-based teaching which entails a series of long-term workshops for students It is clear however that UEM has a vision which places research at the heart of the organisation, this vision will most certainly not be turned back and safeguards the evolution towards a research led university (however slower than anticipated). The language centre will most certainly continue, as a centre it has greatly evolved and has a completely different view about what a language centre is, the centre is already invited to undertake consultancies outside UEM, for NGO's and public institutions, such as the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Youth and Sports and the National Statistics Unit. Next to language courses, the centre is providing services such as: teaching, translation and interpretation, linguistic revision, copy-editing.
4.2. Level of financial sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phasing out was effectively used by UEM to connect Desafio results to the new phase of the Swedish partnership and to secure funds to further work on testing tools, mechanisms and ideas (for e.g. related to the scientific park)

Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the economic crisis, the budget for the scientific directorate has been cut off by UEM and the budget for PhD went down³², UEM is counting on the new Swedish programme (2017-2022) to support with PhD scholarships. The Language Centre has developed a policy to payment of courses, there are prices for UEM staff, participants from outside of UEM and discounts for students.
Overall judgement of sustainability of the project <p>The evaluators conclude that there are not yet many results to consolidate. The decision to continue to work on the operationalisation of the research policy through the Swedish partnership is a relevant and good one. It will be possible to build further on the increased capacity of PhD graduates, but in order to be successful and sustainable, the evaluators argue that the position of the Scientific Directorate and its performance deserves a good discussion and decision. Especially because increased competition for research funds within UEM and internationally is the case, UEM can no longer postpone the operationalisation of its research policy.</p> <p>This being said, it is clear that UEM has a vision which places research at the heart of the institution, this vision will most certainly not be turned back and safeguards an evolution towards a research led university (however much slower than anticipated and probably not fully realised for another decade).</p> <p>Financial and institutional sustainability of the language centre is an exception to the rule.</p>	

EQ 5. Impact and longer-term effects	
Judgment criteria	Comments
5.1. Indications of impact at academic level Score: poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluators did not find evidence of impact at wider academic level. P5 was not only aimed at academic staff involved in Desafio but also in other faculties. Data about effects have not been documented though. Some impact might result from the organisation of scientific events and the scientific journal, but the evaluators did not receive specific information on this.
5.2. Indications of impact on development processes Score: NA	NA
Overall judgement of the impact of the project Not yet indications of impact.	

³² The Swedish evaluation of 2017 highlights that the contribution of the Mozambican government for research went down in the last years.

2.2.7. Project 6: to develop statistical tools and develop research activities

In the following, the evaluation team gives an overview of the assessment of project 6. It is based on the guiding questions in the evaluation framework (see annex), which also refer to the indicators of this project as formulated in the logical framework.

EQ 1 – To what extent is the project relevant?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
1.1. Responding to needs Score: excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific elements related to statistics and analysis were mentioned in the strategic plan of UEM or in the research policy Attention for statistics is aligned with the choice for RH and HIV as central focus: 'talking about health is talking about data is talking about statistics' (bio-statistics) Collecting data (monitoring) and data-analysis can contribute to evaluating effectiveness of government programmes: from the context description it is clear that academics and UEM could play a bigger role in accommodating this government need. At the start of Desafio, the unit for statistics was a small section without MSc and PhD, but already with the task to support teaching and data analysis in other faculties. Strengthening human capacity makes it possible to better serve the other faculties.
1.2. There have been efforts to ensure complementarity and synergy with other projects/other (Belgian) actors No score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within Desafio: the initial idea of consolidating all data collected through the thematic projects in one database was not realised, this idea was not understood/accepted by other projects Later on: more involvement in research design for e.g. in P4 but not in data collection (identification of tools, sample, variables) which complicated/compromised data collection P6 PhD's were realised in collaboration with data collected by PhD's of P4 No evidence of synergy with programmes of other donors
1.3. The intervention logic of the project is coherent Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptation after MTE: formulation of academic objective has been unpacked and became more concrete Indicators defined for phase II at level of intermediate results changed from a focus on scientific output (articles) to development of statistical models which made more sense as these models are essential in order publish new statistical methodology Logical framework is oriented at activities (rather than results: what does this project want to change?) – lack of result orientedness Hypothesis: refer to the willingness of others to collaborate, no real risk analysis nor explicit proposals for risk management in the documents
Overall judgement on relevance of the project <p>P6 is relevant for the Desafio programme and for the statistics unit who received the task to support statistics teaching and data-analysis for the whole UEM but did not have the capacity. Although not explicit, government documents clarify a role for universities to assist in monitoring and analysis of data to inform government policies. This project contributed to the capacity of the UEM to take up this role.</p> <p>The project's logical framework is not really result oriented, risk management, for e.g. being dependent on other faculties to deliver was not addressed in an explicit manner.</p>	

There is no evidence of synergy with other programmes.

EQ 2. To what extent the project's specific objectives have been achieved (effectiveness)?

Judgment criteria	Comments
<p>2.1. The specific academic/institutional objective has been realised:</p> <p>Score: weak to good (but a lot to be expected, depending on positioning of the unit in the research policy and ambitions of UEM)</p>	<p>Objectives were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To develop statistical tools for the analysis of sexual and reproductive health data in Mozambique To strengthen the research capacity of UEM To develop research activities in the department, in partnership with government institutions, industry, NGOs and the society in general <p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offering courses for data analysis: in phase I done with Desafio funds and professors from abroad, in Phase II with own staff within UEM (4 sessions in 2017 for 112 people), but also in branches of UEM and with stakeholders at the Ministry of health. Evaluators were not able to establish who was actually reached by the short courses. Tools and models developed and tested with researchers in P4 and examples of co-authoring, but joint research more difficult to develop, Not yet developed research activities outside of postgraduate study Sharing with Ministry of Health existing research and exchange about common research questions, ready to respond to specific questions (the evaluators did not have an interview with the Ministry of Health to confirm this, but various respondents within UEM have mentioned it). Contacts are established through UEM alumni (also involved in Desafio) Still a lot of work to strengthen basic capacity in data analysis at various faculties: on/off trainings might not be sufficient. PhDs will change faculty and the unit for statistics: quality of service and intervention and quality of teaching already improved a lot over the last years (bringing other ways of teaching from EU countries, networks have been established, especially with UHasselt giving support to PhD, they will remain linked). <p>Factors that influence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognition of the capacity of the unit for statistics by other faculties and acceptance is rather weak: having the statistical research centre established might help to improve on this: it offers a point of contact for other faculties and the outside world and is important for visibility, Dean in the board is the link with the rectorate: dean could defend and look for financial means. Little experience and track record in joint research at UEM with the faculties involved in Desafio explains some resistance to collaboration Lack of support of the Scientific Directorate to manage well the offer of short courses.
<p>2.2. The specific development objective has been realised</p>	<p>Objectives were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None formulated in the logical framework

Score: NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluators note that the unit of statistics is in contact with the Ministry of Health (see the above)
2.3. Research and teaching developed and provided through the IUC is of good (academic) quality Score: good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvement of teaching at undergraduate levels: lecturers are much more knowledgeable, thanks to MSc course and PhD The Faculty is working on improvement of its educational offer: developing curriculum for new MSc in biostatistics and econometrics will be finished by 2021, this is based on study of labour market (through tracer studies and consultations with alumni). UEM has one competitor in Mozambique on biostatistics: Institut Superior de Sciences de Saude Faculty of Medicine (dean) is impressed by the professional work delivered and seriousness of team. UEM evaluation of the courses shows high appreciation and requests to have more training. Some respondents (PhD) acknowledged that courses in statistics were helpful, but also that it is mainly an introduction and that far more support is needed to build capacity of individual lecturers and researchers. The course was on what the faculty staff could offer, considering limited access to advanced tools and progress (using open source).
Overall judgement on effectiveness of the project <p>Considering the high expectations for this project, the effectiveness is still weak. The most important factor is the lack of recognition of the statistics unit by other faculties as a major support in strengthening the research capacity for e.g. through assistance in training, and research design, identifying samples and appropriate models and data collection tools.</p> <p>Given the attendance of courses on statistics offered, the evaluators conclude that at least 100 people (students, lecturers and professionals, for e.g. at the Ministry of Health) have been introduced in basic statistics and tools that are accessible through open sources, which has contributed to their understanding of the importance and nature of data-analysis. However, this is still insufficient to be able to apply and integrate this in proper research.</p> <p>Although P6 did not yet put the statistical unit on the map of UEM, the unit already demonstrated its readiness to assist government (Ministry of Health) with specific questions and it is more capable to support research and to provide better statistical education.</p>	

EQ 3. What is the level of efficiency in the projects?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
3.1. Intermediate results have been delivered. Score: weak to good (if PhD's are finalised, MSc is up and running and centre is functional)	<p>Intermediate results were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge Research activities developed with other projects Adequate number of qualified academic staff Implementation of training (workshops and MSc) Formalisation of statistics research entity <p>Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthening of human capacity building further on Phase 1 (2 MSc students succeeded), this is important for the statistical unit having 23 staff but no MSc or PhD degree at the start of Desafio. Articles in international peer reviewed journals: 8 2 MSc completed in Phase II (total of 4 for the whole programme) PhD: 1 completed out of 4 that started (three others are expected to finish in 2019 or 2020, with extra funds from UHasselt) (7 more PHD's within the statistical unit will be realized before the end of

	<p>2019 with other funds, but Desafio laid the ground for the investment in research capacity)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master course developed within IUC: realised for 80% (already to a large extent in phase 1, will now be taken further for completion by the PhD). • On a personal level: a lot of confidence and some frustration about lack of demand from faculties within UEM (higher level needs to be involved to improve this, for e.g. scientific directorate to integrate services in an overall package and to 'market' the services and urge departments and faculties to take advantage of this). • Basis for statistics unit (materials, library, equipment, PhD's) is there: formal approval by University Council to be awaited, but is now in the final phase. <p>Explanatory factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UEM rule that new curricula can only be developed by a PhD. The PhD in project 6 only now has the time to finalise the MSc course. Also, the unit wanted a sustainable course that would not be 100% or heavily dependent on professors from abroad, therefore, more human capacity needed to be developed first. • 2 PhD's only started in 2015, which explains the delay in realisation • Explicit choice of UEM to have young people that can be abroad for a longer time: they were highly committed and prioritised their postgraduate training, first MSc and then PhD
<p>3.2. Relationship between means and results achieved and objectives (qualitative assessment)</p> <p>Score: good</p>	<p>Comments on the organisation of PhD's</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topics were more or less defined by what was happening in P4 PhD, not their first choice but they did it • Relying on data collection from others was challenging, already improvement after phase 1 thanks to the coordinator who stimulated P4 PhD to share their data. However, P6 PhD's would have liked to be more involved in choices of data collection tools and samples (to improve quality of data). • Change to the PhD scheme of UHasselt: is less favourable according to respondents (less time in Belgium as compared to the other scheme) • Followed courses at the doctoral school in UHasselt which contributed to capacity • Investing in PhD means dropping the evening courses (which provide a bonus on top of the salary), this decision is difficult for the students • Since 2013: having a local supervisor, which is good (but not always easy to have feedback) • UEM salary continued when in Belgium • Proof of flexible management by (Flemish) PL, trying to adapt to circumstances and always looking for alternative ways to get activities executed. <p>Other issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FR 2017: in general, small overspending of nearly 2.000 euro, due to scholarship overspending of 4.500 euro and underspending on operational costs.
<p>2.4.3.3. Project management is conducive for efficient and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centralisation of the programme and the budget at the level of the coordination office is causing too many layers: in Phase 1, the budget was managed by each programme, in Phase 2, request for funds happens on an individual basis (for e.g. request from PhD

<p>effective project implementation</p> <p>Score: weak to good</p>	<p>goes through the PL to the dean and then finance officer, PL does not keep record). This is causing delays and hampers the view of the PL on the available budget.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Struggling with the tools for project management (especially when formats change)
<p>3.4. Environment for efficient and effective project implementation was created</p> <p>Score: not able to judge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific elements provided or observed during the evaluation mission
<p>3.5. Quality of the partnership N-S</p> <p>Score: excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very appreciative of personal contacts (both sides) • Continuation of collaboration with UHasselt in the future • Appreciation of their choice for UHasselt: combination of academic and practical expertise. As such, the first experience with this donor is a good one for UEM • Having experienced what a research group could look like: exposure, support in reflection, many ideas, expertise was right for UEM • Some disappointment at the level of the Flemish academics related to the weak pro-active communication from the UEM side • Not always sure to sufficiently understand what is exactly going on at UEM (which makes it difficult to interact in an effective and appropriate way). • Local supervisor was acknowledged as local supervisor and also mentioned on the thesis • Significant role of Flemish PL in flexible management of the project
<p>Overall judgement of efficiency of the project</p> <p>Looking at the expected intermediate results as formulated in the logical framework, this project performed weak to good: there is delay in the realisation of two important intermediate results, the actual establishment of the centre for Statistics and the finalisation and implementation of a MSc course. The latter is delayed because of specific UEM rules requiring the involvement of a PhD in developing the course (who became available recently). However, when considering the starting point of this unit (having no PhD's or MSc), the evaluators find that there is good progress in realising necessary steps to build capacity and that the project achieved what was possible within the UEM context.</p> <p>It should be noted that this project was dependent on other faculties and units to realise some of its results: P4 had to provide data and the UEM Scientific Directorate had to ensure that other projects and UEM faculties would take advantage of courses (in statistics) offered.</p> <p>Stakeholders involved in P6 are critical about the procedures within UEM to manage the Desafio budget: too bureaucratic and hampering an efficient budget management by the project itself.</p> <p>Partnership has been very much appreciated on both sides. More pro-active communication from the side of UEM would have been welcomed though. The flexibility in project management helped to overcome the weaknesses of the logical framework.</p>	

EQ 4. To what extent the project results will continue after the IUC programme is completed?	
Judgment criteria	Comments
4.1. Level of academic and institutional sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty: unstable internet • Human capacity and networks with colleagues in EU countries, expressed readiness for being at the service of others

Score: good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The unit is showing itself within the department and within UEM: organised two scientific conferences in the dept of mathematics and informatics, planning of 2 trainings/year in data analysis Relations with South Africa will be maintained Retention: criteria for promotion are changing at UEM, previously, a PhD was enough to move up, now you need also a set of publications and an academic track record – this increased the importance of research. PhD are hoping for better career prospects Faculty owns the project and the results, but the group of (young) PhD is a bit an island that is far away from other staff members that do not have a MSc or PhD (gap), which is a risk that needs to be monitored as it is possible that the group of young people will not get sufficient space to further develop the unit.
4.2. Level of financial sustainability Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Still fully dependent upon external sources: UHasselt will continue the cooperation on this topic and offers additional means from its own budget for 3 PhD's that are still ongoing (for max 2 years). Centre: not yet a strategy for remuneration of services done for other faculties, but opportunities for consultancy are possible (agreement on what % needs to go to UEM to be agreed) No budget for the courses on data analysis (stopped in 2017 with the end of the Desafio programme) – courses were offered for free
Overall judgement of sustainability of the project	

EQ 5. Impact and longer-term effects	
Judgment criteria	Comments
5.1. Indications of impact at academic level Score: weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amongst the PhD's interviewed, there is an increased understanding of the importance and the nature of data-analysis P6 has also contributed to the work of some PhD's (mainly in P4). The evaluators understand that for most PhD's, the supervision by (Flemish) promotor has strengthened skills for data analysis.
5.2. Indications of impact on development processes Score: NA	No expectations mentioned in the logical framework No indications of impact yet
Overall judgement of the impact of the project The impact of P6 on the other projects of Desafio and the wider university environment is currently poor to weak which is due to the fact that several intermediate results expected have not yet been realised. This has been influenced by the following factors that have already been highlighted: the starting point of capacity at the unit was almost not existing, there was the absence of the research environment and culture at UEM, the limited time that was spent on the project and the time needed to set up collaboration and interaction with other faculties (which was not	

sufficiently supported by the Scientific Directorate. The weak impact was therefore to be expected within the given timeframe despite the personal efforts of those involved.

3. Conclusions and recommendations

Desafio has been an important project for UEM. Despite the fact that it was a smaller donor (5% of donor funds) it appears from the UEM annual report (mentioned in the context part of this evaluation) that the importance of the scientific events and its contribution to student mobility were significant.

Relevance is confirmed but stakeholders should be supported to improve result-oriented formulation and monitoring of projects

The relevance of Desafio and its choice for stimulating multi-disciplinary research on the topic of sexual and reproductive health and rights, to support the creation of centres, to develop MSc that approach the concept of rights from an academic perspective was confirmed. It answered the challenges mentioned in the Mozambican government documents and the ones identified in the UEM strategy related to its ambition to become a research lead university and to the need for practitioners (for e.g. in the field of law) to be exposed to new perspectives and knowledge which is not offered elsewhere in the country.

One important issue that seemed to be missing in the programme design was the attention to experiment and facilitate the multi-disciplinary work. Academic staff members were expected to get themselves organised in a different way and to develop a new 'way of doing' in collaborating around a shared research agenda. This challenge was not sufficiently addressed by the programme

Synergy with other donor funded programmes was not organised or managed. Both the Office of International Cooperation and the Scientific Directorate did not have a deliberate strategy to coordinate donor programmes in such a way that their execution strengthens synergy and serve better the ambitions and objectives of UEM. Evaluators found that even between partners that know each other, such as the Faculty of Medicine and the Centre for Reproductive Health in Maputo did not collaborate on joint (research) projects.

Overall, the evaluators have found the formulation of objectives in the logical frameworks of the programme over ambitious and the view and understanding of how change happens rather simplistic. Besides the attention for scientific publications and the number of finalised PhD and MSc scholarships as indicators of increased academic capacity, the indicators did not give sufficient insight in changes at UEM level (in behaviour, using new knowledge, interaction between UEM faculties,), the number and type of people reached by Desafio activities and the effects thereof outside of UEM (for e.g. on policy makers, community groups, NGO's, ...). The logical frameworks as such did not support the PL's to be result oriented and to monitor and document changes in a systematic way.

Finally, the evaluators find that the link between expected outcomes at institutional and personal level, the differentiation between the two and the relations between them were not clearly described in the programme document (Phase II). Assumptions about the effect of personal changes at institutional level were not explicit. For e.g. a number of contextual dynamics clearly prevented UEM lecturers from giving the expected contribution to their institutions (having multiple jobs), which means that from the start it was clear that changes at institutional level through changes at personal level would be limited.

Recommendation for VLIR-UOS: support academics in formulating change-oriented road maps (either as logical frameworks, or using other approaches) and in doing so, clarify the expectations at institutional level and the link with changes at personal level.
--

Effectiveness was good in thematic projects, potential to influence processes outside of UEM is demonstrated to a limited extent

The evaluators found that the Desafio programme has contributed to the increased academic capacity for research and teaching, however highlight that it is necessary that all planned PhD's will actually finalise their thesis before the end of 2019. The multi-disciplinary collaboration between academic staff from various faculties is said to be unique for UEM and academic staff now has gained a first valuable experience to further develop. Attention to the development of joint and home-grown research agenda's, both within the faculties and between them is emerging and first steps have been taken, most notably in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Medicine (centre for reproductive health). It is important to pursue this effort to ensure that more research beyond the 'technical assistance' type of research is being developed.

Important indicators of the increased academic capacity are the changes in personal academic competences, the research and the new educational offer of good quality (at the Faculty of Law and Medicine and to be expected at the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Faculty of Sciences, statistic department) and the initiative for regional and scientific conferences which have strengthened the visibility of UEM with regards to Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights. At a personal level, skills for research design, scientific writing, data collection and analysis have improved through the modality of the sandwich PhD. Academic staff that was enrolled in postgraduate programmes feels empowered, has more appetite for research, feels more legitimate and credible to teach and to engage with other academics in national, regional and international networks. Their increased competence has been acknowledged and most of the PhD are seeing their career advance. As a result, UEM academic staff is able to a large extent to take over classes in the MSc courses, to review the courses and to improve them and to use the experience to develop new initiatives (for e.g. plans for the MSc on gender in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences).

It should be noted finally that Desafio in general has contributed to a better understanding of what research is at the level of academic staff which is quite essential to realise the UEM ambition to be a research led university

Factors that played a role in realising these effects are the following: personal commitment and investment (both at the side of Belgian and Mozambican stakeholders), constant invitation and stimulation to publish, support by the doctoral schools in Belgium. The organisation of (regional) events at UEM has contributed to strengthened (individual) academic networks.

Effectiveness was less strong in the transversal projects that needed to create a favourable environment for multi-disciplinary work research and innovative teaching at UEM and that were at the service of the thematic projects in Desafio. Respondents in the thematic projects did not recognise the contribution of Project 5, led by the Scientific Directorate and most of the Desafio respondents did not use the opportunities for training (besides some classes Academic English). Desafio offered the opportunity to test various models and solutions for research management and management of post graduate programmes, but unfortunately P5 never reached the actual test phase. As such, ideas, plans, policies and tools have not yet been translated into UEM owned mechanisms that ensure an effective management of postgraduate studies and that are able to operationalise the research policy. P6 has definitely led to a strong basis of statistical knowledge and expertise in a unit that had almost no capacity, however this capacity and its importance in the strategy towards a research-based university was not yet sufficiently acknowledged with the UEM faculties nor by the rectorate.

The main factor explaining the difficulties for P5 and 6 to be more effective is an institutional and governance factor and the fact that crucial questions are not yet answered: how should faculties be working together, what should be the relation between the faculties and the Scientific Directorate and who should manage all of this? Currently, the SD is working in isolation having limited relations with academic units at UEM; leadership of SD is not constructive; faculties, some of which have a long history of being semi-autonomous have not been responsive in formulating demands for support to be provided by P5 and P6.

It should be noted that the development of the Language Centre (part of P5) portrays a different picture and is an example of a UEM structure that was able to put itself on the map with a sustainable package of services for UEM academics and target groups from outside the university.

The thematic projects have developed new knowledge that is useful for society. This should not be underestimated. For e.g. P1 and P2 in particular, have developed research that is amongst the first available and accessible research on the topics of Human and Social rights, with attention for the Mozambican context and in Portuguese language. The thematic projects have also raised awareness on a number of topics, such as sexual and reproductive health, gender, ... for practitioners outside of UEM and academic staff involved have shared their knowledge through extension services (mainly of the technical assistance - type). Overall, reach and effective influence cannot be fully appreciated due to the lack of data. The appreciation by the Human Rights Commission of the Bar's association however is clear about the potential of UEM to influence the societal debate.

Recommendation: support the emergence of a research *culture*: 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 practice scientific writing. Supporting this culture starts with leadership and the dean of the faculty.

Recommendation: 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 in managing research and post-graduate programmes and to valorise these before presenting a top-down solution.

Efficiency in project management is the weakest link in the programme, but there are success stories from which can be learned

The level of realisation of intermediate results is weak when looking at what was planned and many relevant and important activities with the potential to strengthen effectiveness have been cancelled in phase II of the Desafio programme, for various reasons, such as: gap between ambitions and availability of academic staff, governance and institutional issues (see in the above), weak planning and coordination). The difficulties in realising the targets related to PhD and MSc scholarships were manifold and are partly related to the Mozambican context but also to the weak capacity of UEM (in general and through its Scientific Directorate) to provide a coherent and effective framework for post-graduate studies.

However, many efforts are done to ensure a certain number of PhD graduates (at high personal costs and at the detriment of other planned activities) and if all goes well, 70% of all planned PhD's and more than 50% of MSc's will be realised before the end of 2019. The evaluators also found that each project is able to present a success story, from which other faculties and projects can learn, for example:

- How to develop a marketable package of services (language centre, P5);
- How to mobilise and stimulate writing articles (Faculty of Law, P1);
- How to organise regional events and use them to strengthen regional networks and visibility? (P2);
- How to develop a joint research agenda and ensure collaboration across departments (P3, Faculty of Arts and Sciences). P3 also has demonstrated best performance in project management.

Overall, the relation between means and results is high, when considering the Desafio budget and the effect on UEM (in comparison to bigger funding programmes), but weak when considering the realisation of (planned) intermediate results, more particular in P4 (highest budget and most difficulties to realise activities and numbers of PhD's) and in P5 (a lot of activities, but no actual implementation of proposed solutions). Some choices in implementation strategy did further weaken the results-means ratio (not taking opportunities for synergy, P5 not offering a coherent package of capacity building services/trainings, offering courses for free in P3 and P6, lack of focus in P6 on providing MSc courses for a larger group of staff). The overspending in 2017 was not forecasted. It was caused by weak (financial) planning, an attempt to finance on the 2107 budget as much activities related to the finalisation of PhD's that are planned for 2018 (P3 and P4) and the fact that UEM did not use the opportunity offered by VLIR-UOS to save money from the budget line for local coordination costs (which is 5% of the overall budget and can help in managing unforeseen circumstances). UEM confirmed during the evaluation visit that it will take its responsibility and cover the overspending from its proper funds.

The choice for a sandwich modality was a relevant choice but the execution was hindered by various factors, some of which related to the PhD candidates (their readiness for research and their limited available time due to employment outside of UEM) and the weak UEM framework for post-graduate studies.

UEM confirmed that it learned a lot in relation to the management of international cooperation projects and it has integrated some lessons learned in other funding programmes, such as the importance to negotiate and to be clear on the modalities for the execution of sandwich PhD's and the need to have a clear management manual. Some challenges for efficient project management however persist.

Therefore, the question from the ToR, **'Did the Programme Support Unit perform better in Phase II of the Desafio programme, when it was absorbed within the office of international cooperation?'** has to be answered negatively. The evaluators believe that the root causes of the lack of performance were not addressed and that the decision (to transfer management to higher levels) even worsened some issues. The evaluators give two examples: (i) much more bureaucracy entered the programme which in some cases has led to cancellation of orders (for e.g. the language lab for the language centre), (ii) the PL's did not longer have oversight of budget and budget spending at project level. While some of them might have appreciated that this responsibility was no longer theirs, it took away from them one of the key instruments to manage a project. PL's were only vaguely informed about budget absorption in % ('you have used 25%' but without specifying the available budget) and this information did not reach them on a regular basis. All stakeholders within a project were now responsible for their individual requests for budget to plan and execute their activities. Although the evaluators believe that an International Cooperation Office is an essential attribute for a university dealing with various partners, the management solution was not the most appropriate for the execution of the Desafio programme.

The UEM evaluation of its strategy in 2014 highlighted several weaker aspects in project management and compared to those aspects, improvement has been limited. It is in the evaluation of the Swedish

programme, that the evaluators have found a quote that summarises quite well one of the major stumble blocks for efficient project management and also explains why the programme coordinator and programme manager at UEM only had limited power to improve the quality of project management: *‘The combination of top heavy management and a decentralised academic structure with staff describing the Faculty as their ‘institutional home’ has an impact on the institutional coherence and effectiveness of management’*, also for the management of international cooperation programmes.³³ In all fairness, the evaluators have to state that PL’s from their side clearly invested too little time in project management.

Overall, all respondents have expressed appreciation of the communication between the partners, this was also confirmed by the self-assessments. Some issues had a negative effect on partner relations, such as: (i) the lack of clarity on the role division between the Flemish partner and VLIR-UOS, (ii) Flemish coordinator and PL’s in Belgium in general would have welcomed more pro-activeness in the management, (iii) execution and weak follow-up of Desafio by the UEM PL’s and PSU, (iv) questions at UEM side about the recognition of the contribution of Mozambican supervisors.

Recommendation: create spaces for learning where all governance levels can meet (to reduce the distance between management and execution) 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.

Recommendation: be more explicit from the start about the meaning of the concept partnership: what do each of the partners find important, how do they wish to be recognised.

Recommendation: develop further the approaches, rules and guidelines for scientific supervision, increase the involvement of UEM academic staff in the execution of sandwich PhD’s.

Recommendation: ensure the development, provision and monitoring of a more coherent package of support in capacity building to academic staff enrolled in postgraduate programmes

Sustainability is ensured in faculties where leadership demonstrates more ownership but weak access to external funds puts pressure on sustainability

Academic and institutional sustainability is supported by the individual academic staff but is stronger in P3, P4 and P6 because of stronger leadership and ownership. Clearly, reflection about the integration of research centres is most advanced in these Faculties concerned (more in particular with Arts and Social Sciences and Medicine).

The evaluators found that the multi-disciplinary focus was gradually owned by the Desafio stakeholders. It was understood that this focus helped to create a critical mass of research that allows UEM and Mozambican stakeholders to address current problems in society from different and new perspectives; combining different angles was believed to increase opportunities to develop more effective or alternative solutions to current problems. As such, Desafio provided an interesting and well demarcated experimental environment to learn about the conditions and the operationalisation of the strategic ambition to be a research led university

‘Did the increased involvement of the various faculties in phase II contribute to the ownership of the projects by these faculties?’ (question from the ToR) A management team was created at the

³³ Kruse: 2017, page 53. The evaluation adds to this that UEM is a politicised university and that interlocutors state that the political impact has increased with the last two presidents.

start of Phase II and is comprised of representatives of the rectorate, SD and the deans of the Faculties. The assumption was that this team would make the deans more responsible for the project(s) in their faculty and that this would support efficient execution. Clearly, this decision has led to a general understanding amongst the faculties involved in the Desafio programme that this programme was not only a programme for the Faculty of Medicine but that benefits were pursued for the other faculties as well. It has brought on board some of the deans (see the above-mentioned projects 3, 4, 6). Ownership was however more the result of a personal commitment of the dean than the merit of the management team. This can be explained by various factors: (i) the management team was very high level and far from the actual implementation of the projects; (ii) because it was high level, it was very difficult to gather the people in one meeting; as such the number of meetings was very limited. Moreover, meetings were no longer organised after 2017 which was formally considered to be the end of the programme, even though still many activities, not the least the realisation of the PhD's still had to be finalised during the phase out. As such, the management team did not play a major role in the definition and execution of the phasing out, which is an important phase to ensure sustainability.

Financial sustainability of various results is under pressure. Overall, stakeholders at UEM demonstrated little investment so far in identifying and attracting additional donor money (with the exception of some attempts in P3 and P2 that has been able to secure two years of additional funding for the MSc through its partnership with UHasselt), they are little pro-active, have little knowledge about the channels and are not developing a deliberate strategy nor are they actively marketing research results. Support from the Office of International Cooperation or the SD is weak. This is worrisome in a context where access to research funds is decreasing.

Recommendation: 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.

Impact can be noticed both at academic and development level

There is impact at academic level. The evaluators argue that Desafio has led to a Desafio network of academics that are able to collaborate further in the future (with ideas not yet made concrete though), within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and Medicine. Desafio has influenced other initiatives within UEM and discussions about the weak performance have stimulated efforts to bring more clarity in the UEM framework for post-graduate studies (although far from being finalised).

In relation to impact on development processes, it should be noticed that various individual lecturers, that are active in the Desafio projects have access to decision makers through double employment and consultancies and as such can influence on them. However, to increase impact based on the research results, more deliberate efforts should be undertaken. This requires that UEM and the Faculties really own the research results and that research results are unpacked and translated to a non-academic target public. A first attempt with policy briefs could be noticed in P4 but this practice is not yet wide spread. An interview with the Dutch Embassy reveals that UEM and its faculties are not yet using all

available channels (when, where, how?) to link their research to public debates. The Dutch Embassy for e.g. states that UEM is largely invisible at the main forums/spaces where issues such as gender and social protection are discussed. The evaluation of the Swedish programme also reveals that external parties do not yet consider UEM to be an important or critical voice in Mozambican society or public debate (Kruse: 2017, 75). The latter also points at the fact that, for now, there are no real venues for academic opinion-making in Mozambique.

Recommendation: reflect upon and create various venues and channels to influence on policies besides technical assistance and scientific conferences. Right from the start of the research, UEM and academic staff should engage with decision makers and with other institutions and organisations (instead of waiting for research results to be ready) to shape the research design. Of course, a scientific park (as planned by UEM and studied under P5) is important to increase opportunities to apply research to societal problems, but more 'soft' mechanisms of exchanging and engaging with society and decision makers are equally important.

4. ANNEXES

Annex 1:	Terms of Reference
Annex 2:	Evaluation framework
Annex 3:	Mission programme and people consulted
Annex 4 :	List of documents consulted

4.1. ToR (see separate document)

4.2. Evaluation framework from the inception report

The evaluation framework is composed of five evaluation questions related to the five OECD evaluation criteria. An evaluation framework clarifies how the evaluators will look at the programme and how they will structure their data collection and analysis.

The evaluation questions are elaborated based on the evaluation questions formulated in the ToR and the assessment criteria used in the self-assessment reports. The evaluation questions consist of different judgment criteria and guiding questions or indicators. These indicators and guiding questions indicate what information will be looked for and as such will guide the data-collection and development of interview guidelines. For each of the judgment criteria an appreciation scale is developed as requested in the ToR. A four-point qualitative scale is used. This scale does not have the intention to cover all indicators/guiding questions (as some of them are more important in the final judgment than others) but is above all helpful in formulating a balanced judgment in a transparent manner.

The table below presents an overview of the main evaluation questions and their judgment criteria at project and at programme level. From the logical frameworks, ACE Europe understands that there is no difference between the logical frameworks of the projects and the logical framework at programme level. The logical framework at the programme level is the sum of the projects. ACE Europe will therefore treat the evaluation at the programme level as a synthesis of the analysis at project level and will add a number of specific questions at programme level where appropriate.

In the following, the evaluation questions are elaborated in detail. First, the evaluation questions at project level will be presented, followed by the evaluation questions at programme level. For each of the evaluation questions an overview of sources for verification is provided. This list will be complemented by additional sources during the field mission, where appropriate.

1.1. Five evaluation questions at project level

EQ 1 – To what extent is the project relevant?

Rationale

To ensure that the programme contributes to increased relevance of research and teaching, it is important that objectives and interventions are aligned with the most pressing/important needs in the country, the government policies, interventions of other actors, the strategy of the university itself. Internal coherence within the programme ensures that interventions are clearly aimed at contributing to the overall objective of the programme.

In general, the evaluators do not question relevance a priori, unless counter indications emerge from the interviews and the field mission.

The evaluators will pay particular attention to endogenous approaches and strategies developed by UEM to strengthen the capacity of their university: have these been noticed, to what extent did the IUC programme run in synergy or in parallel (or was it even counterproductive)? The evaluators have learned from interviews with the Flemish project leaders that the typical 'development' approach and jargon of logical frameworks did not very much appeal to them. Rather than to criticise lack of 'development expertise', the evaluators will assess to what extent project leaders have been result oriented in executing their projects.

The flexibility to adapt to context is an important issue and is partly related to the flexibility to adapt in general to new demands, for e.g. in programme management (which will be addressed under efficiency).

Judgment criteria

Guiding questions/indicators

1.4. The objectives of the project are consistent with the needs of UEM, the country/local needs, the VLIR-UOS strategy and donor's policies

- The project is addressing clear demands and specific needs/problems expressed in the strategic plans of the UEM
- The educational improvements and the development of Master programs are relevant within the context
- The project is coherent to the government, regional and local objectives and policies related to research and higher education
- The project is aligned with the objectives identified in the VLIR-UOS strategy (this is less relevant as the strategy was only developed in 2015 and after the design of phase 2)
- The project topics and approaches are relevant for other (potential) donors/actors who are seeking to invest in the domains of rights and health.
- There is a link with the transversal themes of Belgian development collaboration (gender, environment and Digital for development (D4D)): this is less relevant as the themes were introduced after the design of the 2nd phase.

Judgement scales

Excellent

The project is an appropriate answer to key needs and issues identified by the university. The project delivers adequate responses to local development needs in

	general and as identified in government policies. The project answers to needs of other actors/donors
Sufficient/Good	The project is an appropriate answer to some of the key needs and issues identified by the university and delivers to a certain extent responses to the local development needs. The project answers to a certain extent to needs of other actors/donors.
Insufficient/low	The project responds to some of the key needs and issues identified by the university but the content/strategy is not fully what was expected by the university. The project weakly answers to the needs of other actors/donors.
(very) Poor	The project does not provide an appropriate answer to the key needs and issues identified by the university and does not deliver adequate responses to local development needs. The project does not answer the needs of other actors/donors.
1.5. There have been efforts made to ensure complementarity and synergy with other projects/other (Belgian) actors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The project has developed actual and effective synergy with projects supported by other donors at UEM (active in the same domains) – The project has developed cooperation with organisations, private sector actors, research institutions, etc. sharing similar objectives. – The project has analysed ways in which the VLIR-UOS interventions match and/or complement endogenous capacity development interventions developed by UEM.
Excellent	NO Scoring
Sufficient/Good	
Insufficient/low	
(very) Poor	
1.6. The intervention logic of the project is coherent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Level of result orientedness in project execution – Coherence between expected results and specific objectives – Choice of activities is relevant for obtaining the results and objectives – Sufficient insight in the assumptions behind the intervention logic – Intervention can be flexibly adapted to changes in the context when needed in order to remain relevant
Excellent	Project leaders were fully result oriented. The choice of all activities is appropriate to realise the expected results and to contribute to the specific objective. The project builds on realistic assumptions, that have been monitored, is sensitive to changes in the context and adapts where necessary.
Sufficient/Good	Project leader paid attention to result orientation but not at all times. The majority of activities is appropriate to realise the expected results and to contribute to the specific objective. The project is based implicitly on a number of assumptions that have been monitored and is sensitive to changes in the context and adapts where necessary.
Insufficient/low	Project leaders were only weakly result oriented. The majority of activities is appropriate to realise the expected results; but the expected results are not appropriate to contribute to the specific objective. Assumptions behind the intervention logic appeared not always realistic. The project is monitoring changes in the context but does not respond adequately to these changes.
(very) Poor	The choice of activities is not appropriate to realise the expected results and to contribute to the specific objective. The projects has not taken into account assumptions and is not sensitive to changes in the context.
Sources of verification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Self-assessment reports - Programme and project documents, design and annual plans - Policy documents of national government, university, VLIR-UOS - Interviews with programme managers and project leaders - Interviews with university management 	

- Interviews with external stakeholders (other donors and organisations implementing development interventions)

EQ 2. To what extent the project's specific objectives have been achieved (effectiveness)?

Rationale

Following the approach in the self-assessment reports and the ToR a distinction has been made between the specific objective at academic level and the development objective.

As this is a final evaluation of a programme the assessment of effectiveness will receive considerable attention by the evaluators. The methods for data collection will allow for non-intended or unexpected results/changes (positive and negative) to be identified as well. The evaluators will try to understand importance of changes (based on the perceptions of the stakeholders) and what exactly has contributed to those changes (within the programme but also outside of the programme). Explanatory factors for the realisation and non-realisation of planned results will be identified.

It is possible that the formulation of the specific objectives was not sufficiently clear, specific or attainable. In that case, the evaluators will look at the change that has emerged at institutional, scientific and developmental level as a result of the programme interventions and outputs (see under efficiency). More in particular, because of delays in execution, it is probable that changes will be smaller steps towards the realisation of the objective.

Judgment criteria	Guiding questions/indicators
2.1. The specific institutional and/or academic objectives have been realised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The project has realised the academic/institutional objective as defined in phase 2 and in the logical framework (different for each project, for transversal projects, the focus is also on institutional objectives) – The indicators as developed for the specific objective at project level can be validated or there is other evidence – The phase-out plan contributed to the timely realisation of the planned results. – Non-intended changes have been realised (not anticipated in the project design) – Stakeholders from government (ministry of education) acknowledge changes
<i>Judgement scales</i>	
Excellent	The specific academic/institutional objective has been fully achieved.
Sufficient/Good	The specific academic/institutional objective has been partially achieved.
Insufficient/low	The specific academic/institutional objectives has been achieved to a limited extent.
(very) Poor	The specific academic/institutional objective has not been realised.
2.2 The specific development objective has been realised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The project has realised the developmental objective as defined in phase 2 and in the logical framework (different for each project) – The indicators as developed for the specific objective at project level can be validated or there is other evidence – Non-intended changes have been realised (not anticipated in the project design) – Stakeholders (communities, civil society actors, development actors) acknowledge changes.
Excellent	The specific objective has been fully achieved.

Sufficient/Good	The specific objective has been largely achieved.
Insufficient/low	The specific objective has been partially achieved.
(very) Poor	The specific objective has not been realised.
2.3 Research and education offered is of good (academic) quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The research conducted responds to the quality criteria set by the academic world (appropriate support from promoters, valid research methods, publications in international peer reviewed journals, ...). – New educational facilities and practices are introduced and improve the quality of teaching – The MSc-programmes are accredited – Research findings have been presented at regional/international conferences – Students/scholars confirm improved teaching capacity and support for research within their faculty – Appreciation from government/other actors active in education and research
Excellent	The number of articles in international peer reviewed journals has substantially increased, research was presented at various international conferences. Quality of education in the faculties involved has improved considerably and was noticed by students.
Sufficient/Good	The number of articles in international peer reviewed journals has increased to a certain extent and research was presented at various national conference(s) and/or at least one international conference. Quality of education has improved at the level of individual lecturers (involved in the programme) and was noticed by students.
Insufficient/low	The number of articles in international peer reviewed journals has increased to a limited extent only and research was presented in not more than one conference (national or international). Quality of education has only improved to a limited extent (some try-outs), depends on very few lecturers only and was not yet appreciated by students as an improvement.
(very) Poor	The number of articles in international peer reviewed journals did not increase or no articles were published in international peer reviewed journals. Quality of education has not improved.
Sources of verification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overview of articles, conference abstracts, chapters in books, conference contributions, etc. - Self-assessments reports and KRA indicators - Interviews with lecturers and researchers involved - Interviews with Ministry of education - Interviews with stakeholders outside of the universities (attention to balance participation of men and women) - Yearbooks of UEM 	

EQ 3. What is the level of efficiency in the projects ?

Rationale

The VLIR-UOS includes the realisation of the intermediate results under efficiency (and not under effectiveness), in the self-assessment reports the IUC coordinators and team leaders followed the same logic.

The ToR refer to efficiency as “*a measure of how economically resources/input (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.*” Efficiency thus refers to the manner in which inputs are processed for the delivery of the expected outputs in a timely and cost-efficient manner. Efficiency therefore relates to the processes and to the activities executed for the production of the planned results in the pursuit of higher level objectives.

The ToR do not request a quantifiable cost-effectiveness assessment but rather a qualitative appreciation of the relation between inputs and outputs. This also includes an analysis of the factors that have strengthened or hampered efficient implementation of the projects.

The level of efficiency is also influenced by the definition and application of clear and effective roles, tasks, mandates, systems, procedures and tools for the programme management. This is captured in the third judgment criterion.

Judgment criteria	Guiding questions/indicators
3.1. Intermediate results (outputs per project) have been delivered as planned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Level of realisation of intermediate results according to indicators formulated in the logical framework for each project – Appreciation of the process to create new Master Programs or to create an enabling environment for research and education – Level of attainment of the KRA – Factors influencing on the level of achievements (both positive and negative) – Unexpected positive or negative effects of the project
<i>Judgement scales</i>	
Excellent	The intermediate results have been fully achieved
Sufficient/Good	The intermediate results have been partially achieved, with a majority of the indicators being realised.
Insufficient/low	The intermediate results have been partially achieved with a minority of the indicators being realised.
(very) Poor	The intermediate results have not been realised.
3.6. Relationship between means and output (qualitative assessment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Share of missions from the partner in the North, PHD's, trainings, investment costs and operational costs is reasonable in relation to the realisation of the intermediate results – Relevance and cost of the expertise that was mobilised from Flemish partners and other universities (appreciation by UEM) – Efficiency of the organisation of PhD's: support to PhD, organisation of stay in Belgium, management of absence of PhD's – Rate of over- and/or underspending – Choice of activities: cost-effectiveness is being pursued in design of interventions and management – Adaptive measures are implemented if the means and results in the project are not in balance – The approach/ strategy of the project was the most efficient way to realise the intermediate results
Excellent	Resource allocation (Finances and HRM) is clear in project design and well monitored. All costs made and choice of activities is justifiable taking into account the output delivered. There are systems/procedures in place to support cost-considerations.
Sufficient/Good	Resource allocation is clear in project design and well monitored. Costs and choice of activities is justifiable taking into account the output delivered, with some points of attention. Evidence of cost-considerations.
Insufficient/low	Resource allocation is only partially clear in project design, hampering good monitoring of the resources. Costs made and choice of activities are often not sufficiently justified taking into account the output delivered. Systems/procedures in place to enable cost-considerations are most often not respected.

(very) Poor	Resource allocation is not clear in project design, hampering good monitoring of the resources. Most of the costs or activities chosen cannot be justified taking into account the output delivered. No evidence of cost-considerations.
3.3. Project management is conducive for efficient and effective project implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Guidelines for project management as described in the management manual have been respected and have contributed to efficient and effective project implementation – Clear and effective working relations and communication between the project leaders N and S – Good working relation between the project leaders and the programme support unit / programme manager (clear guidelines, clear mandates and decision taking power, transparency, timeliness, etc.) – The necessary capacities and knowledge is available in the project team to support envisaged change process – Appropriate planning, monitoring and reporting systems are in place at project level – Information about execution and results is collected in a systematic way and is used to inform and review strategies – Factors hampering efficient management have been identified and addressed at project level or with the support of the local steering committee and the programme manager (conflict management) – Phase out assisted in realising the results
Excellent	Project management roles, tools, procedures and systems were clear to and respected by all stakeholders involved, supported the realisation of the project and the envisaged change and the monitoring and management of the project. When needed appropriate measures were taken to improve project management.
Sufficient	Project management roles, tools, procedures and systems were clear to and respected by the majority of the stakeholders involved, supported the realisation of the project and the envisaged change and the monitoring and management of the project. When needed appropriate measures were taken to improve project management. When needed appropriate measures were taken to improve project management, with some points of attention.
Insufficient/low	Management roles, tools, procedures and systems were not very clear and/or often not respected by and hampered smooth project management. Measures taken to improve project management were not fully appropriate.
(very) Poor	Management roles, tools, procedures and systems were not clear at all and/or not respected by any of the stakeholders. No initiative was taken to solve difficulties in project management.
3.4. UEM/the faculty created an environment for efficient and effective project implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sufficient amount of time and attention was devoted within the project team to determine the joint ambition, the shared interest in the project and the risks. – There was a clear link between the project and the heads of department and the deans of the faculties involved (reporting, decision making, assessment of progress). – Results of the project were discussed at faculty level. – The project team was encouraged to take initiative – Regular follow-up on results and timing is planned and executed and adaptive measures are taken if needed
Excellent	No scoring
Sufficient	
Insufficient/low	
(very) Poor	
3.5. Quality of the N-S partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Project leaders, and university management for the Flemish universities and from UEM consider the IUC project as an equal partnership, with joint ambitions, and shared interests

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Joint research is done to find innovative solutions and to learn from each other to solve complex global problems– The project creates win –win opportunities for both partners– Sufficient attention was paid to strengthen individual relations and trust.– Collaboration between UEM and the Flemish partner University is planned to continue after the IUC-program and the phasing-out.
Excellent	No scoring
Sufficient	
Insufficient/low	
(very) Poor	
<i>Sources of verification:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Self-assessment reports- Interviews with PSU, programme managers and project leaders in North and South, and ICOS- Interviews project teams- Annual financial plans and reports- Annual narrative plans and reports- Management manual- Sample of reports: quarterly reports, mission reports, minutes of the steering committee meetings,	

EQ 4. Sustainability: to what extent the project results will continue after the IUC project is completed?

Rationale:

As this is a final evaluation, the sustainability of the results will receive specific attention, more in particular, the embedding of results in the faculties concerned and in UEM. Therefore, the perspectives of the main stakeholders at the UEM on 'what now?' or 'what next', based on the lessons learned and the recommendations in the self-assessments will be discussed in detail. One of the important questions will be: what results need to be sustained to ensure that an improved level of development is maintained and can be used to build on further?

The specific evaluation question in the ToR: 'Did the increased involvement of the various faculties in phase 2 contribute to the ownership of the projects by these faculties?', will be answered here

A distinction is made between institutional and financial sustainability. Focus here is at sustainability at project level. Evidently factors facilitating or hampering sustainability at programme level will have an influence on the sustainability at project level.

Specific attention will be paid to the role of the dean and the faculty and to the positions held by MSc graduates, PhDs, and people involved in the project inside their faculty and university. The hypothesis is that the position they hold might influence on the sustainability of results and embedment of project results.

Interviews and focus group discussions will entail questions about the career plans and where respondents see themselves professionally and academically in 5/10 years.

Further, it is clear that P5 plays an important role in promoting a research culture in the university, the contribution of this project to the overall sustainability will be taken into account (looking at functioning

of the doctoral school, the mechanisms for career development, the state of affairs of the ethical advice committee, the budget for research, ...). Further to that, the functioning of the various centres will be assessed: does the centre serve the development of joint research, is there evidence of research teams, is there a research policy and agenda, what is the actual activity that is being developed under the umbrella of the centres?).

Judgment criteria	Guiding questions/indicators
4.1. Level of academic and institutional sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Commitment/ownership of various stakeholders for the results of each project (at team level, department level, faculty level, general management and board of UEM) – Level of embedding of the MSc.-programmes in the university – Level of commitment to preserve and further develop the results that contribute to a research friendly environment: library infrastructure, ICT improvements, – Existence of a follow-up plan to integrate results in future developments or to build upon them (for e.g. in developing the centres). – Capacity of research teams to develop joint research – Trained and competent staff is able to continue the MSc-Programs and to continue the work on ICT, HRM, research up-grading, etc. – Measures taken for finalising and retention of PhDs and staff – Conditions are ensured to support quality of education and programmes (content and approaches) in the MSc developed – Networking with other national, regional and international educational and research institutions is existing and is used to valorise results and to further develop
<i>Judgement scales</i>	
Excellent	Institutional sustainability is fully guaranteed.
Sufficient/Good	Sustainability is explicitly addressed and explicit measures are being taken to ensure sustainability.
Insufficient/low	Sustainability is not explicitly addressed, but some attention is given to pursue a number of activities
(very) Poor	Very few or no deliberate efforts are made to secure sustainability
4.2. Level of financial sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Availability of funds for operations and maintenance of physical infrastructure – Availability of funds to continue to organise the MSc-programs – Availability of funds to continue all or a number of activities that are important/relevant for maintaining and further developing project results – Strategy and initiatives to attract external funding (from other donors, government, private sector, ...) are developed and operational – Capacity of research teams to attract funding for their research proposals – Strategies to optimize the use of income (and accumulated financial surpluses) for example from the MSc-programs are developed and operational
Excellent	Financial sustainability is fully guaranteed, financial management plans are drawn up and include own funds
Sufficient/Good	Sustainability is explicitly addressed and explicit measures are being taken to secure external funding
Insufficient/low	Sustainability was addressed too late and financial means are not sufficient to guarantee the continuation of the MSc-programs or to sustain other important results.
(very) Poor	No deliberate efforts are made to secure sustainability
<i>Sources of verification:</i>	
- Strategy documents related to external relations, collaboration and fundraising	

- Agreements for funding
- Self-assessment reports
- Interviews with project teams and with external stakeholders
- Interviews with management of UEM, financial unit and HR unit, directorate of graduate studies and research
- Observation during the field mission if infrastructure is still in place and used and if the MSc-Programs are functional

EQ 5. What are the indications of impact (long-term effects) of the project?

Rationale

The ToR refer to impact as “*potential positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended*”.

Impact is looking beyond project borders, to effects on final beneficiaries and effects on the overall conditions for development.

Given the delays in project execution, the evaluators might not be able to assess impact but can identify some indications of impact.

Specific attention will be paid to the positions held by MSC graduates, PHDs, and people involved in the project outside of their faculty and university. The hypothesis is that these people will disseminate what they have learned in whatever position they are.

The extent to which government calls the university for expertise: an important contextual element when assessing this aspect is the fact that the government and other interested actors tend to hire individuals and rarely institutions. This is how most researchers contribute to local, regional and national development processes. Thus, when exploring this aspect it is essential to ask about individual consultancies and/or research projects people have been involved and if they see any relation with the capacity built through Desafio.

Judgment criteria	Guiding questions/indicators
5.1. Indications of impact at academic level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Spill-over of some approaches and effects to the faculty – Initiatives by other researchers (inside and outside of the university) to replicate or upscale new knowledge/activities/services that resulted from the IUC programme: Has it been reported any direct or indirect experience exchange and mutual learning with other programmes within the university? – UEM/ the Faculty is taking a leading role in national and/or international forums or networks in the specific research domains – MSC programmes or modules are copied or provided in the region
<i>Judgement scales</i>	
Excellent	The project effectively inspires other faculties in the university and in other educational institutions in Mozambique and in the region, to take initiative building further on what exists
Sufficient/Good	The project effectively inspires the faculty to take initiative building further on what exists/the UEM to scale up the results achieved

Insufficient/low	The project triggered interest of other departments/faculties/universities but no real action was taken yet.
(very) Poor	The project had no effect beyond the team involved
5.2. Indications of impact on local, regional or national development processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Extent to which research was translated into practical knowledge which is useful in the Mozambique context. – The project has influenced public policy on a thematic domain – Government has called the university/departments for policy advice on these topics. – There is evidence of up-scaling of new knowledge/applications/services of the project by external stakeholders such as government, NGOs, communities – The project contributed to improved awareness in Mozambique on the particular challenges related to the topics of health, HIV, reproductive health, rights issues, ... – The MSc-graduates and the PhD's of the project are spreading the knowledge on these topics in Mozambique and are using it in their current work and private situation. – Civil society organisations, for example active in the field of health have changed their programmes/are offering other types of services, following their interaction with researchers/their participation in particular trainings or workshops
Excellent	There is evidence of policy development at national, regional or local level based on project results and/or external stakeholders have improved their performance applying new knowledge, application or services provided by the project, in a sustainable manner.
Sufficient/Good	There is evidence of contribution of the project team members to policy development at national, regional or local level and/or external stakeholders have adapted some of their approaches based on the knowledge resulting from the project.
Insufficient/low	The project team is not called by the government for policy advice and/or external stakeholders have only made use of services, outreach activities, new knowledge to a limited extent and not in a sustainable way.
(very) Poor	The project did not contribute to local, regional or national development objectives yet
<p><i>Sources of verification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews with partners (educational institutes) in national and international networks - Self-assessment reports - Interviews with other educational institutes in national and international networks - Interviews with external stakeholders: Ministry of Health, ... - Interviews with project leaders - Interviews with management of UEM - Interviews with government officials involved in educational policies/reforms (telephone) 	

1.2. Five evaluation questions at programme level

The logical framework at the programme level is the sum of the individual projects. The evaluators will therefore treat the evaluation at the programme level as a synthesis of the analysis at project level and will add a number of specific questions at programme level where appropriate. The specific and additional evaluation questions and –criteria at programme level are listed in the table below.

EQ 1 – To what extent is the programme relevant?	
<p><u>Rationale:</u></p> <p>Focus here will be on the assessment of the added value of implementing a IUC programme (instead of focusing on a number of separate projects).</p> <p>The evaluators will try to assess in particular to what extent the topics of health and rights represent important domains in the development of UEM and to what extent they have provided opportunities to put UEM on the map in the country and in the region and to answer some important needs in the county.</p> <p>The design of the programme is interesting as it provides the opportunity to approach the topic of health and HIV/AIDS from various angles: rights, socio-cultural and medical. The question is, to what extent this integrated approach responded the reality on the ground and needs in the country/government policies.</p> <p>The evaluators understand that many other donor programmes are developed at UEM, more in particular SIDA (Swedish) have been active in the domain of health, it will be important to understand how these have contributed to changes at UEM + assessment of specific added value of the IUC and how programmes have been mutually reinforcing.). This is one of the specific questions in the ToR.</p>	
Judgment criteria	Guiding questions/indicators
1.1. There have been efforts to ensure complementarity and synergy with other projects/other (Belgian) actors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The programme management has looked for synergy with other VLIR-UOS interventions in the country or at regional level (taking into account that other VLIR-UOS interventions are limited) – The programme management has looked for synergy with projects supported by other donors (including NGO's others from Belgium active in the field of health) – The programme management has looked for synergy with endogenous capacity development interventions aiming at strengthening universities that exist in UEM/the region
Excellent	No scoring
Sufficient/Good	
Insufficient/low	
(very) Poor	
1.2.The intervention logic of the programme is coherent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Coherence between expected results and specific objective – Choice of activities is relevant for obtaining the results and objectives – Sufficient insight in the assumptions behind the intervention logic

	– Intervention can be flexibly adapted to changes in the context when needed in order to remain relevant
Excellent	The choice of activities is appropriate to realise the expected results and to contribute to the specific objective. The project builds on realistic assumptions and is sensitive to changes in the context.
Sufficient/Good	The majority of activities is appropriate to realise the expected results and to contribute to the specific objective. The project has some ideas of assumptions behind the intervention logic and is sensitive to changes in the context.
Insufficient/low	The majority of activities is appropriate to realise the expected results; but the expected results are not appropriate to contribute to the specific objective.
(very) Poor	The choice of activities is not appropriate to realise the expected results and to contribute to the specific objective. The projects has not taken into account assumptions and is not sensitive to changes in the context.
<i>Sources of verification:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategy and policy documents of UEM and VLIR-UOS - Self-assessment reports - Interviews with coordinators and programme manager - Interviews with external stakeholders 	

EQ 2. To what extent the programme objectives have been achieved (effectiveness)?

Rationale

In line with the self-assessment and the ToR, the academic objective and the development objective are evaluated under impact of the program. In effectiveness the evaluators will look at the results at the level of the various projects. It will be analysed to what extent projects 5 and 6 have added value to other projects. Results emerging from the synergy between projects will be taken into account as well.

The evaluators will pay particular attention to the level of change within the faculties involved compared to changes in the overall university, what has been the rhythm of development in the faculties involved and in other parts of the university?

No specific questions are added at programme level.

EQ 3. What is the level of efficiency in the programme ?

Rationale

At programme level it is relevant to focus on the **IUC management structure** and the extent to which this programme management structure was conducive for efficient and effective programme implementation. The focus will be on the clarity of roles, tools and function and the degree to which they are respected. On the other hand we will evaluate to what extent this structure facilitated an efficient implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the programme.

Another important factor to be evaluated is the way cooperation and collaboration between the different projects was supported and facilitated. The evaluators understand that this was stronger between the projects 3 and 4 (in the sector of health) and between these projects and project 6 to a lesser extent.

It should be noted that between phase 1 and phase 2 a number of changes were decided, such as the identification of PL (obliged to have a PhD degree), no mix between PhD candidates and PL, other criteria for identifying PhD candidates, financial management integrated in the Office for International Cooperation, decision to focus more on community development, appointment of responsible focal points at higher management levels ... It will be assessed to what extent this contributed to efficiency and effectiveness of the programme.

The specific evaluation question in the ToR: 'Did the Programme Support Unit actually perform better in phase 2, when it was absorbed within the office of international cooperation?', will be answered here.

Judgment criteria	Guiding questions/indicators
3.1. The IUC management structure is conducive for efficient and effective programme implementation and stimulates cooperation and coordination between all parties and projects concerned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The IUC management structure and the Programme management have stimulated synergy and collaboration between projects (for e.g. joint organisation of activities) – Different stakeholders involved in management structures have taken up their respective roles and mandates were clear, respected and effective (Project leaders & teams, programme coordinators (local and Flemish), PSU, ICOS, programme management in Flanders and UEM,) – Good working relation between the projects and the programme support unit (clear guidelines, transparency, timeliness, etc.) – Effective and efficient functioning of the Joint Steering Committee and the Flemish SC/Local SC – Team leaders, programme coordinators, etc. have been supported in their capacity to implement the program with success, when needed – Appropriate result based planning, monitoring and reporting system in place – M&E data are used to inform and review strategies – The set-up and use of the financial management system enables the follow-up of expenditures, including adequate and transparent financial management – Factors hampering efficient management and implementation of the programme have been managed well – IUC support and funding is sufficiently flexible – Good quality of communication within the partnership
Excellent	Management roles, tools, procedures and systems were clear to and respected by all stakeholders involved. They were very effective for the implementation, monitoring and managing of the project and strongly stimulated synergies and collaboration between projects. When needed appropriate measures were taken to improve project management.
Sufficient	Management roles, tools, procedures and systems were clear to and respected by the majority of the stakeholders. They were effective for the implementation, monitoring and managing of the project and stimulated some synergies and collaboration between projects. When needed appropriate measures were taken to improve project management in most cases.
Insufficient/low	Management roles, tools, procedures and systems were not clear and/or often not respected by stakeholders, which hampered smooth project management. Synergies and collaboration was weakly stimulated and adaptive measurements were sufficiently developed

(very) Poor	Management roles, tools, procedures and systems were not clear and/or not respected by all stakeholders. Synergies and collaborations were not stimulated at all and there were no interventions to solve problems.
3.2 . VLIR facilitates the programming, including the selection of the partner organisations and the, the implementation and the monitoring and evaluation of the IUC-programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– The programming creates ownership at UEM and the matching with partner Universities is well done– There is a clear ToC for the general IUC-program and a specific ToC for the IUC-programme with UEM in Mozambique. The ToC is known and relevant– The role, function and mandate and decision taking power of VLIR-UOS is clear during the implementation process;– VLIR-UOS provides effective procedures, templates and instruments for project- and program management (log-frame, management manual, reporting frameworks, etc.);– A clear, shared and effective strategic vision and strategy is developed concerning capacity development (linked to sustainability) and N-S partnerships;– VLIR facilitates the design and implementation of the institutional – and academic change processes by providing process-related training, tools, support and instruments to programme coordinators and project leaders– The feedback on the narrative and financial reports supports reflection, learning and adaptation
Excellent	No scoring
Sufficient	
Insufficient/low	
(very) Poor	
<i>Sources of verification:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Self-assessment reports- Interviews with PSU, programme managers and project leaders in North and South, VLIR-UOS- Interviews project teams, project leaders, programme coordinators and PSU- Interview with the office of International Cooperation- Overview of budget disbursement- Annual financial plans and reports- Annual narrative plans and reports- Management manual Sample of reports: quarterly reports, mission reports, minutes of the steering committee meetings	

EQ 4. To what extent the programme results will continue after the IUC programme is completed (sustainability)?

Rationale:

Also at programme level a distinction is made between institutional and financial sustainability. At programme level focus will be put on the university as a whole and on the extent changes at institutional level will be sustainable. As described for the assessment at project level, there is a strong link between sustainability at institutional level at sustainability at project level.

The preparation of the phase-out clarifies the importance of the further development of the doctoral school at UEM and the efforts to promote research. This will be a point of attention in the evaluation.

The specific evaluation question in the ToR: 'Did the increased involvement of the various faculties in phase 2 contribute to the ownership of the projects by (...) UEM, in general?', will be answered here.

Judgment criteria	Guiding questions/indicators
4.1. Level of academic and institutional sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – See also guiding questions at project level – Evidence of ownership at the level of UEM leadership – Strategy and plan to support further capacity development for administrative, academic and teaching staff is being developed – Measures to prevent brain drain, installing incentives are being taken – Collaboration and exchange outside of VLIR-UOS programme with Flemish Universities beyond project level is planned for – Evolution in position and mandate of the Office for International Cooperation
<i>Judgement scales</i>	
Excellent	Institutional sustainability is fully guaranteed
Sufficient/Good	Institutional sustainability is explicitly addressed and explicit measures are being taken
Insufficient/low	Institutional sustainability is not explicitly addressed, but deliberate attention is given to create conditions enabling a research friendly environment
(very) Poor	No deliberate efforts are made to secure sustainability
4.2. Level of financial sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – See also guiding questions at project level – Evidence of explicit plan to address and enhance financial sustainability at the level of the university (or guidelines at the level of faculties) – Strategy and effective initiatives to attract external funding (from other donors, government, private sector, ...) – Development of business approaches towards financing existing and new initiatives – Capacity of the Office of International Cooperation to increase visibility of the UEM as a trustworthy partner with a good track record in research.
Excellent	Financial sustainability is fully guaranteed
Sufficient/Good	Financial sustainability is explicitly addressed and explicit measures are being taken
Insufficient/low	Financial sustainability is not explicitly addressed, but deliberate attention is given to attract external funding
(very) Poor	No deliberate efforts are made to secure sustainability
<i>Sources of verification:</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategy documents related to external relations, collaboration and fundraising - Self-assessment reports - Interviews with project leaders and with external stakeholders - Interview with UEM leadership - Interviews with management, financial department, HR department 	

EQ 5. What are the indications of impact (long-term effects) of the programme?

Rationale

The ToR refer to impact as “potential positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended”.

The evaluators will assess the impact linked to the academic objectives and the development objective

Judgment criteria	Guiding questions/indicators
5.1. What have been the effects of the programme in terms of the overall academic objective :	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – See the guiding questions at the level of project. – Effects of the programme on the university (institutional level) as a whole? E.g. adapted institutional policies on academic aspects (in terms of research, educational, internationalization, staff, ... policies), changes in research culture, ... – Did the IUC contribute to a change in the positioning of UEM as a research based institution in the higher education market (in the region)? – Do what extent cooperation with South Africa and other (Luso-phone) countries in the region was strengthened ?
<i>Judgement scales</i>	
Excellent	Evidence of change in academic and institutional policies and practices at the level of UEM and other faculties (not involved in the IUC), inspired by the IUC programme. There have been notable effects on the positioning of UEM as a research based institution
Sufficient/Good	Indications of change in academic and institutional policies and practices at the level of UEM and in 1 or 2 other faculties (not involved in the IUC), inspired by the IUC programme. There have been some effects on the positioning of UEM as a research based institution.
Insufficient/low	Indications of change in academic and institutional policies and practices at the level of UEM and in 1 or 2 other faculties (not involved in the IUC), but not really inspired by the IUC programme. There have been some minor effects on the positioning of UEM.
(very) Poor	There is no Indication of change in academic and institutional policies and practices at the level of UEM or in other faculties (not involved in the IUC). There have been no effects on the positioning of UEM
<i>Sources of verification:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Self-assessment reports - Interviews with project leaders, programme coordinators - Interviews with management, researchers, professors of other faculties (this will be verified in case it is mentioned that changes have taken place in other faculties) - Interviews with external stakeholders 	
5.2. To what extent UEM has further developed as a development actor ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The project has influenced public policy development on research/ education What societal impact did the programme have? – Did it change/contribute to local/national government policies, have effects on local communities, did the programme see the scaling up of new knowledge applications or service, etc. – Did it change the role of the university as an “actor of change”? Did the university adapt his way of addressing communities, rendering services to society?
<i>Judgement scales</i>	

Excellent	The programme had a high and visible societal impact through community based research and services to the society at government policy level. UEM became an important “actor of change” for development in Mozambique, influencing policy makers and other societal actors.
Sufficient/Good	The programme has been able to influence government policies and programmes and delivered services to society to a lesser extent.
Insufficient/low	The programme has little visible societal impact or impact on government policies and programmes
(very) Poor	The programme has no visible societal impact or impact on government policies and programmes
<i>Sources of verification:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Self-assessment reports - Interviews with project leaders, programme coordinators - Interviews with management, researchers, professors, - Interviews with external stakeholders 	

4.3. Mission programme

Day	stakeholders	Topics and method
August 8th 2018	Vice-rector of academic affaires Local Coordinator, programme manager and head of office of International Cooperation	Courtesy meeting
Programme per project see further below		
August 16th, meetings with external stakeholders		
August 17th	Representatives of all stakeholders with the exception of rectorate and P3 and P6	Restitution Presentation, exchange and discussion
August 27th	Debriefing with members of the Flemish Steering Committee	Presentation, exchange and discussion

Project 1: Human Rights, Faculty of Law – 09 August 2018

Objective of the meeting /method	Participants
focus on the outcome and impact of the project + introduction to the organisation of the faculty	Dean of The Faculty of Law (Team leader of P1 and P2) with Deputy Team Leaders
focus on the outcome and impact of the project	Members of the team of P1
focus on the outcome and impact	Visit to the Centre of Human Rights
Focus group discussions with students from newly developed masters	Students funded by the Desafio Programme
Focus group discussions with students from newly developed masters	Students not Funded
Outcome and impact	Additional interviews with PhD students

Projecto 2: Social Rights, Faculty of Law – 10 August 2018

Objective of the meeting	Participants
Discuss management of the programme	Interview with PSU, local coordinator and programme manager

focus on the outcome and impact of the project	Members of the team of P1
focus on the outcome and impact of the project	Focus group discussion with students from newly developed masters

Project 3: Gender and Family, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences – 13 August 2018

Objective of the meeting	Participants
Analysis and validation of the outcomes for the project in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. + introduction to the organisation of the faculty	Dean of The Faculty of Arts and Social Science + deputy deans
Focus on outcome and sustainability	Interview project leader (Prof. Carlos Manuel) and former team leader
Outcome and impact	Focus group discussion or interviews with PhD and Master students
Mainstreaming gender	Focal point of gender
Synergy and appreciation of development impact	Ministry of Health

Project 4: Reproductive Health, Faculty of Medicine + Project 5 Capacity building – 14 August 2018

Objective of the meeting	Participants
Analysis and validation of the outcomes for the project in the Faculty of Medicine. + introduction to the organisation of the faculty	Meeting with the dean of the Faculty of Medicine (Prof. Mohsin Sidat)
Focus on changes on to raise awareness of policy makers and decision makers	Interview project team
Group meeting with PhD and Master students funded by Desafio Programme	Focus group discussion or interviews with PhD and Master students (in two groups)
Focus on efficiency and outcome	Interview of Team leader of P5

Project 6: Biostatistics and Modelling + Project 5 Capacity building – 15 August 2018

Objective of the meeting	Participants
Analysis and validation of the outcomes for this transversal project	Dean of the Faculty of Science (Prof. Emilio Mosse)
	Parallel Project 5: interview with PHD and MSc students
Focus on changes on the development of statistical tools for the analysis of sexual and reproductive health data.	interview project leader (Rafica Razac) & project team (Rafica, Osvaldo and other members of DMI)
	Parallel project 5: visit of the language centre
Focus on changes on the development of statistical tools for the analysis of sexual and reproductive health data	Focus group discussion or interviews with PhD/MSc students (two separate sessions)
appreciation of performance of PSU and follow-up of results	Visit of relevant facilities involved in the project: Centre of Biostatistics.

4.4. List of persons consulted

Interviews with members of the Flemish steering committee

	do 28/06	vr 29/06
VLIR-UOS, Christophe Goossens	10-12	
Mieke Van Herreweghe (P5-UGent)	12-13 (tel)	
Eva Brems (P1-UGent)	13-14 (tel)	
Petra Foubert (P2- UHasselt)	14-16	
Olivier Degomme (co-FC-UGent)	16-18 (skype)	
Kristien Roelens (P4-UGent)		8-10 (skype)
Gily Coene (P3-VUB)		10-12 (skype)
Marc Aerts (P6-UHasselt)		12-14 (skype)
Annick Verheylezoon (ICOS-UGent)		14-16 (skype)
Martin Valcke (FC-UGent)		16-18 (skype)

Interviews at UEM (University Eduardo Mondlane)

NAME	TITLE
University Management	
Amalia Uamusse	Vice rector for Academic Affairs

Orton Malipa	Finance Department, chief of department donations
Manuel Guilherme Junior	Head of the Office of International Affairs
Members of PSU	
Nafissa Bique Osman	Desafio local coordinator
Sergio Nhanombe	Desafio programme manager
Projects 1 and 2, Faculty of Law	
Henriques Henriques	Dean of the Faculty of Law
Orquidea Massarongo-Jonas	Deputy Project Leader P1 and PhD student
Paolo Comoane	Deputy Project Leader P2 and PhD graduate
Angelo Matusse	PHD student
Celly Neyda Valla	PHD student (discontinued)
Farida Mamade	PHD student (by skype)
Luis Bitone	PhD student
Ludmilla XX	Collaborator in the Centre of Human Rights
Lurdes Rodrigues	Collaborator in the Centre of Human Rights and legal clinic and member of project team
Bonifacio Ildefonso	Member of project team
Carlos Sousa	Member of project team
Armando Cuamba	Member of project team
Lurdes Araujo	Legal Clinic
Ivete Mafundza	MSC student Human Rights (funded by Desafio)
Nilza Maesso	MSC student Human Rights (funded by Desafio)
Nilza Guivale	MSC student Human Rights (funded by Desafio)
Group of 16 students	Class of MSc students, Human Rights, 2017, 2015, not funded
Group of 5 students	MSc students Social Rights, not funded
Project 3, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences	
Cláudio Mungói	Dean
Carla Braga	Deputy dean for research and extension
Eliseo Mabasoo	Forensic linguistics, deputy dean for undergraduate courses
Esmeralda Mariano	PhD student and current deputy dean for post graduate studies
Carlos Manual	Team Leader P3 and director of the Language Centre
Rehana Capurchande	PhD student
Carlos Cuinhane	PhD student
Vânia Pedro Elídio Manjate Eugênia Macassa Ulmênia Mangujo	MSc students
Gracinda Mataveia	UEM focal point Gender, CECAGE
Project 4, Faculty of Medicine	
Moshin Sidat	Dean of the Faculty
Katia Munguambe	Team leader P4

Esperanca Sevene	Deputy director research and extension, coordinator of a Swedish funded programme on HIV
Leonardo Chavane	PhD student
Monica Frederico	PhD student
Beatriz Chongo	PhD student
Catia Taibo	PhD student
Maria Emilia Jose Goncalves	PhD student
Group of 3 students	MSc students
Project 5	
Natasha Ribereiro	Team leader P5
Adriano Uaciquete	PhD student
Demócrito Manyissa	Masters student
Manuel Cabinda	PhD student
Carlos Manual	Director of Language Centre
Project 6, Faculty of Sciences	
Emilio Mosse	Dean
Rafica Razac	Team leader P6
Oswaldo Loquiha	PhD
Adelino Juga	PhD student
Adelino Martins	PhD student
Rachid Mualeia	PhD student
João Munembe	Member of Faculty
Others	
Esperanza Sevene	Ministry of Health
Moresse Ricardo	Head of HR Commission at the bar's Association
Eneasara Antunes	Policy Officer for Gender, Social Protection and HIV and AIDS at the Dutch Embassy at the Dutch Embassy
Ximena Andrade	Researcher - WLSA (Women and law in Southern Africa)
Dr. Lucas	Former head of the Office for International Cooperation
Anna Mondjano	former Vice Rector of Academic Affairs

4.5. List of documents consulted

1. Documents of the IUC programme

All self-assessments at programme level (North and South) and project level (P1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

Van Baren, B. and Mosca, J. (April 2012) Mid-term evaluation of the ongoing cooperation with the Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique.

VLIR-UOS (december 2018). Country sheet. Mozambique and Flemish University Cooperation for Development. The data received an update from the consultant.

Project documents:

- IUC. Factsheet UEM. (Excel file)
- Overall view on budget disbursement over the years
- Formulation of the programme, phase 2
- Logical frameworks of each project and programme
- All narrative and financial reports of the IUC desafio (2013-2017)
- Overview of status of PhD students (letter from February 2018 and excel file)
- IUC PARTNER PROGRAMME with the University Eduardo Mondlane, Management Manual 1 April 2013 (Mozambique Phase II of IUC co-operation (2013-2017)
- UEM reports of management meetings (June 2017)

2. UEM documents

Barros, João (2016), “Evaluation of Centre Financed by Desafio – Final Report

UEM (2007) Política de Investigação da Universidade Eduardo Mondlane.

UEM (2015) Política de Publicação Científica na Universidade Eduardo Mondlane

UEM (2016) Research Lines at Eduardo Mondlane University

UEM (2017) RELATÓRIO DE AVALIAÇÃO DO PLANO ESTRATÉGICO 2008-2014
Rumo a uma universidade alicerçada na investigação (**Strategic Plan 2018-2028, ‘Towards a Research-based University’**) + Planos Operacionais do Plano Estratégico da UEM 2018-2028

UEM, Vice-Chancellors Annual Report 2017.

UEM, Estratégia de Financiamento do Ensino Superior; Estratégia de Equidade de Género (CECAGE);

UEM, Estratégia de Mobilização de Fundos

UEM, Política de Publicação

UEM, Política de Extensão (in development).

<http://www.uem.mz/> : website of UEM university (consulted several times during inception phase and during the field mission)

<http://www.repositorio.uem.mz/> : the current repository of UEM

3. Other documents

Gonçalves, Euclides, Sandra Manuel, Anselmo Matusse (2013), “Think Tank – University Relations: Mozambique”.

Kruse, S-A; a.o. (2017), *Evaluation of Swedish government research cooperation with Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique 2011-2016*.

República de Moçambique (2014), “*Estratégia Nacional de Desenvolvimento (2015-2035)*”, Maputo, Moçambique.

VLIR-UOS (2015) Country Sheet Mozambique. Mozambique and Flemish University Cooperation for Development.

VLIR-UOS (2015) Mozambique Strategy document (Approved by the Bureau UOS of 18 December 2015).

ABOUT VLIR-UOS

VLIR-UOS supports partnerships between universities and university colleges in Flanders and the South that seek innovative responses to global and local challenges.

We fund cooperation projects between professors, researchers and teachers. In addition, we award scholarships to students and professionals in Flanders and the South. Lastly, we contribute to strengthening higher education in the South and internationalising higher education in Flanders.

The information and views set out in this evaluation report are those of the author(s), independent evaluators, and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of VLIR-UOS or the universities/university colleges involved.

VLIR-UOS is part of the Flemish Interuniversity Council and receives funding from the Belgian Development Cooperation.

More information: www.vliruos.be

Responsible editor: Kristien Verbruggen, VLIR-UOS, Julien Dillensplein 1, bus 1A, 1060 Brussels

Front cover: Faculty of Medicine, UEM

D/2018/10.960/3

