
MAKERERE UNIVERSITY

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mid-Term Review of the Makerere-Sweden bilateral research programme, November 2015 – February 2018

1. Review Purpose

Pursuant to article 12 (Section 12.3) of the specific Agreement on Research Collaboration between Sweden and Makerere University during the period 3rd November 2015 – 30th June 2020 between The Uganda state owned Makerere University (“Mak”) and Sida, represented in Uganda by the Embassy of Sweden in Kampala, Makerere University shall undertake an internal Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the program in the last quarter of 2017 (postponed to Feb. 2018), including an assessment of academic quality and management of local PhD training, management of cross-cutting courses; the program partnership with Ugandan regional universities based on the guidelines developed (Article 11.5); and an ‘Exit Strategy’ foreseeing the phasing out of Swedish funding to research collaboration.

The review should consider the plans by the Ugandan Public Universities to sustain what has been achieved and clearly state their strategy to ensure enhanced Government funding as well as methods to continue successful partnerships beyond Sida funding in 2020.

The MTR should cover the period of November 2015 to February 2018. The review shall provide an independent view on the bilateral research support to five Ugandan public universities.¹ The purpose of the review is to assess progress and make realistic recommendations, regarding outputs (e.g. Trained PhD’s etc.), outcomes, (e.g. use of research results etc) and other internal management control systems. The review will thus provide information regarding the effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and efficiency of the research cooperation.

2. Background

The Government of Sweden, represented by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) at the Embassy of Sweden in Uganda, and the Government of Uganda, represented by the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MoF) entered into a mutual agreement to implement the Sweden-Uganda Research Collaboration programme 1st November 2015 - 30th June 2020. The point of departure is the overall objectives of the *Strategy for research cooperation and research of relevance in development cooperation 2015-2021* “to strengthen research of high quality and of relevance to poverty reduction and sustainable development , with a focus on low-income countries”. In addition, the objectives of the *Strategy for Sweden’s development*

¹Makerere University, Kyambogo University, Busitema University, Gulu University, and Mabarara University of Science and Technology.

cooperation with Uganda 2014-2018, in particular Synergies with research collaboration should be sought in order to promote knowledge and innovation within all result areas. In accordance with the Agreement, Sweden shall provide 275 000 000 SEK to enable the Ugandan public universities and Swedish partner universities implement their joint research projects including training of 125 PhD students, 147 MA students, and 65 post-doc fellows, divided between the five partner public universities. This graduate training, including institutional support, brings the Swedish contribution to *32 million USD* over the five years.

The collaboration is directed to support an environment that is conducive for research and research training. The support to individual research projects within project-based research and research-training programs is a tool to achieve this goal.

The main objective of the bilateral research cooperation is to increase the capacity of Makerere and Partner Public Universities to generate knowledge and promote research uptake for national and regional development.

3. Objectives of the Consultancy

The Over-arching objectives of the consultancy are to:

1. An assessment of academic quality and management of local PhD training, management of cross-cutting courses; and the program partnership with Ugandan regional universities.
2. Assess results at the outcome level with focus on changes in research capacity and the enabling environment during the period November 2015 – February 2018.
3. Make an overall analysis of the research cooperation in relation to its effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, and sustainability.
4. Make an assessment of the level of institutional preparedness, capacity in terms of resources (human and physical), mechanisms, policies and structures to continue implementing the research programme beyond 2020.

The MTR shall also make an overall analysis of the research cooperation in relation to its effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, and sustainability. The MTR is intended to make an assessment of the level of institutional preparedness, capacity in terms of resources (human and physical), mechanisms, policies and structures to continue implementing the research programme after the Swedish funds comes to an end in 2020. The specific recommendation(s) will enable Makerere and its Partner Public Universities to plan for an Exit Strategy after 2020.

A. General

1. Given the present institutional context in which the bilateral research cooperation program operates, describe and analyse, at a general level, changes in the research and research environment especially with regard to multi-disciplinary approach that have occurred and how the research cooperation program between Sweden and Uganda has contributed to that change.

B. *Relevance*

2. Analyse and describe the relevance of the programme in relation to other programmes that focuses of strengthening research capacity at the five partner universities including Makerere University, Gulu University, Busitema University, Kyambogo University and Mbarara University of Science and Technology including funding from other donors.

C. *Scientific quality*

3. What are the quantity of research results obtained, in terms of publications in international and national scientific journals and presentations at international conferences?
4. Do the universities have sufficient quality assurance mechanisms? How do the different universities follow up the students' academic and research performance?
5. Have the research groups adopted the multi-disciplinary approach in their research activities, curriculum review and training?
6. To what extent has the research cooperation impacted on academic quality within the local PhD programmes at the partner universities.
7. What is the assessed scientific quality of local PhD programs with regard to coursework, produced research and supervision?

D. *Efficiency*

8. Comment on the issues around the sandwich and local PhD training.
9. Comment on the multidisciplinary method in view of the achievements and challenges faced? What has worked well and what has not worked well with the multi-disciplinary approach? How can implementation be improved?

E. *Effectiveness*

10. Assess in particular the quality and effectiveness of the crosscutting PhD courses.
11. Assess the supervision within the program, both regarding the quality, availability and commitment of the Ugandan and Swedish supervisors.
12. Procurement procedures are a key function within the program. Are these working efficiently at Mak and how have these procedures affected the program? How can procedures be improved?
13. How has the disbursement of funds affected the effectiveness of the program? From Sweden to Mak, and from Mak coordination office to the projects.
14. How has the gender policies adopted by partner universities been implemented and followed up by the Gender guidelines in the program?
15. Describe changes in the partner universities' strategies and priorities for research and research training, and ways in which the research cooperation has contributed to improving the strategic environment for research.

F. Effect

16. Assess to what extent the programme has contributed to improved research capacity at the Uganda partner universities. In which specific fields? To what extent?
17. Are there any indications that the research program will ultimately have impact on policy, collaboration with ministries, industry and civil society? Give examples.
18. Have the supervision capacity, skills and competency at the partner universities improved? Has any change detected been institutionalised beyond the Swedish program. If so how?
19. What impact have the research program had on the Swedish partner universities? Could they have been more incorporated within the program or used in a different way?
20. How has the program increased capacity to formulate research problems and proposals? Propose future possible changes.

G. Sustainability

21. Generally, to what extent can the results of the current program (both in terms of research capacity and institutional changes) aiming to create an enabling environment be sustained? (Specifically in relation to Institutional support to Library, ICT , GIS, DSS and research management). In addition to what extent have regional (Africa) and international long- term research collaboration been established as direct or indirect result of the Program?
22. Assess the sustainability of research and research training at the partner universities when the Swedish research cooperation program supported by Sida ends. What is the current plan for sustainability in research capacity building when support ends?
23. Assess the disbursement performance and compare/match the rate of disbursement with outputs or activities achieved, resource mobilization efforts and long-term sustainability.
24. To what extent have regional and international research collaborations been established?
25. To what extent are the synergies between the research results and the result areas in the Result strategy for Sweden's International Development Cooperation with Uganda 2014 – 2020?
26. In what areas do partner universities have the preconditions, e.g. critical mass of supervisors, courses, and infrastructure and management capacity to continue with the local PhD training?
27. Assess the efficiency in coordinating the program during the review period. Has Mak worked in a sustainable way, when coordinating the research teams? Assess effectiveness of decision-making.

28. What are the main bottlenecks for development of research capacity within the partner universities such as ICT, personnel and welfare issues, procurement, etc.?

4. Recommendation(s) and lesson(s) learnt for the future

The MTR shall provide recommendations including guidelines for an exit strategy foreseeing the phasing out of Swedish funding to research cooperation in 2020.

Recommendations shall address the following questions:

- How can the present research cooperation with Uganda be improved and made more efficient with regard to overall goals, research management, program coordination, and scientific goals?
- How can the research cooperation's contribution to viable and sustainable research environments be further improved?
- How can the Swedish partner universities be used further in an innovative and sustainable way within the program?
- How can Sweden/Uganda cooperate in the improvement of quality of supervision of PhD students?
- How could the system for quality control of the local PhD training programs be improved?
- Should the crosscutting PhD courses continue in the current set up and comment on the existence of sustainable funding mechanisms for the courses?
- How can the Demographic Surveillance Site's future be secured in a sustainable way? What should the role of Sweden as a donor be – if any? What efforts have been/are going to be made to make the DSS research Facility/resource known to the Ugandan Government in order to assess funds from the appropriate ministry?
- What risks does the Review Team foresee in the research cooperation and how can these be mitigated?

5. Methodology

The assignment shall be performed through, but not limited to, document review and analysis, review of project reports, interviews with implementers and beneficiaries and another method deemed appropriate by the consultant in consultation with the project team leadership, supervisors, researchers, PhD and master students, academic staff.

The methodology used shall be described and annexed to the final report.

All conclusions should be supported by data, and if not, it should be stated that the conclusions are based on the opinions of the authors.

7. Work plan and schedule

The assignment will be implemented over a period not exceeding ten weeks. The assignment is expected to start on 24th Jan 2018 and end on 3rd April 2018.

Activity	Period / Point in time	Whom
Preparation of ToRs	30 th Nov 2017	DRGT
Advertising the Consultancy services	15 th Dec 2017	DRGT
Submission of the Consultant's proposal	29 th Dec 2017	DRGT
Contracting of Consultant	19 th Jan 2018	DRGT
Inception meeting with Mak-Embassy	24 th Jan 2018	Consultant
Assessment (survey, visit to Partner Universities, interviews, document review and analysis)	19 th Feb – 2 nd Mar 2018	Consultant
Submission of draft report (electronic)	23 rd March 2018	Consultant
Presentation of Report to DRGT & Embassy	27 th March 2018	Consultant
Submission of Final Report to DRGT & Embassy (Electronic)	3 rd April 2018	Consultant
Presentation of Report to the Annual Planning Meeting	23 rd April 2018	Consultant

8. Reporting /Deliverables

The following outputs shall be delivered by the Consulting Team:

- Inception report
- Draft MTR report
- Final MTR report

The draft report should be submitted electronically to the Directorate of Research and Graduate Training, Makerere University and the Embassy of Sweden, Kampala on 23rd March 2017. The draft report shall be presented and discussed at the Mak-Embassy Consultative Committee meeting for their feedback and input, on 27th March 2018.

The final reports shall be submitted to the Directorate of Research and Graduate Training, Makerere University and the Swedish Embassy, Kampala, not later than 3rd April 2018, in electronic form in Microsoft Word for Windows and should be presented in a way that enables publication without further editing.

The report will be presented during the Annual Planning Meeting on 23rd April 2018.

Reporting requirements:

- The report shall be in English and not exceed 50 pages, excluding annexes.
- The reports shall contain a list of persons interviewed during the review, detailing their names, positions and affiliations.
- The report shall contain an Executive Summary, which shall provide an overview of the report highlighting the main conclusions and recommendations.

9. Desired attributes of the Consultant

The Consultant must include a Team Leader and other persons with:

- Knowledge of higher education contexts in Uganda
- Knowledge of sustainable research capacity building
- Knowledge of research management/institution building
- Knowledge of gender policy and gender mainstreaming issues
- Knowledge of multi-disciplinary research programming in practice

10. Application process

The following documents should be submitted as part of the application:

- i. A cover letter outlining the applicant's motivation and summarizing their relevant experience.
- ii. Applicants' summary of relevant experience should include:
 - A description of experience and proven capacity to conduct an evaluation of a large research training programme in the last five years, with names and contacts of the clients.
 - Experience in qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis, and report writing.
 - A technical proposal showing the applicant's understanding of the assignment and how they plan to carry it out.
 - A financial proposal detailing the cost of carrying out the assignment.
 - A proposed work plan for carrying out the assignment.
 - Contact details for at least three independent referees with in-depth and proven knowledge of the applicant's expertise and relevant work experience.