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UM sopi Kansainvälisen henkilövaihdon keskuksen (CIMO) kanssa pilottivaiheen toimeenpanon viranomaisyhteistyöopimuksesta maaliskuussa 2004. CIMO on luonnollinen valinta Ohjelman toimeenpanijaksi, sillä se oli mukana Ohjelman suunnittelussa heti sen alkuvaiheessa vuosituhannen alussa vuosittainen liikkeen alueen hallinnonjärjestelmän. CIMO perustettiin vuonna 1991 ja sen tehtävänä on nimennä toimia edistää kansainvälistä opiskelijavaihtoa Suomeen ja Suomesta. CIMO on opetusministeriön alainen viranomainen ja siten noudattaa ministeriön luomiota ja vahvistamia koulutuspolitiikkaa.

Ohjelmalle perustettiin heti vuonna 2004 oma ohjausryhmä, jonka jäsenet edustavat seuraavia tahoja: ulkoasianministeriö; opetusministeriö; Rehtorien neuvosto; ammattikorkeakoulut (yksi rehtoriedustaja); yliopistot (yksi rehtoriedustaja); ja opiskelijatunnutti. Ryhmän puheenjohtajana toimii CIMOn johtaja: sihteeri on myös CIMOn henkilökunta. Ohjausryhmä kokoontuu CIMOn kutsusta tarvittaessa, yleensä noin 3–4 kertaa vuodessa. Ohjausryhmä käsittää kokouksissaan Ohjelman edistämistä, projektilaisten valintakierroksia, sekä itse valintoja. Projektien valintaa varten se kehitti ensimmäisen kevään 2004 hakukierroksen jälkeen kriiteristön, jota CIMO noudattaa esittäessä rahoitettavia projekteja. Kriiteristö on luonteeltaan suuntaa antava, ja nyt näljen hakukierroksen jälkeen Ohjausryhmä on tuttua työskentelemään, että kriiteristöä on yrittää tarkastella uudelleen. UM:llä on rahoittajat roolinsa vuoksi veto-oikeus ohjausryhmän toiminnassa. Alkuperäinen henkasiasjuuri suunnitteli ohjausryhmälle nykyistä isompaa roolia päätöksen teossa nähden sen ylimpänä päätöksenteokirjanä ja CIMOn ennen kaikkea toimeenpanijana. Viranomaisyhteistyötä ja – toimintaa sätelevät lait kuitenkin kieltevästi, tässä tapauksessa CIMOa, luovuttamasta sille annettua päätöksentekoa muille tahoih, joten ohjausryhmän rooli on ennemmin neuvoo antava ja CIMO vastaa Ohjelmaan liittyvistä päätöksistä.

Itse Ohjelman rakennettiin muotoon, joska CIMO informoi korkeakouluja uudesta tukimuodosta, käynnistää yksittäisten projektien rahoitushaun, arvioi tukea hakevien yksittäisten projektien ja esitää niiden hyväksymistä tai hylkäämistä Ohjelman Ohjausryhmälle. Itse projektit ovat suomalaisten korkeakoulujen liikkuvuutta edistäviä yhteistyöjärjestelyjä. Liikkuvuuden kohteena

1 ODA-kelpuisuudella tarkoitetaan, että se on julkista rahoitusta, jota käytetään köyhien maiden sosiaalisen ja taloudellisen kehityksen edistämiseksi.
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Projektit toimivat siis verkkostoina, useimmissa niissä on ensimmäinen kuin yksi suomalainen ja yksi kehitysmaitainen korkeakoulu, näitä yksi-yksi -järjestelyjä on kuitenkin noin joka neljäs. Tämän hetkisistä yhteistyöverkostoista itse asiassa 60% on sellaisia, joissa on mukana vain yksi suomalainen korkeakoulu, mutta kehitysmaita kumppanikorkeakouluja voi olla yhdellä ker- taa jopa neljä kappaletta. Suurin suomalainen korkeakoulujen yhteistyöverkosto on terveyden-huollon alalla, jossa yhdeksän suomalaista ammattikorkeakoulua on ryhmittynyt toteuttamaan isoa, Terve Afrikka – projektia.

hieman yllättäen kulttuurin tukeminen. Suomen perinteisessä kehitysyhteistyössä kulttuuria ei tueta vastaavassa määrin. Osa projektien pohjana olevista yhteistyöverkostoista oli olemassa ja toiminnassa jo ennen Ohjelman käynnistymistä, osa perustui kansalaisjärjestötoimintaan ja osa korkeakoulujen henkilöstön aiempaan yhteistyöhön. Kun Ohjelmaa vuosittuovalle vaiheessa alettin käynnistää, niin niin silloiseni, nytemmin syrjään jätettyynä tavoitteeni oli varmistaa, että suomalaisia kehitysyhteistyön osajohtajia olisi jatkossa.”


Korkeakoulujen informaatiotyöverkosto vaihtelee oppilaitoksittain, periaatteena on, että ammatti-korkeakoulujen yhteiskunnallinen tiedottamisverkosto on yliopistojen nykyisiä velvoitteita selkeänä ohjelmana. CIMOn velvollisuus tiedottaa Ohjelmasta olisi otettu huomioon jopa Ohjelman budjettiasiakirjassa. Nykyinen CIMOn tiedotuspolitiikka suostuu nettipohjaisia tiedotus- ja kehitysmaiden tarpeet eivät tässä suhteessa tule tarpeeksi huomioiduiksi, sillä niissä perinteinen kirjallinen materiaali ei vielä tällä hetkellä halutumpaa kuin kehitysmaajärjestöissä halutun tiedon sähköinen tiedotus.

CIMOn tekemä ohjelmaan liittyvä raportointi on kehitetty pilotin edetessä, mutta seuraavassa vaiheessa myös silloista on kehitettävä selkeät tavoitteet ja keinojärjestelmä. Erityisesti rahan käytön seuranta on nykyisen raportointin valossa erittäin vaikeaa. Evaluoinnin kannsa yhtä aikaa tehty tilintarkastus ei huomannut Ohjelman toteutuksessa minkäänlaista väärinkäytöksiä, mutta sen sijaan silloista on oletettu huomautuksia koskien nimenomanaa raportointikäytäntöjää.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

After extensive consultations and preparatory work, the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) approved the programme in March 2004 with the title: "Higher Education Network Programme 2003–2006". During the pilot phase, the programme adopted the title “The North-South Higher Education Network Programme” (Programme). The Programme supports student and staff mobility between higher education institutions (HEI’s) in Finland and in developing countries. The first three-year pilot phase finishes at the end of 2006. The total amount of funding granted to the Programme by the MFA is 2 542 000 euro.

In the end of 2005, the MFA decided as part of its normal project management cycle to organize an external evaluation of the Programme. The evaluation was not only to assess the past performance but to also draw up best practices and good lessons learnt in the Programme. Also, the evaluation was to put emphasis on the administrative and management arrangements as well as on the practical implementation of the Programme in order to provide the MFA with good planning tools for the possible next phase. The MFA chose Merja Mikkola, EconoMik, and Outi Snellman, University of the Arctic, as the external evaluators.

The overall objective set for the Programme is to support the goals of Finnish development cooperation: alleviation of widespread poverty, prevention of global environmental threats and promotion of equality, democracy and human rights by improving developing country capacities and abilities in their higher education sectors through long term co-operation between Finnish and developing country HEI’s. The Programme also aims at developing good governance and exchanging best practices by improving the students’ democracy, and building capacity between the networking partners.

According to the Programme Document, CIMO is responsible for the practical development and management of the Programme. An official assignment between MFA and CIMO was signed on March 11, 2004 for the period of December 1, 2003 to December 31, 2006. CIMO is a natural choice to be the Programme implementer as it was involved proactively already in the inception and development of the Programme and is managing most of the national international education and mobility programmes between Finnish HEI’s. CIMO was established in 1991 with the specific task of promoting student and staff mobility in Finnish educational institutions. As an agency under the Finnish Ministry of Education (MinEd), CIMO follows and implements the formal education policies endorsed by the Ministry.

An Advisory Committee (AC) was also established to with a responsibility to coordinate the Programme, endorse its main directions and provide guidance for the Programme’s future development. The following organizations are represented in the Committee: MFA, MinEd, Rectors’ councils of universities and polytechnics, representatives of Finnish student organizations (SYL and SAMOK), CIMO, and the Chair and Secretary. The AC has met on average three times a year. The AC launched the Programme calls (four calls in total), created the criteria for Project selection, approved the Projects to be funded based on allocation proposals composed by CIMO, and monitored the development of the Programme. It also conducted an internal evaluation as part of the application process for the 2006 Project financing.

Because CIMO is an official authority by law, it cannot authorize any other body to make decisions on its behalf, therefore the foreseen role for the AC as the highest decision making body in the Programme implementation was unrealistic and against the Finnish law. In practise,
the AC serves in an advisory capacity to CIMO on its implementation of the Programme. The MFA has a special position, as the financier, in the AC; it has obtained a veto right for the AC work.

The Programme implementation model is based on CIMO informing the Finnish HEI’s about the new funding, organizing calls for projects, evaluating individual projects applications and proposing the ones to receive funding to the AC for approval. The projects are collaborative networks between HEI’s enhancing mobility. The mobility is targeted between students and staff at participating institutions, and lately, also those responsible for administrative arrangements for mobility in the participating institutions. The Programme target is to send 140 Finnish students to partner institutions abroad for a maximum of two semesters and to receive 220 students to Finland. Furthermore, the target numbers for teaching staff exchanges are 45 teachers from Finland abroad and 65 teachers to Finland for the same period. In addition, the Programme was to support teachers’ preparatory to partner institutions. Four Calls were organized during the pilot phase: spring and autumn in 2004, one in early 2005 and one in early 2006.

From the start, it became evident that there is a clear need for the Programme to support cooperation and mobility between Finnish higher education institutions and partners in developing countries. The first call for applications resulted in more applications than anticipated or what was possible for the Programme to support. Out of the 77 applications, only 20 projects received funding. The number of funded projects today is 23, and all projects funded after the first call still receive funding. The Programme’s goal is enhancing long-term cooperation between the participating institutions. In this light, it was seen to be natural to support the initial set of projects for the duration of the pilot. The total number of projects that have applied for funding does demonstrate, however, that there is a great demand for expanding the Programme to new projects. For the possible next phase of the Programme, the total funding level needs to, therefore, be re-examined so that new and potentially innovative projects can be included.

According to the Programme Document, the partner institutions, or projects, are responsible for the actual planning and implementation of the Programme. Their tasks include the following: planning the individual mobility processes, informing the students and departments about the possibilities of the Programme to support. Out of the 77 applications, only 20 projects received funding. The number of funded projects today is 23, and all projects funded after the first call still receive funding. The Programme’s goal is enhancing long-term cooperation between the participating institutions. In this light, it was seen to be natural to support the initial set of projects for the duration of the pilot. The total number of projects that have applied for funding does demonstrate, however, that there is a great demand for expanding the Programme to new projects. For the possible next phase of the Programme, the total funding level needs to, therefore, be re-examined so that new and potentially innovative projects can be included.

According to the Programme Document, the partner institutions, or projects, are responsible for the actual planning and implementation of the Programme. Their tasks include the following: planning the individual mobility processes, informing the students and departments about the possibilities of the Programme, organising the actual mobility activities and taking care of the all related practicalities, monitoring the implementation of the institution’s specific mobility activities and reporting about them to CIMO, briefing the students and teachers (both outgoing and incoming) about the studies, practical arrangements, cultural issues, etc. as well as identification and information of potential EU funds for student and teacher mobility with developing countries.

The projects themselves are diverse in terms of field, project focus, method of implementation as well as partners. Each individual project is coordinated by a Finnish HEI, either a university or polytechnic. CIMO directs all project level funds through the coordinating institution. The polytechnics receive the full project budget in one lump sum, whereas the universities invoice CIMO on the basis of actual mobility. This practise has made it more difficult for CIMO to manage the Programme finances and reporting, and one clear need for further development in the next phase of the Programme funding is improving the financial reporting and transparency. Clear guidelines are needed for all those involved in the Programme for reporting at all levels.

The Programme allows for a variety of types of network cooperation. All individual projects have a Finnish lead partner as coordinator. In a network, there are one or more Finnish partners.
The number of partner institutions in developing countries varies also. It can be stated that each project has formed a network arrangement with the best fit for its purposes. Every fourth project, or network, is a bilateral partnership with one partner in Finland, the lead, and one partner in a developing country. 60 per cent of the currently funded 23 projects have only one Finnish partner, the lead, but up to four partners in the developing countries. The largest network on the Finnish side, the Health Africa Project, has nine Finnish polytechnics and two African universities as partners.

Both polytechnics and universities are eligible to participate in the Programme. Of the total 23 projects that are funded during the pilot, 9 are coordinated by polytechnics and 14 by universities. The total number of Finnish partners in the networks is 28; 13 of these are polytechnics and 15 are universities.

Geographically, the coordinating institutions in Finland are relatively evenly spread throughout the institutions in the south of Finland from Turku, to Helsinki and all the way up to Oulu. The largest numbers of supported projects in developing countries are with South-Africa (7), Namibia (6), Zambia (5), Tanzania (5), Kenya (4), and three with Mozambique and Ghana. The only project outside of Africa is with Peru in the field of natural sciences and environment. The cooperation between the partners in the developing countries will need to be a strong focus area in the next phase of the Programme.

To review the project allocations by sector, the evaluators used the OECD classification and placed the 23 projects financed during the pilot phase into eight categories. The projects under each category were listed and their annual budget allocations recorded. The funded projects can be placed in the following sectors: Education, Humanities and the Arts, Social sciences, Science, Engineering, Agriculture, Health and Welfare, and Services. It is evident that the sectors receiving most of the financing include Social Sciences, Health & Welfare and the Humanities & Arts. Since this is the Programme’s pilot phase, most of the projects financed are based on existing networks and cooperation initiatives between the Finnish and developing country partners. It is noteworthy that the Humanities & Arts is not a typical sector financed by the Finnish official development assistance ODA. Many of the projects which have received pilot phase financing are based on either active individuals’ contacts or an earlier non-governmental organization (NGO) financed cooperation. NGO activities cover more sectors than the Finnish ODA in long-term partner countries. One of the criteria emphasized both in the Programme and in the Finnish development cooperation policies, is that sectors in which Finland has something special to offer should be supported.

The Programme as well as all individual projects supported from it are to enhance the goals set forth in the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDG). This link is still somewhat obscure in many of the projects, which will need to be a clear focus area for development for further phases of the Programme. One way to enhance these goals is to look at the number and quality of the goals set by the projects themselves at the Programme level. The Advisory Committee’s selection criteria are for the time being focussed on the selection of projects to be funded and do not act as a steering mechanism for the choices the projects make on their internal priorities. Some of the projects have developed excellent internal selection criteria, clear internal goals and information and communication solutions. The Programme level can learn from the good practises developed at the project level.

The information responsibility and method varies from institution to institution. In principle the formal responsibility of polytechnics for outreach is more regulated than that of universities.
CIMO's information responsibility about the Programme is clearly stated at the Programme budget level. CIMO's current information and communication policy favours web-based solutions at a time when the developing countries are increasingly straddled with the "digital divide". This hampers their ownership of the Programme when they simply are struggling with accessing the Programme information. In the next phase for the Programme, the needs of the partners in the developing countries need to be in a more central focus in the communication strategy.

The reporting mechanisms developed and implemented by CIMO have improved significantly since the start of the pilot, but the next phase needs to see clear guidelines and goals for reporting and monitoring up front. In particular, monitoring the detailed use of funds is extremely cumbersome in light of the current reporting practises. The financial audit conducted in parallel with the external evaluation of the pilot found no mismanagement of funds; however, several comments were made concerning the reporting practises.
# ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMK</td>
<td>Ammattikorkeakoulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>Budget Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMO</td>
<td>Centre for International Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIs</td>
<td>Higher Education Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCROM</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Ministry for Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MinEd</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBE</td>
<td>National Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProDoc</td>
<td>North-South Higher Education Exchange Network Programme Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>The North-South Higher Education Network Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMOK</td>
<td>The National Union of Finnish Polytechnic Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYL</td>
<td>National Union of Students in Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEM</td>
<td>University of Eduardo Mondlane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAM</td>
<td>University of Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNZA</td>
<td>University of Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIPO</td>
<td>World Intellectual Property Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the evaluation

In the spring 2000, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA) already established a working group to study issues related to ensuring the future supply of Finnish experts in development cooperation. The group provided the Ministry with its findings and recommendations in February 2001. The main themes of that report included expert assistance, mobility, reciprocal internships, training and volunteer work in the developing countries. Based on this work, a group with members from the Centre for International Mobility (CIMO), MFA, the National Board of Education (NBE) and the Helsinki Deaconess Institute continued the effort to develop and identify new ways and mechanisms to increase the cooperation between the Finnish higher education institutes and developing countries.

CIMO conducted an enquiry among Finnish higher education institutes in the spring 2002 in which it requested information about the existing cooperation initiatives between them and their partners in the developing world. The same enquiry also shed light on to what types of cooperation would be appreciated by the educational institutions.

Based on the findings of the two working groups and the study made on the higher education institutions (HEIs), CIMO made a proposal on September 30th 2002 to the MFA for a new mobility programme. The proposal was for a three-year pilot phase to be financed from the development cooperation budget. The proposal was discussed at the MFA in November 2002. It was decided that Finnish representatives in developing countries would be consulted as would be the Ministry of Education (MinEd) on the needs for this type of cooperation. Both instances came up with a positive and enthusiastic response. At the same time, the MFA investigated how the mobility programme would meet the requirements set for ODA (Official Development Assistance) funding. The result was that, in order to fulfil the ODA requirement, the mobility programme should be connected clearly to Finnish development policies, and its main emphasis should be cooperating with Finland’s long term partner countries.

In July 2003, the MFA decided to finance the preparation of the mobility programme document by an outside consultant. To a large extent the document was drafted on the basis of CIMO’s proposal. The draft document titled: “Higher Education Mobility Programme 2003–2006” was made available in August 2003. The final version of the programme document (Programme Document) dated February 4th, 2004 was approved by the Minister of Foreign Trade and Development in March 2004 with the title: “Higher Education Network Programme 2003–2006”. During the pilot phase, the programme adopted the title The North-South Higher Education Network Programme, hereafter referred to as “the Programme”.

It was decided in the very early stages of the preparation process that the new Programme would start as a three-year pilot in 2003–2006. The Programme preparation process was more time-consuming than originally thought and thus the start of the Programme was expedited in spring 2004 in order to get concrete results from the Programme already during the pilot phase.

In the end of 2005, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA), which is the financier, decided as a part of its normal project management cycle to organize an external evaluation of the Programme (see Annex 1: Terms of Reference).
1.2. The evaluation task and its objectives

The evaluation was not only to assess the past performance but to draw up best practices and good lessons learnt in the Programme. Also, the evaluation was to put emphasis on the administrative and management arrangements as well as on the practical implementation of the Programme in order to provide the MFA with good planning tools for the possible next phase.

A tender competition for the evaluation was organized in early January in 2006. A working coalition of EconoMik and the University of the Arctic won the tender and was commissioned by the MFA in late February 2006. The evaluation team (the Team) consists of two members: Ms. Merja Mikkola, development economist as the team leader and Ms. Outi Snellman as the higher education expert.

The Team started its work on February 20th, 2006. The start up workshop was organized on February 27th, 2006 at the MFA. Present were Ms. Sinikka Antila, MFA, Ms. Kirsi Brolén, MFA, Ms. Anita Etholen, MFA and Ms. Ulla Ekberg, CIMO in addition to the evaluation team members. The working method and time schedule of the evaluation were discussed and confirmed in the workshop. Further, the selection method of the institutions to be interviewed was agreed. The content of the interviews was also discussed as was the selection of partner countries where local interviews would take place. Those interviews would be conducted in Namibia and Zambia, since many Programme financed individual projects take place in these two countries.

The interim report was completed on March 17th, and submitted to the MFA, focusing on the evaluation process and methodology. An evaluation questionnaire was attached, forming the backbone for the interviews conducted (see Annex 2: Evaluation Issues).

The interviews by the Team members took place between March 3rd and 20th with the following organizations and bodies:

- CIMO
- MFA
- Helsinki Polytechnic, Stadia together with Seinäjoki Polytechnic
- Helsinki University (SSHK) together with Tampere University
- North Karelia University of Applied Sciences
- University of Oulu
- Pirkanmaa Polytechnic
- Tampere University of Technology
- Turku University
- Turku University of Applied Sciences
- University of Joensuu
- Programme Advisory Committee

The persons interviewed including the students are listed in the Annex 3.: Persons Interviewed in Finland between 3.3–13.3.2006.

The evaluation tender made by the Team included interviews in selected partner countries. The interviews in Namibia and Zambia were conducted by Ms. Iina Soiri and Dr. Pia Chuzu respectively during the month of March, 2006. The persons interviewed in Africa are listed in Annex 4.
Consultations about the preliminary findings were organized with the project coordinators as a part of the CIMO North-South Coordinators Workshop in Helsinki on April 3rd, 2006.

1.3. The evaluation methodology

The Team conquered the importance of interviewing not only the CIMO Advisory Committee and the MFA but also the institutions and persons involved in the Programme. The evaluation is about the Programme, not about the projects per se. However, it would be unrealistic to evaluate the Programme without a closer look at the projects under implementation. At the end of 2005, there were 22 on-going projects (note: the 23rd project was approved based on the 2006 call, the project had received funding for a preparatory mission already earlier).

Altogether about ten projects, which are a representative number of projects financed by the North-South programme, were chosen to be interviewed. The choice of projects was made on the basis of:

- Thematic/sector coverage
- Equal inclusion of both universities and polytechnics
- Inclusion of all possible network solutions, i.e. one partner in Finland – one partner in a developing country; one partner in Finland – multiple partners in developing countries; multiple partners in Finland – multiple partners in developing countries; multiple partners in Finland – one partner in a developing country
- Geographical coverage both in Finland and in partner countries
- Duration of the projects.

Interviews held in various universities and polytechnics included wherever possible:

- University leadership
- International relations management
- Academic coordinator of the project
- Administrative coordinator
- Finnish teachers who have been in exchange
- Visiting teachers
- Finnish students who have been in exchange
- Visiting students.

However, it was not always possible to include all of the categories listed above in all the interviews conducted. The list of persons met and interviewed is made available in Annex 3: Persons Interviewed in Finland between 3.3–13.3.2006.

The interviews were conducted in a form of discussions in which the evaluator asked about the project’s start, its linkages to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), implementation, administration, budget and finance, selection criteria of students and teachers, possible impact, future life span of the project. Also, the awareness raised by a project was discussed.

The Team received a number of newspaper clippings about the Programme or individual projects, along with at least one book published about exchange experiences of a Finnish exchange student in Zambia. A number of Finnish exchange students keep either a “blog” or www-pages about their experiences abroad.
2. CONTEXT

2.1. Finnish overall development policies

Finland, as an active and responsible participant of the international community, has fully assumed the MDGs as its reference point for its development co-operation. Thus the thrust of the Finnish policies is to promote development and a more equitable division of the benefits of globalization. The policies also seek for a broad national commitment and coherence in all policy areas. Partnerships based on participation by the public and private sectors and civil society, both at the national level and internationally, are seen as essential for fruitful and sustainable cooperation.

In the fields of education, research and culture Finland is committed to promoting the Education for All process and to support education sector programmes in development cooperation, emphasizing the development of basic education and exploiting the expertise of representatives of Finnish institutions. Finland has achieved a high standard of education and firmly believes that it is a central precondition and fundamental element of a well-functioning national economy. Finland supports education sector development in all of its long-term partner countries from the point of view of the MDGs; in addition education related bilateral cooperation is taking place in other eight countries. The major part of the support is channelled to primary education and a substantial part of the resources is channelled via Non-Governmental Organisations. The Programme under evaluation has a specific position in the Finnish development cooperation, since it is one of the rare support activities targeted to the tertiary education. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs has published an education strategy for Finland’s development cooperation; it can be obtained from the internet:

According to the Government resolution of 2004\(^2\) cooperation between the MFA, the MinEd and the NBE are important and thus should be increased. Also, the Finnish universities and HEIs are encouraged to invest in resources for the teaching and research of development issues. The same resolution encourages the institutes of higher education and research to seek mutual cooperation with organizations in developing countries. Furthermore, the resolution emphasizes the need for the (CIMO) to develop mobility and exchange programmes to promote cooperation among experts in Finland and in the developing countries.

In the area of development cooperation, Finland aims at adopting predictable long-term solutions, and communicates all activities and plans in a transparent manner. This applies both to the financing and contents of policy. To put this into practice, Finland has decided to cooperate with a number of countries on a more long-term basis. In the selection, there is a strong focus on Africa.

Finland’s long-term partner countries are Mozambique, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Zambia and Kenya in Africa; Nicaragua in Latin America; and Vietnam and Nepal in Asia. Finland wants to support equitable development in all of its long-term partner countries. In each country, specific forms of support are negotiated and agreed upon. In the co-operation, there is room for various types of actors, not only Government to Government type of support is foreseen but also Non

\(^2\) Development Policy, Government Resolution 5.2.2004, MFA
Governmental Organizations, (NGOs) and various types of institutions are encouraged to cooperate with partner countries.

According to the same Government resolution of 2004, Egypt, Namibia and Peru are countries whose economic development gives Finland an opportunity to move from relations where the emphasis is on development cooperation to more diversified cooperation and interaction. In addition, Finland is prepared to build new kinds of partnerships not only with the three transitional countries but with all its partner countries.

2.2. Finnish education policies

The Finnish MinEd is responsible for the national preparation of matters relating to education and training, culture and youth, certain fields of research and participation in international cooperation relating to them.

According to the Ministry’s information materials, the most important agencies in international cooperation in the Ministry’s sectors are international organisations based on intergovernmental agreements: the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), the Council of Europe and the Organisation for Economic Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the World Trade Organisation (WTO), and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). Nordic cooperation relating to culture, education and training is conducted within the scope of the Nordic Council of Ministers and its agencies, and the Nordic Cultural Fund. Important bodies in neighbouring area cooperation and in the northern dimension are the Baltic Sea Council, the Barents Euro-Arctic Council and the Arctic Council. General EU affairs are coordinated by the EU Desk at the MinEd.

Finland has concluded bilateral cultural agreements with 33 countries since 1937 and has exchange programmes based on these with 31 countries. In this context, culture is understood in its broad sense: these instruments concern education and training, science and scholarship, research, cultural heritage, libraries, non-governmental organisations, cultural institutes abroad, as well as sport and youth.

CIMO, established in 1991, is an organisation operating under the Finnish MinEd. It offers services to encourage cross-cultural communication, administers scholarship and exchange programmes, implements nearly all EU education, training, culture and youth programmes at the national level, advances teaching of Finnish language and culture in universities abroad and arranges summer courses in Finnish language and culture for international students. CIMO in practice manages the implementation of higher education sector international exchanges and mobility.

The traditional long-term objectives of Finnish education policy have been to raise the general standard of education and to promote educational equality. Efforts have been made to provide all population groups and regions of the country with equal educational opportunities. These are the basic tenets of the educational reforms carried out over the last few decades. Special attention is being paid to the content of education and the methods of instruction, as well as to educational standards and equality. Increasing overall flexibility and opportunities for individual choice are also considered important. In the recent years, internationalization has emerged as a key objective.

Moreover, Finland’s national objective is sustainable development and balanced societal and economic development. High employment, productivity, and competitiveness are key factors. A significant part of this is a high quality tertiary education system.
Recent policy decisions governing Finnish Higher Education can be summarized as follows:

- the enactment of new university legislation emphasizing universities’ autonomy as well as inducing them to diversify their funding base
- the introduction of the third mission in university legislation, relating to their regional role and responsibility
- the introduction of Bachelor's degrees in universities (Bologna process)
- the enactment of new polytechnic legislation, making them the second pillar of the Finnish tertiary education system
- a government resolution on the structural development of the public research system with the aim of intensifying research and development, increasing co-operation between different interests in the research system, as well as creating and reinforcing internationally competitive science and technology clusters

The ongoing policy directions can be summarized as follows:

- Strengthening cooperation between tertiary education institutions and forming new consortia between universities and polytechnics
- strengthening the development of internationally competitive universities
- using the emerging Master's programs as a way to attract international students to Finland, and exploring the possibility of charging fees for incoming students which would not only influence university financing but also social access to tertiary education
- intensifying internationalisation in HEI's by increasing the number of outgoing and incoming exchange students and number of foreign degree students. Measures will be taken to improve the possibilities, capabilities and mechanisms to enable foreign researchers to work in Finland. One of these measures is flexibility in the salary systems.
- The university sector will be developed into a world-class system in Finland’s areas of strength and which will continuously generate new research openings and initiatives.
- The HEI’s will have to combine their resources into larger entities and to boost networking, management and impact analysis. Universities will improve their international competitiveness by raising their profiles and by investing in high quality research across disciplinary borders and research personnel on an internationally recognised high standard.

The Education and Research 2003–2008 Development Plan, Publications of the Ministry of Education 2004:8 is based on the education and science policy objectives set in Prime Minister Vanhanen’s Government Programme and in the Government’s strategy document. It states that the Finnish higher education system forms a basis for a regionally comprehensive innovation system. The HE system is developed as an entity which is internationally competitive and responds flexibly to regional needs.

One major aim of the planning period is to strengthen the international activities of the HEI’s to improve the competitiveness in the international education market. Internationalization also responds to new knowledge requirements in research and the labour market. This entails that sufficient resources are allocated for international activities and that the statutes governing HEI’s are up to date. Finland must be an active player in the European HE and research area, and the opportunities available in the EU for developing the quality of higher education must be used in full.
The aim is that by the end of the present decade, 8000 polytechnic students and 6000 university students annually study a part of their degrees abroad and that a corresponding number of exchange students study in Finland. Polytechnics and universities will increase the number of foreign students to the extent that in 2008 there will be a total of 12 000 foreign degree students in Finland. To this end, the HEI’s will arrange foreign language programmes according to their own profiles. The HEI’s will increase international teacher exchanges and facilitate the recruitment of foreign teaching personnel.

Russia is one of the foremost partners for Finland. Russia-related expertise must be further strengthened in Finland and HEIs need to increase their cooperation with Russian HEIs. Nordic cooperation will be built on the existing strong basis. The aim is to strengthen cooperation with North America and expand interaction with countries in Asia, Latin America and Africa. The prerequisites of HEIs to participate in development cooperation projects will be strengthened.

2.3 International Trends

Higher Education faces big challenges in the 21st century, particularly from the thrust towards globalization. According to the Spanish sociologist Manuel Castells, one of the leading authorities on Globalization, effects on the universities by globalization will be more profound and far-reaching than industrialization, urbanization and secularization combined.  Castells claims that the biggest challenge the university as an institution has faced for more than a century and a half is globalization. Increasing internationalization has been a major trend identified in higher education over the past two decades. This entails student and teaching staff mobility, internationalization of curriculum, development of foreign language study programmes for international students, as well as the internationalization of study experience at home. In the European Union, the internationalization process has been spearheaded by programmes like ERASMUS and Leonardo. Mechanisms such as ECTS (European Credit Transfer System) to support student mobility and transferability of credits have been developed.

The strong push for a European Higher Education Area led to the Bologna Process during the late 1990’s. The expressed goals of the Bologna Process are to increase the mobility and employability of European higher education, thereby maintaining competitiveness on a global scale. Mobility in the European Higher Education Area is only possible if credits are transferable and degrees are internationally recognized. Key components are ECTS and the Joint European Diploma Supplement, both initially developed as a part of the ERASMUS mobility programme. The Bologna Process introduced the bachelor’s and master’s degrees as the basis for degrees in European higher education institutions. The Bologna Process has spread to countries beyond the European Union and the original signatories of the agreement. A degree reform is underway in, for example Russia, based on the Bologna two-step degree model.

A strong trend in recent years has been the ‘massification’ of Higher Education where an increasing proportion of the population has access to higher education. The Society for College and University Planning has noted that the number of tertiary students worldwide doubled in size between 1975 and 1995 from 40.3 million to 80.5 million. The demand for access to higher education is high everywhere. Until recently, many European countries educated only a small portion of the relevant age group in universities, and expansion has been rapid as universities struggle to meet the demand. The United States educates close to half of its college-age population. In Europe, the proportions until recently were 20 percent or less. Now, the participation rate is growing, placing tremendous pressures on academic institutions.
Through massification and technological innovation, alternative forms of providing higher education have emerged. According to Guy Neave, International Association of Universities Director of Research, the new generation of alternative forms of higher education have redefined the three basic unities of the historic university – the unity of the student age range, of place of study, and pace of study.

Two major types of alternative forms of higher education are now prevalent: enterprise universities and virtual universities. The Enterprise university relies on a clear link between higher education (and applied research) and the industry who benefits. In this system learning is injected into the productive sector rather than serving it from outside through external linkages. This has posed questions about academic freedom that extend beyond enterprise universities and affect higher education as a whole.

Virtual education or e-learning has become part of the planning agenda for most organizations concerned with education and educational outreach. Virtual Universities are the most radical development in the realm of alternative providers, since they cater to a dispersed student body as well as a dispersed teaching staff and, sometimes, also completely dispersed organization and management. Virtual universities give an entirely new meaning to HEIs as a community.

As virtual education and information technology continue to expand, there is a growing trend for educational divergence termed ‘the digital divide.’ The divide is created by developed countries employing innovative methods based around information technology that emerging economic countries do not yet have the capacity to support.

Finally, there are strong trends, again strongly linked to globalization and massification of higher education, that have to do with funding of higher education. There is a move towards privatizing higher education. Private higher education has expanded in many countries to provide access to large numbers without a rise in public funding by shifting the monetary burden to the student. We have seen a marked shift in how higher education is provided in Southeast Asia, but this trend extends internationally.

Discussions are underway in other European countries, and it seems only a matter of time until Europe’s public universities charge tuition. This change is the result of a combination of demographic pressures, fiscal realities, and reinvigorated conservative ideas about public spending in Europe. In the United States, the private system of higher education is already well developed seeing 20 percent of the student population attending private universities where they shoulder most of the educative costs.

Higher Education Institutional development, especially in Russia and Latin America, has been largely with this idea of privatisation in mind. The new institutions tend to be vocationally oriented and specialize in fields where the cost of offering instruction is fairly low and the demand is high, such as management studies or computer technology. The quality of many of these universities is, at best, untested, and at worst highly questionable. New private colleges and universities are absorbing the demand for higher education, with few questions asked.

---

5 The Changing Faces of Virtual Education. Dr. Glen Farrell, Study Team Leader and Editor © The Commonwealth of Learning, 2001 ISBN: 1-895369-75-4
3. ISSUES UNDER EVALUATION

3.1. Relevance to Strategic Goals

The Programme started with a three-year pilot phase aimed at developing the educational network co-operation between Finnish and developing country HEIs. During the pilot phase, the Programme was limited to co-operation with Sub-Saharan African countries and two other countries, namely Egypt and Peru. The rationale for this selection was the poor availability of funding for mobility programmes with the Sub-Saharan African countries in question and the need for developing new co-operation mechanisms for Egypt and Peru during their transitional situation as Finland’s development co-operation partners. Already at the planning phase it was noted that in case the Programme is continued after the pilot phase, the widening of the Programme for all Development Assistance Committee (DAC) classified developing countries should be considered.

According to the Programme Document, the plan was to start the pilot with the six-month preparatory phase. However, the pilot started with immediate implementation upon the signing of the necessary agreements. This resulted in some of the planning being ad hoc: guidelines were not developed up front (including Programme information materials and project selection criteria and monitoring tools) but were produced along the process.

Objectives and Purposes

The overall objective set for the Programme is to support the goals of Finnish development cooperation: alleviation of widespread poverty, prevention of global environmental threats and promotion of equality, democracy and human rights, by improving developing country capacities and abilities in their higher education sectors through long term co-operation between Finnish and developing country higher education institutions. The programme also aims at developing good governance, exchanging best practices, including improving the students’ democracy, and building capacity between the networking partners.

The purpose for the three-year pilot phase, as identified in the Programme Document, is to stimulate internationalisation and improve the quality of higher education in the developing countries and in Finland and establishing the necessary funding mechanism. The projects to be financed by the program were based on the following principles:

- A project between partner institutions includes reciprocal mobility and co-operation of teachers and students, based on joint educational efforts which contribute to the needs of developing countries.
- The studies carried out under the Programme shall be fully credited in the home institution
- The funding will cover only the travel and additional living costs of the persons participating in the Programme.

As defined by the Programme Document, the following results are expected from the pilot phase:

1. Improved developing country educational capacities and enhanced abilities of developing country teachers and students in sectors which contribute to the economic development and welfare of developing countries
2. The implementation of the partnership on the institutional level
3. The increased mobility of teachers and students between south and north
4. An efficient financing, management and monitoring system
5. A user-friendly information system established at CIMO for the Higher Education Network Programme. The information system will also cover potential EU-funds aimed at co-operation of higher education institutions between EU and developing countries.
6. Information packages and training programmes for cultural adaptation and development co-operation developed for the Finnish students and teachers participating in the Programme. In addition, information packages on Finnish society will be developed for students and teachers travelling to Finland.

Approximately 220 students and 65 teachers from the developing countries and 140 Finnish students and 45 teachers have participated in the mutual projects by the end of the pilot phase. The objectives and their respective indicators were presented in a logical framework matrix as an Annex 5: Logical framework matrix to the Programme Document.

3.2. Partners and Participation

The active stakeholders of the Programme include the Finnish Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Education at the central government level, CIMO at the authority level and a number of universities and polytechnics at the operational level. The universities and polytechnics level stakeholders include not only students and teachers in exchange but also top management, academic and administrative coordinators at project level, as well as international relations managers in the central administration. It can be said that the Programme reaches from the very student level up to the level where policies on development cooperation or education policies are made. Also, the student organizations are actively participating in the management of the Programme.

The role of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is naturally very different from the Ministry of Education, since MFA is the financier of the Programme and MinEd. is a member of the Advisory Committee. In the AC work MFA has obtained a veto right for itself if needed. MFA has chosen to be an active partner in the AC work and thus to participate in Programme development and implementation together with the other AC members. MFA has an obligation to monitor the Programme in a similar fashion it has for all activities it finances from the ODA budget. The role of the various actors, including that of MFA and CIMO, is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.3. of this report.

Project partnerships

The individual project partnerships (individual networks) were initiated with an open call from CIMO for project applications to the HEI’s in Finland. The Finnish institutions used their internal information channels to inform about the call in addition to the general information from CIMO. In most cases, in forming the partnerships the Finnish institutions in turn contacted their existing partners in those developing countries which were qualified for the financing from the Programme. Finnish HEI’s have much cooperation also with HEI’s in developing countries which are not eligible for financing from this Programme, particularly in Asia.

The Programme participation does not give a comprehensive overview of all the existing partnerships with developing country HEIs. The interest in the Programme was immediately extremely high with out of the initial 77 applications, only 20 receiving funding. This is proof
of extensive cooperation between Finnish and developing country HEI’s despite the fact that no special national funding instruments for such cooperation had existed previously.

Types of networks
The Programme allows for a variety of types of network cooperation. Individual projects have a Finnish lead partner. In a network, there might be more than just one Finnish partner. The number of partner institutions in developing countries does vary also. It can be stated that each project has formed a network arrangement best fitted for it purposes. Out of the 23 projects presently financed:

- 6 have one partner in Finland and one partner in a developing country
- 4 have one partner in Finland and three partners in developing countries
- 3 have one partner in Finland and four partners in developing countries
- 3 have one partner in Finland and two partners in developing countries
- 2 have two partners in Finland and one partner in a developing country
- 2 have two partners both in Finland and in developing countries
- 2 have three partners both in Finland and in developing countries
- 1 project (namely Health Africa) has ten partners in Finland and two partners in developing countries.

Both polytechnics and universities are eligible to participate in the Programme. Of the total 23 projects that are funded during the pilot, 9 are coordinated by polytechnics and 14 by universities. The total number of Finnish partners in the networks is 28; 13 of these are polytechnics and 15 are universities. The list of all the Partners participating in the pilot phase is given in Annex 6: Partners. The geographical distribution of the present Finnish partners is presented below. The second picture below presents the cooperation partners in Africa together with the lead HEIs in Finland. The maps show good geographical distribution for the most part. However, as is readily evident from the map, many of the same institutions are involved in multiple programs; of the institutional participations over half (22) are centered in 5 cities. While this is not necessarily a fault (due to population distribution), more emphasis should be placed on trying to get a larger number of HEIs in Finland involved in the North-South Higher Education Programme. There is very little participation north of Oulu and this is something that should be addressed for the future of the program.

Figure 1: Geographical Distribution of Finnish Partners
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Figure 2: Number of Projects in African Partner Countries with Lead HEIs in Finland

From the pictures it can be noted that the most popular partner countries are South Africa, Zambia, Namibia, Kenya, Tanzania and Mozambique. The active countries are the ones where also the official Finnish development cooperation takes place. Ethiopia is an exception in this respect to this programme. It is understandable that it can be easier to organize the practicalities in a country where Finland has formal representation than in a country where there is no official Finnish representation. This has been the case for example with visa applications in Malawi. On the other hand there are no French speaking countries involved in the Programme. Peru is the only country active outside Africa, the sole individual project in implementation is the one between University of Turku and its two partners in Peru.

3.3. Programme Model and Organization

The Programme functions as a framework programme for individual projects i.e. HE partnerships between Finnish institutions and institutions in developing countries, focussing on teacher and student mobility. The Programme gives general goals and objectives for the framework and the projects are responsible for carrying out these objectives.

The Programme Document defines the programme in two components: general Programme administration and mobility implemented at the individual project level. The responsibility for the Programme is shared – depending on the component – between CIMO and the Advisory Committee on the one hand and CIMO and participating institutions on the other.

Role of CIMO

According to the Programme Document CIMO is responsible for the practical development and management of the Programme. After developing the mechanisms, CIMO’s coordinating and managerial tasks include:
• Marketing and informing about the Programme
• Organizing the application processes
• Appraising the applications and processing the funding proposals for the Advisory Committee
• Handling the disbursements to the participating institutions
• Reporting to the Advisory Committee
• Based on the requests and needs, providing guidance to interested parties
• Organizing training courses for the Finnish students (and teachers) participating in the programme.

An official assignment between MFA and CIMO was signed on March 11th, 2004 for the period of December 1st, 2003 to December 31st, 2006. The Programme Document was annexed to that agreement. In principle the tasks listed in the Programme Document were also listed and described in more detail in the signed agreement. An important addition though, is the one which defines the CIMO’s authority to make decisions on the Programme. CIMO makes decisions on the implementation of the Programme based on the recommendations of the AC. If, for any given reason, CIMO would like make a decision against the AC recommendation on the selection of the individual projects, it has to seek for MFA’s approval for this. In the agreement it was stated also that CIMO would notify relevant people in the MFA and the relevant Finnish Representations in partner countries the names and specifics of all Programme participants in order them to apply for visas.

In addition, the assignment stated that CIMO should prepare annual reports based on reports collected from individual projects including and their use of Programme funding along with the Programme level financial reports and audits as well as monitoring reports.

Advisory Committee

According to the Programme Document an Advisory Committee would be established to coordinate the Programme at the higher level. It would be responsible for the general coordination of the programme as well as for the actual decisions on the approved scholarships. The Advisory Committee was also expected to commence the evaluation of the programme during the third year of the pilot phase. However, for the present external evaluation the actor has been MFA. (see Annex 7: Advisory Committee meeting March 20th, 2006)

Indeed, the AC was established at the very early stage of the Programme and the following organizations are represented in the Committee:

• Ministry for Foreign Affairs
• Ministry of Education
• Rectors’ councils of universities and polytechnics
• Representatives of Finnish student organizations (SYL and SAMOK)
• CIMO, Chairman and secretary.

The AC has met about three times a year. It has been presented by CIMO among other issues about the application process related matters including launching the calls and project selection. AC prepared in spring 2004 the project selection criteria which CIMO is expected to follow when it prepares for the project approval.
Because CIMO is an official authority by law it cannot authorize any other body to make decisions on its behalf; therefore the foreseen role for the AC as the highest decision making body in the Programme implementation was unrealistic and against the Finnish law. AC may only advise CIMO on its implementation of the Programme.

MFA has a special position, as the financier, in the AC; it has obtained a veto right for the AC work.

Role of the Higher Education Institutions
According to the Programme Document the partner institutions are responsible for the actual planning and implementation of the programme. Their tasks include the following:

- Planning the individual mobility processes
- Informing the students and departments about the possibilities of the programme
- Organising the actual mobility activities and taking care of the all related practicalities
- Monitoring the implementation of the institution’s specific mobility activities and reporting about them to CIMO
- Briefing the students and teachers (both out-going and in-coming) about the studies, practical arrangements, cultural issues, etc.
- Identification and information of potential EU funds for student and teacher mobility with developing countries

The Programme coordination at the HEI level involved several types of coordinators:

- Academic coordinators at the department level
- Administrative coordinators at the department level
- Institutional International relations personnel responsible for coordination international projects at the central level

The Finnish partner institutions were expected to take care of the financial management of its mobility activities. Thereby, the institution’s administration would channel the funds to the departments and/or students and teachers as well as pay the scholarships to the visiting teachers and students.

The participating HEIs themselves have determined the role of the project coordinators (administrative and academic) and the role of the central administration in the project management. The roles in the funds and project management vary from institution to institution and project to project. In some institutions some project funds management is handled from the central administration whereas others are handled at the department level.

The international relations managers at central administration in the Finnish HEIs who coordinate the institutions’ international activities in general have a key role in distributing information about the Programme to the eligible departments and faculty. In some cases they stay involved in the Programme implementation whereas in others they only serve as the conduits of information from CIMO on Programme calls etc.
3.4. Implementation and Coordination

The programme is managed and implemented through the following arrangements:

CIMO
CIMO has a dual role in the Programme: on the one hand CIMO participates in and organizes the Advisory Committee’s work and on the other hand CIMO is the glue for the project implementation. In real terms, CIMO has been proactive in the early planning processes for the decisions on the creation of the Programme and now coordinates the decision making-processes for the Programme implementation (for example selection of Projects) as well as the day-to-day practical implementation of the Programme with the HEI’s.

The Director of CIMO acts as Chair of the Advisory Committee. CIMO also provides the Secretary for the Committee as well as handles all the document preparations, including preparing the agenda and proposals, for the Committee decisions.

The Programme Document defines CIMO’s responsibilities as:

• The practical development and management of the Programme.
• Marketing and informing about the Programme
• Organising the application processes
• Appraising the applications and processing the funding proposals for the Advisory Committee
• Handling the disbursements to the participating institutions
• Monitoring the execution of the Programme
• Reporting to the Advisory Committee
• Based on the requests and needs, providing guidance to interested parties
• Organising training courses for the Finnish students (and teachers) participating in the Programme.

As CIMO already manages several EU, Nordic and national mobility programmes, CIMO has a high capacity to manage this kind of a Programme. CIMO is the obvious Programme implementer of the possible stakeholders in Finland.

Advisory Committee
The Advisory Committee launched the Programme calls (four calls in total), created the criteria for Project selection, approved the Projects to be funded based on allocation proposals composed by CIMO, and monitored the development of the Programme. The Advisory Committee was also proactive in organizing the Programme evaluation as a two-step process, consisting of an internal evaluation followed by an external one. The internal evaluation was conducted as a part of the application process for the 2006 Project financing.

The Advisory Committee endorses the Programme’s main directions and provides guidance for the Programme’s future development.

The Advisory Committee has met three times annually. Each meeting is called together once there is a sufficient and meaningful agenda for discussion.
Role of the Higher Education Institutions
The partner institutions are responsible for the actual planning and implementation of the Programme. Their tasks include the following:

- Planning the individual mobility processes
- Informing the students and departments about the possibilities of the programme
- Organising the actual mobility activities and taking care of the all related practicalities
- Monitoring the implementation of the institution’s specific mobility activities and reporting about them to CIMO
- Briefing the students and teachers (both outgoing and incoming) about the studies, practical arrangements, cultural issues, etc.
- Identification and information of potential EU funds for student and teacher mobility with developing countries

The Finnish partner institutions take care of the financial management of their mobility activities. Therefore, the institution’s administration channels the funds to the departments and/or students and teachers as well as pays the grants to the visiting teachers and students. The Finnish partner institutions cannot cover the cost of substitute teachers out of the Programme funds.

In practice, the Finnish partner institutions have also taken the responsibility for informing about the Programme inside the institutions, to the partners in developing countries as well as the general public. The motivation level in the partner institutions for looking after this aspect was high in many cases. However, as there initially was little Programme level information or guidance for Communication and Outreach activities, the quality of the materials developed at Project level differed from Project to Project. Also, the intensity of focus on information dissemination varied.

3.5. Information dissemination and Communications, Media relations

CIMO, as the implementing agency for the Programme, was given a coordination role and budget for informing about the Programme to eligible partners as well as informing the general public about the Programme and its progress.

The primary channels utilized by CIMO for informing about the Programme were the following:

- Campus, CIMO’s web-based newsletter
- Announcements through CIMO’s listservers for university and polytechnic international relations managers: campo and cimeoni
- The CIMO website: http://www.cimo.fi
- Discover Finland website: http://finland.cimo.fi
- Press releases
- The NORTH-SOUTH Higher Education Network Programme brochure (in English)
- A printed one-page leaflet in two languages (Finnish, English) with Programme information
- Information sessions in the Finnish HE cooperation events for international relations managers
Also the MFA announced the first call for projects in the Programme with a press release.\(^7\)

As the Programme implementation was commenced with a first call for applications, very soon after the funding decisions were made, and little information material was available up front. CIMO used the existing network of international relations contact persons in the HEI’s in Finland to inform about the Programme and the application procedures. Also, the basic information about the Program objectives and application procedures were made available on the web. Using the existing channels was very effective, and information about the new Program and the pilot was disseminated very effectively to the institutions which in turn informed the relevant departments.

As the goal was to establish partnerships with HEI’s in developing countries the fact that information for the first call was only available in Finnish was a problem. Information materials about the Programme were developed by participating institutions either at the institution level or at an individual project level rather than at CIMO. This resulted in a great variety in the level and quality of information materials used and some inefficiency in the use of resources. It would not have been possible for the participating institutions to invite foreign partners to the projects without materials either in English, Spanish, Portuguese or French.

The general information materials were then developed by CIMO to serve a variety of audiences. A logo for the Programme was developed and a print brochure was produced. The quality of the materials was good, although the overall volume of material available on the program was not in proportion to the funds allocated for this activity. The general look and feel of the print materials was very subdued.

Projects have produced project-specific information materials for implementation purposes. Often existing channels for informing students were used.

CIMO has been proactive in informing the media about the Programme since its inception. A good example is the article in the Vieraskynä column of Helsingin Sanomat by Maija Airas, the programme coordinator at CIMO.\(^8\) Several articles on the Programme and specific projects appeared in the CIMO newsletter Campus. Furthermore, Projects produced their own press releases and articles for local papers and area-specific publications.

CIMO used its general website (www.cimo.fi) to distribute and store information about the Programme electronically. The CIMO website index page does not contain a direct link to the North-South Program. Instead, one needs to scroll through the ‘Quick Links’ until the Student Scholarship area and then the North-South Programme link are found. Once on the North-South Program index page, the interface suggests it is only for University administrators. The only information for students is contained under the sub-heading ‘Activities’ and can be easily overlooked. There is no link to what institutions are involved or with what countries.

When tested by a student, it proved difficult to find information on the Programme using an internet search engine (www.google.com). Several search prompts were used and yielded very sparse and sporadic results concerning the Programme. Even when the name of the program and administrator were searched (‘CIMO North-South Higher Education Program’) no direct

\(^7\) Press Release 66/2004; 16.3.2004

\(^8\) Maija Airas "Koulutus ei ole mikä tahansa kansainvälinen kauppataava." Helsingin Sanomat, Vieraskynä 19.2.2006
link to the North-South Program information page was provided. Instead, more navigation was required, usually through the CIMO website itself.

There is a search page at www.cimo/Resource.php/cimo/maatietopankki.htm. However, there is no link to it from any of the English pages. This makes sense as the search page is entirely in Finnish and has no English component.

These findings show that it is very difficult for a student, who is unaware of the CIMO North-South Higher Education Program, to discover it. A recommendation would be to ensure that common search queries yield a direct link to the Program index page. However, the Program index page itself is confusing. The page gives general information about the program, but has no student area and no component for searching, in English, for what institutions or African Countries are involved. A recommendation would be to make the Program page more student-friendly by providing a student page or area where there is information on how to get involved and links to past examples of exchanges such as blogs, student pages, etc. Another recommendation is that a search page for finding information on who are the institutions and countries involved should be provided (in English) with a direct link from the Program index page.

Many Projects have created websites for the projects. Also, several students are maintaining websites or blogs about their experience. It was impossible for the evaluators to search out blogs or student-designed web pages about the Programme using a search engine. A system for students to link their blogs/web pages to the CIMO North-South Programme site would provide useful information that prospective students can easily access information on how other students have found the exchange program to work.

3.6. Project Selection Criteria

The goals and objectives for the Pilot Phase are dictated in the Programme Document. Consequently, the Programme’s project selection criteria have to be built on the objectives defined in the Programme Document.

The Document itself does not provide detailed project selection criteria. The Pilot implementation began with a call for project proposals (to be received in CIMO by April 23, 2004) to the HEI’s without communicated selection criteria.

The Advisory Committee developed the first set of selection criteria for the purpose of the selection process in their meeting on May 17, 2004. The criteria are as follows:

- project has a clear development cooperation focus
- regional balance between partner countries
- regional balance in Finland
- projects in areas with particular Finnish know-how
- avoidance of overlap of funding
- reliable partners: experience and contractual basis for partnerships
- expansive networks not a prerequisite
- pure research outside the scope of the Programme although a foundation for projects
- reciprocity
In the second round, the selection criteria were clearly communicated to the applicants and the applications were based on a form that asked the projects to describe the project in relation to each of the project criterion.

The selection criteria are clear and justified. However, no differentiation is made between programme level criteria (for example balance on national level) and project level criteria (reliability of partnership, quality of planning, coverage). The criteria did not touch upon the field of the project and therefore the relevance of the topic/field for the economic development of the partner country was not addressed.

The selection criteria favour projects that are based on existing cooperation arrangements and partnerships. There are no criteria that focus on the quality of the partnership as such, for example the innovative nature of the cooperation.

Selection Criteria for Students and Teachers
The Programme did not introduce Programme level student or teacher selection criteria. The participating HEI’s have extensive experience with international student and staff mobility programmes, and often saw it natural to develop transparent project level selection criteria. A good example is the Tili-Tonse project’s selection criteria.

Selection of Students
Each student will make an application for the study period in English. The application would include at least the following:

- the reasons to apply (interest, aims)
- how the study period is linked to the personal study plan and future plan for employment
- personal aims for studies and tentative study and work plan for the period
- personal preparation plan
- how do I share my experience: plan for documentation and distribution of learning
- strategy for funding (personal budget)
- analysis of one's health, social situation and language skills
- a statement of the student from the tutor teacher as an attachment

Criteria for selection:

- a good pass of the student’s studies so far
- personal application will be in coherence with the personal study plan of the student
- adequate spoken and written English
- professional motivation and social ability (representing profession, institute and Finland)
- coping strategies for adapting into different work and/or cultural environments
- no considerable health risks (physical or mental)
- commitment to the exchange.

Again, in the example of Tili-Tonse, the students from Zambia were selected by the University of Zambia based on mutually agreed criteria. Some projects had jointly developed student selection criteria, in others the detailed criteria used by the partners was not known to the Finnish partners.
3.7. Project budget and funding model

Project budget

The financial frame for the pilot phase of the Programme is set for 2,542,000 € and is fully funded by the Finnish MFA. Participating educational institutions have mostly given in-kind contributions such as organizing outgoing and incoming students' scholarship arrangements, organizing substitute teachers for the outgoing ones, giving guidance for the participants and taking care of other practical procedures. The Programme budget does not give any estimates for anything else than MFA funded items. Therefore, it is not possible to estimate the total budget of the Programme. In this special case, there is little difference on how the HEIs in Finland presently operate. However, there are serious efforts ongoing in HEI accounting systems to clearly show the in-kind contributions for such externally funded projects.

The Programme budget is defined in the Programme Document; however, the instructions for the financial reporting have not been clearly spelt out in the Programme Document. Therefore, the budget analysis has been a challenging task for both evaluators and auditors. The Programme audit took place by the KMPG in March 2006. According to the audit report, the financial reporting has not been adequate enough for the financier (i.e. MFA) to follow the Programme expenditures on a level which would have been beneficial for the Programme monitoring. The auditors did from their part reconstruct the budget expenditures for the years 2004–2005 on the basis of the information they collected mainly from CIMO. Their analytical work has been utilized by the evaluators in this chapter.

According to the Programme budget, the MFA annual allocations which are ODA classified are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>34,000 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>800,000 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>852,000 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>856,000 €</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Programme budget 2003–2006, €

The budget is divided into budget lines for each year. The main budget lines include:

- Preparatory missions;
- Teacher mobility;
- Student mobility; and
- Programme administration.

In the Programme document, which is the guidelines for the implementation, each budget line (BL) has been further divided into various activities. CIMO does not report every budget component as its own. CIMO states that it has not received any detailed instructions for the reporting in the course of the implementation. It has chosen to use the same kind of financial
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reporting as it applies to the other authority levels of cooperation in Finland. An additional
difficulty is that the financial reporting CIMO receives on the individual projects from the
HEIs follows the academic years rather than calendar years. Furthermore, there is one more
difficulty in the accounting at the CIMO level: the universities are reimbursed annually on the
basis of the expenses occurred, but the polytechnics are in principle in a position that they
receive their total Programme budget when their individual projects are approved.

The level CIMO follows and reports budget expenditures is only that of administrative costs
and mobility costs. For example, there is no knowledge of how much is spent each year on
student mobility or teacher mobility, not to mention that there would not be any sector or
gender aggregated expenditure data. According to CIMO, money has been transferred between
the BLs during the implementation. Information on these transfers was not accessible for the
evaluators.

Taking into consideration all of the above, it appears to be difficult to judge if the programme
budget has been allocated as planned. CIMO monitors and conducts internal audits on the
programmes under its implementation; however the North-South Programme has not been
audited internally as yet.

Programme administration budget
The only funding for the programme administration has been allocated for CIMO. The
administrative expenses were foreseen to be 20 percent of the total budget. In the Programme
document, it was designed that a Programme manager will be recruited on a full-time basis to
manage the Programme. In addition, it was foreseen that about 0.5 person years of additional
assistance would be needed annually. In the budget, administration includes personnel costs,
sub-consultancies, information costs and other costs including travel and overhead.

In the table below there are budgeted administration costs compared with the actual costs.

Table 2: Administration budget 2003 – 2006, €

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006,</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted</td>
<td>34 000</td>
<td>189 000</td>
<td>135 000</td>
<td>135 000</td>
<td>493 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual11</td>
<td>77 226</td>
<td>90 307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The administration budget has not been used as agreed in the Programme documents. But, the
total use of administrative funds has been planned by CIMO to increase significantly towards
end of the pilot phase. In practice, personal costs are only now reaching the level planned, as
foreseen in the pro doc (i.e. 1.5 person years annually). In the year 2004, up to 50 000 € were
allocated for information purposes. The annual allocations from thereafter have been 15 000 €
according to the plan. The utilization of the information budget line has been more modest
than planned because the Programme did not require the kind of marketing that was initially
envisioned.
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However, there are additional administrative costs at the institution level, which are typically financed from the budgets of each participating HEI in Finland. The resources of various institutions differ depending on their total budgets and their resources allocated for internationalization. However, a more serious problem has risen in the partner countries. During the pilot phase, it has become obvious that some of the difficulties in the implementation are due to the lack of administrative resources in the partner universities. In many of the partner universities, there are no formalized international exchange coordination personnel or units or these units are not fully operational.

Scholarship funding model
According to the Programme Document, three types of funding are made available. These are as follows:

- Teacher scholarship
- Student scholarship
- Grant for a planning trip.

It is not possible to estimate how much has been spent this far on each of the funding types. CIMO has kept records only on an individual project level, meaning that each individual project is a cost centre and the expenses, whether they are student, teacher or administration related, are considered as one only expenditure event and thus not examined separately. The budget during 2004 and 2005, according to the financial reporting, has been seriously under spent. One reason for the obvious under spending is the fact that the universities need time for their student and teacher exchange implementation; also the universities are reimbursed annually and only after the relevant expenditures occur. The CIMO financial reporting does not clearly reflect the amounts allocated and spent annually, since according to CIMO and the auditors the budget is fully allocated and will be spent fully. Yet, it seems that the last expenditures from the pilot phase budget will be reimbursed only in late 2007 due to the timeliness of mobility and the universities’ billing procedures.

Table 3: Mobility budgets 2003 – 2006 and allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006,</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted teacher mobility, €</td>
<td>120 000</td>
<td>160 000</td>
<td>160 000</td>
<td>440 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted student mobility, €</td>
<td>401 000</td>
<td>517 000</td>
<td>496 000</td>
<td>1 414 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted preparatory missions, €</td>
<td>90 000</td>
<td>40 000</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>150 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted total, €</td>
<td>611 000</td>
<td>717 000</td>
<td>676 000</td>
<td>2 004 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual12, €</td>
<td>273 586</td>
<td>542 727</td>
<td>816 313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4: Difference between budgeted and actual expenditures 1.1.2004 – 31.12.2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All in euros (Table prepared by the Auditors)</th>
<th>MFA approved budget (max) for the pilot phase</th>
<th>Actual expenditures 1.1.2004 – 31.12.2005</th>
<th>Difference between budgeted and actual</th>
<th>Scholarships approved 2004 – 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel related expenditure, total</td>
<td>216 000</td>
<td>126 469</td>
<td>89 531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administrative expenditures, total</td>
<td>277 000</td>
<td>41 604</td>
<td>235 395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenditures, total</td>
<td>493 000</td>
<td>168 073</td>
<td>324 927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation 2006</td>
<td>25 000</td>
<td>816 313</td>
<td>1 187 687</td>
<td>2 121 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships, total</td>
<td>2 004 000</td>
<td>1 187 687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error in the Programme Document</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2 542 000</td>
<td>984 386</td>
<td>1 557 614</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT, total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMO billed from MFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>989 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the approved funding for 2004 – 2006 is added altogether then the amount exceeds the budgeted amount by approximately 100 000 euros. Some 60 percent of this amount is from the unused funds approved for scholarships in 2004. The difference between the budgeted and actually spent scholarship funding is 1 187 687 euros. In 2006, scholarships worth of some 800 000 euros have been approved. Out of the scholarships approved in 2004 and 2005, the HEIs have about 400 000 euros still unbilled and unreported.

The grant for teacher mobility
The following principles should be applied in teacher mobility:

- The visiting teacher will carry out a concrete or another educational programme in the host institution. The course shall be included in the host department’s curriculum and it will be credited in the host institution accordingly.
- Special attention has to be paid to ensure that the visits of the developing country teachers to Finland must contribute to the economic development and welfare of the developing
countries as their main objective. The visits have to strengthen the capacities of the developing country educational institutions.

• The nature of the visits of developing country teachers to Finland should concentrate on improving and enhancing the teacher's personal capacities as well as the institutional capacities of his/her institution.

• Teaching periods may last between two to eight weeks.

The programme may provide the following financing:

• Travel cost: Lump sum 1 500 €
• A per diem for accommodation and living costs: a lump sum of 2 500 €.

There is no additional funding for a HEI to substitute a teacher visiting the partner institution.

**The grant for student mobility**

The main component of the programme is the student exchange. It provides students with the possibility to participate in study programmes in partner institutions. The studies' objective must be to contribute to the economic development and welfare of developing countries.

There are a number of conditionalities set for the student exchange; namely that:

• The study period should be included into the student’s academic studies in the out-sending institution and credited accordingly.

• The period of studies may be one or two academic terms. Only full-time studies are supported.

• The students must have studied at least one year at the out-sending institution.

• The studies of the Finnish students in the partner institution must support the economic development and welfare of the developing countries.

• The studies of the Finnish students in the partner institutions must contribute to the economic development and welfare of the developing countries. This goal places special demands on the practical arrangements of the Finnish students’ studies and related activities.

• All Finnish students have to undergo a training prior to leaving for their period.

The funding will cover the costs as the following:

• Travel costs: a lump sum of 1 200 € per student.
• A per diem for accommodation and living cost: 600 € per month per student coming to Finland.
• A per diem for accommodation and living cost: 400 € per month per an out-going Finnish student.

There have been a lot of complaints that student mobility funds are inadequate. This is especially the case for flight tickets. The prices of flight tickets have been in many cases more than 1 200 €. Sometimes, when incoming students have had to pay more than 1 200 €, administrative coordinators have used a part of their budgeted accommodation and living costs to cover the excess amount. However, the above described arrangements do not happen in all occasions, since they are administratively cumbersome. At least one occasion when there were no flight tickets available with 1 200 €, and the student or the out-sending institution could not afford the extra costs, the student cancelled his/her arrival to Finland.
Flight ticket prices have been rather stable since 2003, but they vary depending where they purchased (in Finland or in a partner country) and also on the time of the year they are purchased. It appears to be more expensive to arrive for the beginning of the Finnish spring season, since the proximity of Christmas effects the flight ticket prices. Many of the universities and polytechnics have decided to use the e-tickets as often as possible to find reasonably priced tickets.

Since in many of the project reports there were complaints that the grant of 600 € per month was not enough for incoming students, the evaluation team requested a tentative budget for an incoming student to be prepared by Pirkanmaa Polytechnics using as an example of a student arriving from Mozambique to Tampere. The flight ticket price is appr. 1 400 € (200 € will deducted from the monthly grant).

Table 5: Example of an Incoming Students’ Monthly Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Student’s monthly budget</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent (TOAS)</td>
<td>185 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly bus ticket</td>
<td>33 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>(20 x 2,35 €) - 47 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid-phone card</td>
<td>50 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery etc.</td>
<td>20 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and other basics needed</td>
<td>200 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>535 €</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investments at arrival</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership fee for the SYL 15</td>
<td>77 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit for the Survival Kit which includes linen and some dishes</td>
<td>50 € (out of which 40 € will be returned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit for the bus card</td>
<td>6,70 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used cell phone</td>
<td>30 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic winter clothes</td>
<td>200 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic household items for cleaning etc.</td>
<td>50 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>413,70 €</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grant for a planning trip

Finnish institutions may apply for planning trips between the cooperating partners. The funding is provided as a lump sum of 2 000 € per planning trip per person. For one partnership, two planning trips may be applied for: one trip from Finland and one trip to Finland. The lump sum is expected to cover travel and accommodation. Finnish institutions can apply for the grant.
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The planning trips which should be carried out by the professors/teachers responsible for the actual exchange are defined in the projects document as follows:

- Detailed contents and academic issues related to the programme (courses, execution of the studies, study materials, how the studies or teaching periods will be credited, etc.)
- Practical arrangements of the exchange (travel, accommodation, safety issues, briefing of the persons involved in the exchange, costs and financing exchange, etc.)

Proper planning is an absolute prerequisite for the approval of funding.

**Administrative trips**

The administrative trips are not included into the project plan, however during the pilot phase there have been requests for administrative trips. The need for administrative trips has been understood during the Programme implication. There are a number of administrative matters which obviously need attention. However, the Advisory Committee decided that funding will be rewarded for ten administrative trips during the last year of the pilot phase.

**Sectors financed**

In practical budget implementation, it is important to review the sectors which are financed by the Programme. In order to do that, the projects financed during the pilot phase have been placed by the evaluators into eight categories which have been adopted from the OECD, see Annex 8: Project categories. The projects under each category have been listed and their annual budget allocations recorded. The sector allocations are presented here as pie diagrams. The sectors under review are:

- Education
- Humanities and arts
- Social sciences
- Science
- Engineering
- Agriculture
- Health and welfare, and
- Services.
Table 6: 2004 Budget Allocations by Sectors, €

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>27 550</td>
<td>39 000</td>
<td>44 200</td>
<td>110 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitites and arts</td>
<td>116 700</td>
<td>85 400</td>
<td>122 400</td>
<td>324 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>107 900</td>
<td>221 600</td>
<td>212 600</td>
<td>542 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>68 000</td>
<td>84 800</td>
<td>82 400</td>
<td>235 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>36 800</td>
<td>30 600</td>
<td></td>
<td>67 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>68 000</td>
<td>70 700</td>
<td>96 200</td>
<td>234 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and welfare</td>
<td>185 128</td>
<td>146 212</td>
<td>177 028</td>
<td>508 368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>29 300</td>
<td>33 000</td>
<td>33 600</td>
<td>95 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>602 578 (28%)</td>
<td>717 512 (34%)</td>
<td>799 028 (38%)</td>
<td>2 119 118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sectors receiving most of the financing include social sciences, health & welfare and the humanities & arts. Since this is the Programme’s pilot phase, most of the projects financed are based on existing networks and cooperation initiatives between the Finnish and developing country partners. It is noteworthy that the humanities & arts is not a typical sector financed by the Finnish ODA. Many of the projects which have received pilot phase financing are based on either active individuals’ contacts or an earlier NGO financed cooperation. NGO activities cover more sectors than the Finnish ODA in long-term partner countries. One of the criteria emphasized both in the Programme and in the Finnish development cooperation policies, is that sectors in which Finland has something special to offer should be supported. Therefore, it is not surprising that for example an interesting IT project ”5 ARTS” is a part of the Programme.

The health sector issues are covered in many forms in the Finnish development cooperation. One might say that from the recruitment point of view, capable health sector personnel are very much needed in many parts of the developing world.
3.8. Student support and Services

The necessary support for students, both incoming and outgoing, is organized at the CIMO
level, institution level as well as on the Project level.

The Programme Document defines CIMO’s student support responsibilities as the following:
• based on the requests and needs, providing guidance to interested parties
• organizing training courses for Finnish students (and teachers) participating in the
Programme.

CIMO has prepared an online country information databank (http://www.cimo.fi/Resource.php/
cimo.maatietopankki.htm), launched in the summer of 2005, to assist students and teachers
seeking information about African and South-East Asian countries. Students interested in a
particular exchange or country can access relevant information from the databank easily.

CIMO also planned and organized pre-departure orientations in Helsinki for students departing
on their exchange periods. The orientations took place over two days and focussed on the
following content:
• Finland’s development policies
• health issues
• safety issues
• intercultural communication

In addition, the students were given country-specific information. In 2005, a total of 80 students
participated in the pre-departure orientation. CIMO collected feedback from students
participating in the orientation sessions and it is clear that the program content and organization
met the students’ expectations and they felt they were extremely useful.

No upon-arrival orientations were organized and the students who had been on an exchange in
the same country did not necessarily find a way to get in touch with each other.

The participating HEIs in Finland as well as the departments responsible for the Projects are,
for the most part, extremely experienced in organizing student support services related to
international academic mobility. The partners in Finland used their regular support structures,
for example arrival orientations, guides for international students, and the general services
provided by the International Offices of the respective institutions. Also, as all projects have
both an institutional and academic coordinator, the incoming students receive guidance and
tutoring both in academic and practical matters.

Some Finnish institutions provide student tutors and godparents for the incoming students to
facilitate the students’ adjustment to Finland. Several of the Finnish partners have several
projects, and generally the host institution has made sure that the students studying in a particular
institution find out about each other and can share experiences.

Safety in the partner countries is a big concern. Several students interviewed reported incidents
during their exchange period where their safety was under serious threat. The need for information
on safety and measures to safeguard is an important aspect to bear in mind in the future phases
of the programme as well.

One of the core principles of the project is that the studies carried out under the Programme
shall be fully credited to the student’s degree in the home institution. The institutions participating
in the Programme on the Finnish side are highly experienced with student exchange and
recognition of credits from partner institutions, as this is a prerequisite for all EU student
mobility. This is not the case for many of the partner institutions in developing countries. In these cases, the recognition of credits taken outside the home institution, support services and practices connected to it and in general an academic culture that would be supportive on this principle is, in many instances, completely lacking. This has resulted in many problems, starting from shorter than initially planned exchange periods or mobility of students who already are graduated. Finnish models for academic advising will gradually help in building capacity in this area in the developing country partner institutions.

3.9. Barriers to mobility

In order to obtain an actual and timely picture of the existing barriers to mobility the evaluators utilized the opportunity to discuss the topic at the CIMO coordinators’ meeting on April 3, 2006 in Helsinki (annex 9: North-South coordinators’ meeting on April 3rd, 2006 at CIMO). The goal of the discussion was to help the evaluation process in identifying barriers to mobility from the project implementors’ perspective. A draft evaluation report with recommendations had been made available for the participants and served as background for the discussion.

The participants were asked to address barriers to mobility from the following perspectives:

- Personal barriers of students (for applying, having positive exchange experiences)
- Institutional barriers (inability to participate, inability to recruit, inability to provide effective student services etc)
- National barriers
- Programme barriers

The strongest personal barrier often is loneliness. This can be combated, for example, by allowing students to participate in exchanges in pairs of groups. Also, godparent families are a good mechanism to help with getting adjusted in the new country. Special provision has to be made for students who have left a family behind as they tend to experience the loneliness in an even more profound way.

Lack of centralized information about the Programme and its activities to the partner countries’ consulates and embassies served as a clear barrier to mobility. When the staff at consulates was not informed enough about the Programme, much work was needed on each individual student visa. Sometimes student’s study periods needed to be cancelled when visas did not come through in time. Almost invariably the visas required much attention from the coordinating institutions which diminishes the efficiency of the Programme. Often the delays caused additional problems and extra costs for the air line ticketing.

The most obvious institutional barrier in the Programme has been the tight schedule, resulting in a very tight application cycle for Projects as well as for students. On the long run, the need for highly personalized support services for students at institutional level (for example visas, travel arrangements, insurance) can become a barrier when there are more and more demands for efficiency in the HEIs support services.

At Programme level, the lack of English language materials was a big barrier for implementation in the beginning. Also, the fact that the Programme goals were defined at a high level and not made concrete may have served as a barrier in the beginning; many existing partnerships may not have understood that they in fact are eligible for funding from the new Programme.
3.10. Evaluation and Quality Assurance Procedures

As a part of the Programme and project monitoring and management, it is important that the reporting is clear, regular, standardized and easily accessible. It is difficult if not impossible to follow and thus assess the progress on various levels if there is no good reporting available. The modern IT arrangements including electronic filing systems and possibilities to request and transfer information helps in the management and monitoring.

The Programme has been organized in a manner in which CIMO collects the aggregate information and HEIs record their own information. In the Programme Document, no specific instructions on the reporting were set. As the Programme started hurriedly, there were no clear reporting procedures created especially for this Programme. Therefore, the detailed information about expenditures, exchange details or gender statistics is not readily available at CIMO. Detailed, but crucial information on each project is available only in the respective HEI. To manage and monitor the Programme, CIMO has created a reporting system as the process goes along. It is important that the next phase has a set reporting system already from the beginning.

A remarkable amount of information on projects was collected in the connection of the 2006 project call. All projects were requested to evaluate themselves internally. For that purpose, CIMO prepared a questionnaire which the HEIs were supposed to follow in order to cover all important aspects of their networks. The HEIs are used to report on their funding and progress in a detailed manner in connection of other funding models. Therefore, HEIs are prepared also in connection of this Programme to report adequately.

The students are requested to report their experiences after they return. However, there is no standard reporting model adopted Programme wide and the quality and information value of those reports vary a lot.

CIMO reports to AC and MFA. It collects most of its information from the project applications and in 2006 especially from the self evaluations. CIMO prepares the AC with annual reports with annexes. The pilot phase is new and there is not yet an agreed standard how the annual report should look like, what it should contain and what are the annexes. The annual report 2006 was a good attempt to the right direction, however there is still room to improve e.g. in financial reporting. The AC is the highest decision making body and their needs for information on the progress of the projects and Programme are crucial for the monitoring of the Programme. The AC discusses the annual report in its meeting.
4. EVALUATION FINDINGS

4.1. Relevance

Relevance measures how appropriate the aid has been within the context of a specific target and according to the specific needs to be addressed. It asks the questions whether the aid was used to do the right things as opposed to doing things right (effectiveness).

The overall objective of the Programme is to support the goals of Finnish development cooperation: alleviation of widespread poverty, prevention of global environmental threats and promotion of equality, democracy and human rights, by improving developing country capacities and abilities in the higher education sectors through long-term cooperation between Finnish and developing country higher education institutions.

The Programme has been limited to only ODA qualified countries and to purposes which are ODA qualified. At the beginning of the project planning process there was a need to sharpen the scope of the Programme that it would meet the ODA requirements.

The MFA responsible unit in the beginning of the process was the one dealing with the recruitment issues. The MFA recognized the need to educate future development co-operation experts, enhance their willingness to contribute to the work and also to increase their knowledge and skills. However, when the scope of the Programme was slightly shifted from a recruitment perspective towards one of MDGs oriented cooperation and the Programme had started in full, the responsible MFA unit was moved to the general development and research unit.

The budget for the pilot phase of three years was limited so the partner countries eligible for financing were also limited. The decision process on which ODA countries would be qualified was long, and as its result, the Programme was limited to Sub-African countries and to Egypt and Peru. So, the choice of eligible countries was stricter than that of the Finnish long-term partner countries as Nicaragua, Vietnam or Nepal were not included. To the evaluators, the country selection appears unfair and arbitrary as no clear criteria for selection could be identified. Therefore, the selection of countries needs to be revisited.

To reach the development goal and objectives set for the Programme, the fields of education were not limited beforehand. It was seen that it is more important to highlight the development objectives in the projects, rather than concentrate on the financing and thus networking of specific fields. The projects financed, to a large extent, representative fields that are traditionally active in development cooperation. In the pilot this is natural, as the projects were almost without an exception based on existing cooperation.

The Programme was welcomed by the higher education institutions based on their long existing need to get support to many of the already existing cooperation projects. Some of these projects were funded as a part of the Finnish NGO support. For the MFA, it was important to recognize the education cooperation for its own merits, and not to dilute it among greater bulk of NGO cooperation.

Very soon after the Programme was announced, it became evident that there was a clear and strong demand for such a Programme because interest in the participating institutions was higher than expected. No special marketing of the Programme was required and the institutions prepared a vast number of applications in record time.
It was not always necessarily clear to the institutions preparing the applications what the actual requirements for the application were, and what type of activity the funding was to be targeted on.

The largest financial allocations have been to projects in the social sciences, business and law sectors as well as the health and welfare sectors. Together, these fields have received slightly over half of the total budget allocated to projects. Surprisingly, a less traditional development cooperation field, humanities and arts, had received the third largest allocation. This potentially contributes to the broadening of the traditional formal Finnish development cooperation.

For recruitment, this would not have been the most obvious sector—with a recruitment perspective that the projects selected would most likely have been focused on different fields entirely. The recruitment aspect was not included in the project selection criteria.

The projects selected represent balance between Universities and Polytechnics, and the partners in developing countries are relatively evenly distributed between the different eligible countries. However, much of the cooperation is focused on cooperation with South Africa, Mozambique, Zambia and Namibia, Tanzania and Kenya.

Mozambique is a popular partner although the language spoken, Portuguese, is one that is not commonly mastered in Finland. Therefore, special training efforts for those participating in exchanges with the partner country are necessary. The most common language used in the partnerships is English. Spanish is needed only in Peru. For Spanish-language partnerships, Nicaragua would be an excellent potential additional partner country in the future.

The pilot phase implementation was based on in principle annual application calls and funding decisions. During the first year, the funding period was even shorter. This has caused the project to have to adjust the long-term Programme goals to a very short-term project level planning cycle. This has hampered the planning of the student and teacher exchanges in a meaningful way; a longer project funding decision would have enabled a more stable and administratively more manageable approach.

At least two of the projects under the pilot financing have chosen to take the risk to admit students to a two-year Master programme with a one-year guaranteed financing.

Initially, master programmes were not foreseen to be an essential part of the Programme. Also, research as such was not part of the scope of the Programme although it was seen to be a sound basis for cooperation.

**Gender Balance**

The MDG 3 emphasizes the need to promote gender equality and empower women as part of the international development efforts. Since the MDGs are essential for the Finnish development cooperation, also the gender aspect has to be regarded carefully in the Programme. However, in Finland it is common in many fields that female students dominate the numbers in many HEIs and therefore the outgoing students are pre-dominantly female. This trend is typical especially in the health sector. Therefore, at the project level there might be projects where gender balance in student selection processes is difficult to adopt.

As to gender balance in teaching staff mobility and staff participation in general, from the Finnish side women are 20 percent more involved with the exchange program. Teachers coming into Finland slightly favour a male component, but are reasonably balanced. The dispersion of Finnish teachers seems gender balanced with only a couple of examples where no women or no men were sent to a given country. From the African (and Peru) teacher exchange perspective
there were three countries that did not send any women teachers and two that did not send any men. Uganda did not send any teachers on an exchange. If one looks at the total numbers by gender of teacher exchanges one sees that the Finnish and African (with Peru) numbers are roughly equivalent, 19 and 18 respectively. However, there is a large discrepancy between the number of male teachers exchanged between Finland and Africa (with Peru) showing 14 and 21 respectively. This statistic shows us that a third more male teachers leave Africa (Peru) to come to Finland than vice versa.


It is important that there would be discussion at the AC level how the gender balance should be taken into account at the Programme and project level.

4.2. Impact

In the pilot phase of such a new approach for higher education networking and mobility in Finland, the impact after such a short period is most observable on the individual student and teacher levels. As one goes up in the hierarchy towards the project level impact, institution level impact, and Programme level impact, it becomes more difficult to identify the visible impact of the cooperation after such a short time period.

An individual project seldom is in a position by itself to make a difference in a partner developing country. However, in the sectors where the present projects are active, they surely contribute towards the social, economic and environmental goals of the country where they operate through building capacity in these countries. Most of the impacts will be visible only on a more long-term perspective, when the present students are active in their future jobs. They might be e.g. journalists who comfortably tackle the human rights or environmental issues; they might be skilled forestry specialists who fight against deforestation; or they might be trained nurses and doctors saving lives in their home countries and communities. Whatever field the future experts represent, it is definitely too early to say anything about the development effects of this Programme in the partner countries as yet.

On the individual student and teacher levels, the impact of the Programme is very noticeable. The evaluators are able to observe from the extensive student and teacher report forms that the exchanges were highly successful in terms of cultural exchange, improvement in understanding development problems, as well as applying research interests and expertise during the exchange period to a new environment. Some teachers have collected new teaching material packages and developed new courses, including online courses.

On the project level, the clearest result at this stage is first the established partnership: although the cooperation was based in most cases on existing cooperation, new links were formed and cooperation expanded to new areas. The projects have diversified during the project period by bringing in new aspects, for example research cooperation.

On the institution level, the impact has been in a new strategic focus for international cooperation, often recorded in the institutions strategic plans and result agreements with the Ministry of Education.

On the Programme level, the clear impact is the functioning networks which have resulted in new and intensified cooperation not only between the Finnish partners and the partners in the
developing countries, but also between HEIs in Finland on development cooperation. These partnerships are gradually resulting in research cooperation partnerships between Finnish institutions as well as joint education programming. One of the national HE policy objectives is regional cooperation in Finland between HEIs as well as stronger cooperation between universities and polytechnics. Because of this, the Programme clearly has had an impact on intensified collaboration.

It is clear that Finnish HEIs have strong traditions with working with partners in some of the eligible developing countries, where the contact base in countries like Peru and Sudan may be shallower. The Programme has a clear impact on diversifying this base.

Some of the cooperation fields are clearly traditional development cooperation areas. However, the fact that the Programme was open to all education areas has resulted in innovative cooperation in new areas particularly in humanities.

4.3. Effectiveness

The MinEd was involved in the inception of the pilot phase of the project with MFA. The Programme demonstrates a new type of inter-governmental partnership where CIMO, under guidance from the MinEd and in cooperation with the participating higher education institutions, acts as coordinator for the Programme implementation. CIMO has been allocated with the responsibility to manage the Programme. It is supported by the advisory committee, which consists of representation from the MFA, MinEd as well as from the higher education institutions, both from the student groups and leadership.

The Programme forms a logical addition to the suite of higher education cooperation programs administered by CIMO. CIMO is systematically perceived as the only possible administrator for North-South. It has all the tools needed for the operation of this type of a Programme and is seen as neutral and professional.

CIMO has an extensive network of international relations managers in the higher education institutions in Finland and was able to build on that network for purposes of informing about the program and developing administrative arrangements. The Program pilot implementation commenced very quickly after the Program level agreements were made. In the early phase, procedures and administrative arrangements were often developed in cooperation with the participating partners, or, separately by the participating partner institutions or individual projects. In particular, English language materials were not available and needed to be developed at project level.

Because of the pilot nature, arrangements in the first round were often ad hoc. The expert network of international relations managers together with CIMO helped improve the administrative arrangements for the pilot, in particular concerning information and marketing, student selections, reporting and student and faculty feedback. However, there is continued need for improvements in some of the practical arrangements as well as in the information materials.

The awareness of the Programme in Finnish Higher Education institutions is high. The awareness in the partner institutions and countries in general was not high but is improving as there is a critical mass of people who have been on visits to and from those institutions.
In the initial phase the Programme included funding for preparatory visits. These visit grants enabled the partners to plan implementation quickly on the academic level. However, the need for such grants, also for administrative coordinators responsible for organizing the visits and providing for necessary support services for students, was identified very early. Such grants for particularly African administrative coordinators would have improved the effectiveness of the Programme significantly.

Project coordinators are aware of the need for balanced participation in the Programme and the need is one consideration in the selection process for participation for faculty and students. The diversity and balance of participation needs to be monitored at the central level, not only project level. This calls for a more a more clearly organized Project and student tracking system by CIMO.

The commitment to the Programme in the participation institutions is extremely high, sometimes demonstrated by spin-off projects funded from other sources but focusing on cooperation. There is strong interest in broadening the scope of the activities to, for example, joint conferences with all partners present and possibly in cooperation with several projects.

4.4. Efficiency of the implementation

The implementation of the pilot phase started immediately after the Programme Document was approved by the MFA in spring 2004. The preparation phase had been long and there were a lot of expectations concerning the new Programme held by various stakeholders. The implementation started without any major information campaign, also the implementation started without any clear criteria for the project selection. The selection criteria were created by the AC after the first project proposals had been received. Also, the implementation procedures were developed along the process. It was planned that the Programme would start with the first year’s budget allocation only for administration. In that plan, the administrators would have been prepared for the project call, project selection and project implementation better than they appeared to have been in the reality.

Since the first project call was hurried and the funding cycle during the pilot phase has been only for a year, it was difficult for the projects which were selected in spring 2004 to commence in an orchestrated manner. It is not easy or easily possible to organize student or teacher exchanges to take place in such a short notice. It is fair to say that most of the projects are running as planned and proposed only now when the pilot phase is coming to end. It would be possible to analyze the efficiency of the implementation of many of the individual projects at this point. To analyze the efficiency of the implementation on the Programme level at this point, when the projects are only taking off, is too early.

Therefore, the evaluators have decided to look at the efficiency of the implementation by studying and comparing the mobility figures planned with those achieved. The overall as well as annual mobility targets were set for teachers, students both who would come to Finland as well for those who would travel from Finland to partner institutions. There are no mobility targets or budgets set for a possible exchange between developing country institutions or for any administrative trips to either direction.
Table 7: The planned mobility according to the Programme Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– to Finland</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– from Finland</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– to Finland</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– from Finland</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory missions</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Funding granted for the mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– to Finland</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– from Finland</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– to Finland</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– from Finland</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory missions</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative visits</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implementation of the Programme started in the spring 2004 when the first call for projects was organized by CIMO. In the first call of April 2004, there were altogether 40 applications and in the second of September 2004 there were 18 new applications. A share of spring applications did not contain all needed information and thus were appraised only in the autumn. Out of the 58 applications, 38 came from the universities and 20 from the polytechnics. The amount of funding granted for the selected 20 projects represented 35% of the total applied being 604 578 €. In addition, funding was granted for two preparatory missions. Some of the projects approved in the spring 2004 started already in 2004, but most of the projects commenced their mobility only in 2005. According to CIMO, in 2004 there were 17 exchanges altogether, out of which a major share was preparatory visits. It is understandable that the share of preparatory visits in the very beginning of the Programme implementation played the major role. Even though the funding decisions were made in 2004, the actual expenditures took place only 2005. In the CIMO statistics, the mobility figures are added for the years when financing decisions take place not for the years when the actual exchange takes place. If the financing decisions in the next Programme phase would cover longer period than the present ones of one year it might contribute to the accuracy of the statistical information as well.
In 2005, one call for projects was organized. By the end of January 2005, which was the deadline for project applications, 36 proposals were received by CIMO. Out of 36 proposals, 22 received funding. Two projects were new and 20 such projects which have received funding already in 2004. It was decided by the AC that preparatory visits would not be financed for the projects commenced already in 2004. Also, the AC emphasized in its financing decisions the share of student exchanges. The total amount of funding granted was 717 512 €. An external auditing is taking place in parallel with this evaluation.

The latest project call of January 2006 was restricted to cover only projects that have received financing already earlier. In addition to earlier financed projects also a proposal from Sibelius Academy was approved since they have received preparatory funding earlier.

CIMO has organized four project calls during the pilot phase; all calls have attracted more finance proposals than funds have been available. According to the understanding the evaluators hold CIMO has tried while preparing the AC decisions to ensure that the proposals for approval would be feasible for implementation and their cost structure realistic.

4.5. Achievements

Achievements of the Programme can be studied by comparing the targets set in the logical framework of the Programme with actual achievements made by the end of 2005.

The overall objectives set for the Programme included that:

- Quality of education improved and the internationalisation of participating higher education institutions enhanced through enabling mutual student and teacher mobility between Finnish and developing country universities.
- Supply of qualified Finnish experts for cooperation with developing countries enhanced.

As possible indicators which would be studied from the HEI reports and by this external evaluation the Programme Document (ProDoc) listed the following:

- Academic relevance of the mobility
- Number of long-term twinning partnerships established
- Number of persons involved in the programme working with development countries.

Based on the evaluation interviews it can be said that those individual projects interviewed felt that the network cooperation is academically interesting and important for them as a means to broaden the scope of their curriculum. As an example of the relevance to partner institutions they said that many of the visiting teachers, and also students, have used the Finnish libraries and available internet connections as well as their peers in Finland to prepare and collect new teaching material and new courses and research material. The students who are in late stages of their studies have collected material for their thesis work. On the other hand those incoming students who have actually graduated from their universities in partner countries are not in the best position to benefit their home institutions, since it might be that after their exchange they will not even go back to their sending institutions.

The duration of the partnerships funded by the Programme varies to a great extent. There are only few partnerships funded which commenced in the beginning of the Programme. Most of the partnerships supported by the Programme have existed for a long time already. Also, because of the short existence of the Programme there is practically no indication if more people have
been engaged in work with the developing countries. Most of the exchanges which have taken place happened only in 2005.

The Programme purpose was set to establish an effective and efficient funding mechanism for mutual co-operation between Finnish and developing country higher education institutions. The original plan was to have the funding mechanism operational by the end of year 2003. It was operational only in the first half of 2004.

The Finnish HEIs feel that the Programme is labour-intensive; much hands-on attention to individual students is needed. Compared to for example programmes like ERASMUS and Nordplus where cohorts of students are moved with very little individualized service, the Programme is not suitable for mass student mobility. However, traditional bilateral exchanges in HEIs often operate on a similar level where the central administration and the department level need to provide a high level of individual attention. There is a growing sentiment in HEIs that for the Programme to be sustainable on a long-term basis the cost of the administration at the HEI and individual project levels needs to be recognized and compensated from the Programme.

The assumption in ProDoc was that there would be high interest among Finnish and developing country HEIs for the Programme. This assumption has proved to be right already during the Pilot phase. Many more Finnish HEIs and their staff and students have become active in developing country-related issues.

The ProDoc expected the Programme to reach the following results:

- An efficient and user-friendly information system established at CIMO for the Network Programme. The information system would also cover potential EU-funds for teacher/student mobility with developing country higher education institutions.
- Information packages and training programmes for cultural adaptation and development co-operation developed for the Finnish students and teachers participating in the programme. In addition, information packages on Finnish society will be developed for the students and teachers travelling to Finland.
- An efficient management and monitoring system established for the Network Programme.
- Approximately 220 students and 65 teachers from the developing countries and 140 Finnish students and 45 teachers have participated in the programme by the end of the pilot phase.

The Programme has indeed reached most of the results expected from it. CIMO has established an efficient information system based on electronic distribution of information to the programme coordinators and experts in the participating HEIs. The information is not, however, geared to the individual student seeking for information, nor to any external audiences.

CIMO has organized training for the out-going students and has established a country information system. Both for the out-going and arriving students the Finnish HEIs use their existing information packages and training mechanisms.

The management of the Programme at the HEI level is efficient. CIMO is coordinating the work among the Project coordinators and university international education managers to gain synergies in Programme administration from already existing structures in the Finnish HEIs. However, such structures often do not exist in the partner institutions in the developing countries and much capacity building is still needed.
4.6. Participation and Ownership

The participation in the Programme is active and enthusiastic on all levels. As an important indication of that is the number of projects seeking for funding from the Programme. Those projects which have been chosen for funding represent both universities and polytechnics. The evaluators interviewed about half of the ongoing projects. The commitment and ownership for development their own network project was evident in all cases. The participation in an individual project in a HEI is wider than the official statistics show. The participating teachers and students involve in many cases their colleagues or fellow students in the network cooperation. The case with the visiting teachers and students is even more evident; they operate in the HEI environment and thus in their daily operations get in touch with more students and teachers who are involved in a project itself. The communication of these visiting teachers and students is important to spread the knowledge about the network in question, about Finland abroad and about the partner institution and partner country in Finland.

The networks in Finland are broad as discussed earlier in this report. However, there is the group of Finnish HEIs and faculties which have applied for Programme participation but have not been included due to the restricted resources or for some other valid reason. The challenging task for the next phase of the Programme is to ensure that these networks are motivated to seek with good applications for the participation in the future and thus expand the Programme participation even further in Finland and maybe even to new partner countries.

CIMO has shown true commitment to the Programme at all times. CIMO is the self-evident coordinator of the Programme. It has used its existing network of international education experts in HEIs very effectively for example to jointly share experiences and gained in the Programme and best practices in the Projects, as well as to solve problems raised along the implementation process. Using the national CIMO-HE cooperation meetings for the purpose of discussing the Programme has been an efficient way to share experiences.

The AC members have actively participated in the Programme meetings; they have discussed general issues related to the Programme and its implementation. The AC consists of representative members; however, all its members are Helsinki based as the Programme itself is widely spread over Finland. The central government level has been active in the pilot phase as it should since a pilot phase is an excellent forum to learn about new modes and methods for cooperation. Their active participation is important also in the future phase since the starting point of the Programme is close also to their ministerial operations.

4.7. Sustainability

The key to the Programme’s sustainability lies in sustainable networks. The networks have to bring added value to all relevant stakeholder groups so that they are committed to maintaining the partnerships beyond the Programme funding period. The possible ways for making a network beneficial for all parties include:

- Voluntary participation
- More than one active participant in an organization
- Ownership at a high level of organization
- Motivated teachers and students
- Mutual/common recognized goals in teaching/or research
- Curriculum acknowledged by both parties – systemized credit recognition system.
The voluntary contributions from the different stakeholder groups to the Programme are very high, demonstrating a strong motivation for ensuring lasting partnerships. This is most visible at the student level where students are actively disseminating information about their exchange periods and even organizing systematic alumni gatherings for North-South participants.

If a network is based on the enthusiasm and commitment of one or two individuals it is highly vulnerable. In some projects this is the case and cooperation has not expanded beyond a few individuals. However, in the majority of projects the networks are starting to have a department-wide impact, often institution-wide. The broader the base – both in terms of activities and people involved – the more likely the network is to survive changes in personnel and funding structures.

For many of the institutions involved, development cooperation is a new activity. It is necessary to incorporate the activities into the key strategic plans at institutional and departmental level at an early stage to ensure sustainability. This, to a certain extent, has been ensured also from the national level by the MinEd.

A good network brings academic added value to the work of the institutions and individuals involved. Planning academic activities together is the real substance of the cooperation. A network will be more likely to find means to sustain the relationship if there are shared goals for education and research, and mutual recognition of quality. In the case of North-South, much of the focus in the beginning has been in establishing the network or broadening the scope of an existing network to cover activities eligible for funding from the Programme. In most of the networks there are still big challenges in this area. This can be seen, for example, from the multitude of difficulties with credit recognition.

For the networks to be sustainable, the Programme Document assumes that external funding is required as long as the co-operation is active. It also assumes that in case the evaluation in the end of the pilot phase recommends the continuation of the Programme, a long-term funding mechanism needs to be established. The evaluation Team has, in fact, come to the same conclusion. The long-term commitments in the partnerships need some sort of assurance of the continuity of the external support. The security of the funding available ensures the long-term development of partnerships, including the possibility to extend their scope, e.g. into research cooperation with other means.
5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Examples of Best Practises

The evaluation is conducted in a participatory manner on those occasions and themes where it was possible and most relevant. The Team decided that examples of best practises would be a good topic to cover at the CIMO coordinators’ meeting on April 3, 2006 in Helsinki. The goal of the discussion was to help the evaluation process in identifying good models for the Programme implementation. A draft evaluation report with recommendations had been made available for the participants and serves as background for the discussion. The participants in the workshop were asked to touch upon the best practises in the Programme implementation in the following areas, choosing issue that to them were most relevant:

- Project formulation
- Partnership structures
- Partners’ roles and responsibilities
- Objectives of the partnerships
- Partnerships among developing country institutions
- Role of mobility in the partnerships
- Selection processes
- Various elements of partnerships (research, common courses, teaching materials)
- Administration of partnerships
- Finance of partnerships
- Monitoring of partnerships including reporting
- Information arrangements

The fact that the Programme is based on academic cooperation and teaching exchanges was seen as one of its clear strengths. Cooperation between members of teaching staff builds trust which in turn makes issues like credit recognition for students easier. Strong curricular interest between members of academic staff is a key to good student exchanges.

One example of an excellent way to initiate a project is to start from curriculum development (for example a 3-month module) for the incoming students, and to engage a set of existing partners to plan the teaching staff and student exchanges.

For teaching exchanges, an excellent model is to have teacher partnerships: each teacher has a partner in another partner institution. Also, longer teacher exchanges have proven to be beneficial to both the receiving and sending institution.

The Tili-Tonse project with its transpired student selection criteria has been singled out as a case of best practise in student selections. The workshops participants agreed that for the next Programme phase a stronger focus on sharing good practises about student selection processes is needed. The criteria need to be transparent with a clear focus on the development goals of the Programme. The student recruiting needs to be transparent in order to attract the best students, not the ones that have the means available to go on an exchange.

On reporting the participants agreed that reporting on an annual basis works best for the HEIs and projects. There needs to be a clear link with the activity and the money allocated. For a more substantive evaluation a 1–2 page content-focused report will serve the purpose best. All instructions on reporting need to come up front as the projects need to set up the mechanisms to collect the information; the actual information will then not be hard to come by.
### 5.2. Recommendations table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Finland is committed to support the education sector in developing countries; however, the North-South Programme is one of the rare support activities to tertiary level education</td>
<td>After the pilot phase further support to tertiary level education is needed</td>
<td>The Programme should be continued after its pilot phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CIMO organised open calls for projects in 2004 and 2005 which produced more applications than it was possible to finance in the pilot phase</td>
<td>There is indeed a great demand for this type of programme in HEIs</td>
<td>The momentum of the positive experiences gained in the pilot phase should be utilised and the next phase should immediately follow the pilot phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The funding applied even by the approved projects exceeded the available budget</td>
<td>More funding is needed to expand the Programme to either cover more projects i.e. networks, or to develop the present networks further</td>
<td>The budget of the next phase of the Programme should be increased; also other possible sources of funding should be explored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It was difficult to measure if the development goals and objectives of the pilot phase were met</td>
<td>The development goals set for the pilot phase were unrealistic</td>
<td>The objectives set for the next phase should be more realistic, but clearly follow the overall development strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Programme should be continued</td>
<td>A new Programme Document with clearly defined and agreed goals, objectives, activities, tasks and roles, budget and reporting and monitoring guidelines needs to be drafted</td>
<td>The new Programme Document should be prepared by an outsider to the Programme in close cooperation with all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The calls for projects have been organised on an annual basis</td>
<td>It has been difficult to plan any network cooperation with a budget horizon of one year</td>
<td>The finance decision for individual projects should be at least for three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>It was unclear in 2004 what type of projects/networks should be financed</td>
<td>The selection criteria was formulated only during the implementation of the pilot phase</td>
<td>Project selection criteria should be revisited before the first call of the new phase and shared with the open call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gender balance needs to be addressed at all levels of the Programme</td>
<td>There is sufficient gender balance in student participation, but strong imbalance in incoming teachers from Africa</td>
<td>Discussion at the AC level how gender balance should be taken into account at the Programme and project levels is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The projects supported this far have been in both universities and polytechnics in Finland</td>
<td>Networking has been beneficial for both types of HEIs</td>
<td>Both universities and polytechnics should be supported in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28 HEIs in Finland participate in a total of 23 projects; some HEIs participate in several projects (total of 40 participations)</td>
<td>The participation is not regionally balanced in Finland</td>
<td>Efforts should be made to achieve regional balance in implementation in the future to involve all HEIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Most of the projects supported are operational only in Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>It is more natural to commence a project in a country where there are cooperation links already</td>
<td>The Programme should include all Finnish long-term partner countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>In many networks there are a number of participants in partner countries</td>
<td>There is room and possibility to increase networking and cooperation between partner institutions.</td>
<td>It should be ensured that networking between all partners is foreseen and sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Both Finnish and Swedish speaking Finnish HEIs are active as are Portuguese and Spanish speaking institutions in Partner countries</td>
<td>Networks includes also non-English speaking partners</td>
<td>Language training should be supported to enable smooth cooperation within the networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The content of the projects varies considerably</td>
<td>Some of the projects are typical mobility programmes with a traineeships aspect, some are more innovative and some cover master programmes</td>
<td>If the Programme supports master studies in Finland, it should be clearly define</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The fields financed by the pilot Programme are various</td>
<td>The selection criteria have been open for various types of cooperation fields</td>
<td>The selection of fields should continue to be open-ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Network clusters vary considerably</td>
<td>All types of networks both in Finland and abroad are eligible</td>
<td>All types of networks both in Finland and abroad should continue to be eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Arts and humanities have received a bigger share of funding than they typically receive with ODA funding</td>
<td>The Programme can support non traditional development cooperation fields and widen the scope of Finnish cooperation</td>
<td>An innovative approach in the selection of fields and projects within more traditional development cooperation fields should be encouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The names of individual projects vary from report to report – also the language used</td>
<td>How to call or name each network has been left open and it has depended on the situation</td>
<td>Each project should have a clear name which then should be standardised, and all terminology used in the Programme should be standardised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Recognition of credits is one of the Programme principles</td>
<td>Clear problems with the developing country partners with recognition of credits as little prior experience and tradition for such practises</td>
<td>Strong focus on capacity building and sharing of good practises in credit recognition practises needed for the next phase of the Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>There have been difficulties to finance the exchanges due to the high flight ticket prices</td>
<td>The budgeted amount has been too low - Inadequate level of funding can act as a barrier to mobility</td>
<td>There should be more flexibility to purchase flight tickets both in budget and administrative way (less regulated, focus on most economic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Strong student satisfaction to the CIMO pre-departure orientations</td>
<td>A need to meet with others who have participated in the Programme is strong</td>
<td>The pre-departure orientations should continue and upon arrival orientations should be considered; at minimum, a chat-room for students should be established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Exchange students have faced difficulties to cover their expenses in Finland.</td>
<td>The budgeted 600 € is not sufficient in all study locations – inadequate level of funding can act as a barrier to mobility.</td>
<td>HEIs in one location should present a standardised budget for students studying in that specific location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The length of the teaching period is regulated</td>
<td>The two week minimum requirement can be a barrier to some; on the other hand some teachers would benefit from longer exchanges.</td>
<td>Teaching period should be flexible (one week to several months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>In many projects there is a research component</td>
<td>Research cooperation is seen important and often a prerequisite for sustainable cooperation by the partners – short teacher visits counter-productive</td>
<td>Research cooperation should be encouraged even if not funded from Programme funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The Programme is coordinated at the Scholarships unit at CIMO</td>
<td>Most mobility programmes at CIMO are a part of the EU Programmes Unit</td>
<td>The appropriate unit in CIMO for Programme implementation should be considered carefully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The MFA moved the management of the Programme from the recruitment unit to the planning unit during the implementation of the pilot phase</td>
<td>The scope of the Programme was established to be more research and education oriented from the planned recruitment orientation</td>
<td>The Programme management should stay with the Planning Unit at the research desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The Advisory Committee (AC) has met irregularly</td>
<td>The AC meets only when there is a meaningful agenda to be discussed</td>
<td>Clearly defined Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure needed for AC to define its role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The AC consists only of members from Helsinki.</td>
<td>There is no special budget line to cover AC operations in the Programme budget</td>
<td>Need to ensure that there is more geographical distribution among the AC members to reflect Programme participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Records from AC meetings are not signed, also the decisions made and discussions held in the AC meetings are recorded on a rather superficial level</td>
<td>The records kept from the AC meetings are not of an adequate level. E.g., there is no recording of the decisions concerning individual projects</td>
<td>The record keeping of the AC meetings should be improved. The meeting records should be signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The Programme’s Annual reporting varies from year to year</td>
<td>The 2005 annual report was significantly better and more descriptive than the previous one</td>
<td>Annual reporting guidelines to be agreed. The financial reporting guidelines to be agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>It was difficult to monitor the expenditures by budget lines and by years</td>
<td>The budget monitoring is not adequate or clear. Information from budget line by budget line or expenditures from individual projects were not easily available</td>
<td>The budget monitoring should be improved considerably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Informing about the Programme ad hoc in the beginning</td>
<td>Modest information about the Programme available in print particularly in English</td>
<td>More proactive information campaign to the partner countries should be organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The Programme has a website under the CIMO home page</td>
<td>It is difficult to locate the Programme information on the internet using a search engine</td>
<td>A clear strategy to make the Programme information more accessible (also linking projects to the Programme information) should be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>The Programme implementation model relies heavily on strong administrative support at central and project level in all participating HEIs</td>
<td>The HEIs feel that the demand on administrative capacity is high</td>
<td>Funding to support administration at HEIs in Finland and developing countries should be explored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Administration of the projects varies considerably depending on the resources available</td>
<td>The administration resources in partner countries are scarce</td>
<td>The administration aspects of the networks should be supported more e.g. visits of the partner institution administration people to Finland should be encouraged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Unit for Evaluation and Internal Auditing

(Draft, 27 December 2005, subject to modifications as may be agreed upon with the MFA)

TERMS OF REFERENCE
Evaluation of CIMO North-South Higher Education Network Programme

1. BACKGROUND
In winter 2002 a working group was initiated and established by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs to discuss the measures needed for ensuring the future supply of Finnish experts as well as for developing mechanisms for new types of cooperation between Finnish and developing country higher education institutions. The working group consisted of members from the Ministry, National Board of Education, Helsinki Deaconess Institute and the Centre for International Mobility CIMO.

Based on the working group’s recommendation CIMO submitted in September 2002 a proposal for MFA on a “mobility programme” between Finnish and developing country higher education institutions. In March 2004 the final funding decision was made to start the North-South Higher Education Network Programme.

A three-year (2004–2006) pilot programme is based on principle of networking and its aim is to create sustainable partnerships between Finnish and developing countries’ higher education institutes and hence contribute towards economic and social development in developing countries.

The programme follows the goals of the UN Millennium Declaration and Finnish Government Resolution on Finnish Development Policy (5.2.2004) having as central aim to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger. The programme contributes the implementation of Finnish development policy through increasing the participation of civil society to development cooperation and strengthening of national partnership for development.

In the on-going pilot phase the participating countries have been, in addition to Finland, countries in sub-Saharan Africa, and Egypt and Peru. From Africa Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Libya are excluded.

CIMO, an organisation operating under the Finnish Ministry of Education offering services and expertise to encourage cross cultural communication has been given a mandate to administer and manage the North-South programme on behalf of the Ministry. CIMO’s general mandate includes many aspects in terms of international contacts in the field of education. To support internationalisation of educational and training institutions in Finland CIMO offers training, information, advisory services and publications. CIMO also promotes and organises international trainee exchanges. CIMO administers scholarship and exchange programmes and is responsible
for implementing almost all EU-funded education, training, culture and youth programmes at national level.

At practical level, the Finnish universities and polytechnics are in charge of various arrangements for different projects and programmes.

North-South programme supports reciprocal teacher and student exchanges between two or more higher education institutions. The duration of teacher exchanges can be between 2 to 8 weeks and that of student exchanges 1 to 2 terms. The graduation is always taking place at own institute. Funding is also available for preparatory visits to plan future cooperation projects. A rolling deadline is applied for these visits. The target set for the pilot phase of the programme has been to receive 220 students and 65 teachers to Finland and to send 140 Finnish students and 45 teachers to higher education institutions in the partner countries. Partner institutions in Finland and in partner country agree together on the contents and arrangements of cooperation. The application is always submitted by a Finnish higher education institution who will also act as a coordinator of the project being responsible for the management of funds.

CIMO has presented the programme approach in international meetings and it has created interest, e.g. among UNESCO being one of the few programmes with reciprocal two-way approach instead of only giving scholarships for the students of developing countries.

The budget for the pilot phase of the programme is 2 542 000 EUR and it is fully funded by the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs. However, the participating educational institutes have contributed their share mostly in-kind in the form of organising the outgoing and incoming students’ scholarship arrangements, giving guidance for the participants and taking care of other practical procedures.

2. OVERVIEW OF THE SITUATION

The first North-South application round was organised in April 2004 for exchanges taking place in the academic year 2004–2005. Altogether 58 applications from 27 Finnish higher education institutions with partners in 14 countries were submitted to CIMO. The projects represented a wide variety of sectors, such as forestry, ICT, education, arts, communication, linguistics, and health care. Twenty projects were granted financing.

In 2005 total 36 applications were received. All the twenty projects that were given grant on the previous year continued and two more applications were approved, in total 22 projects in 16 different countries.

Applications are assessed by the Advisory Committee of the North-South programme with representatives from higher education institutions, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and student organisations. CIMO’s director is the chair of the committee and will make final decisions about funding based on the Advisory Committee’s recommendation.

It seems that there is a growing interest towards the programme among the universities and polytechnics in Finland and the budget available for the programme has not allowed allocations to all, even good and justified, applications.
3. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation is expected to produce information and views about the management arrangements, implementation, efficiency and effectiveness of the North-South programme as well as compatibility with the Finnish development cooperation principles and strategies. To a certain degree, also aspects of sustainability and foreseen impact are to be assessed.

The purpose of the evaluation is to highlight different aspects of the programme and its achievements in order to allow a well justified decision to be made, due in April 2006, of the continuation of the programme. The evaluation should analyse the gains received through the programme to all actors of the programme, i.e. higher education institutes both in Finland and in developing partner countries, CIMO and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

The evaluation is to analyse the present programme structure and systems, and propose, if found appropriate, in concrete form possible alternative ways to arrange the whole programme or certain parts of it anew. The intention of the evaluation is to look backwards to the degree that is necessary to analyse the past. However, the main emphasis should be looking into future in order to analyse future prospects of the programme based on the lessons learnt.

Attention has to be paid to determining the ODA eligibility of the programme also ex-post.

4. ISSUES TO BE EVALUATED

The aspects and questions presented here should be taken as a guidance for the evaluation and should not be interpreted as a limitation to the issues to be analysed during evaluation. The evaluator is encouraged to raise all issues that are found appropriate during the study independent of them being mentioned here or not. All questions are not expected to be answered directly as such but to guide the analytical thinking.

General aspects

• What is the added value of the programme to the Finnish development cooperation sector in general, participating educational institutes both in Finland and in developing countries, CIMO and the Ministry?

• Should a balanced thematic, country-vice, university-polytechnic-ratio etc. allocation be promoted or should the allocations be based purely on the active interest shown by the applying institutes?

• Should this programme have a connection with the Ministry for Foreign Affairs recruitment policy and part of its initiative to increase the pool of potential qualified people interested in and capable to participate into international challenges? Is there a difference between teachers’ and students’ participation?

• Are there such shortcomings or rooms for improvements that need to be taken into account when planning for the possible continuation of the programme?
Administrative arrangements
The evaluation should analyse the administrative procedures and division of work between the Ministry, CIMO and participating education institutes as well as optimum roles and mandates, and the mandate, composition and smoothness of operation of the Advisory Committee.

- Does the current arrangement programme being outsourced to be administered by CIMO, and in general the current role of the Ministry serve its purpose and where should the administration of this programme be placed within the Ministry?

- Does the specific mandate given to CIMO include all essential elements or does the current version include tasks that some other actor could possibly more naturally be in charge of? What is the optimum way of organising the administrative workload within CIMO and outside it?

- How the programme is known among the potential users of financial support and how the marketing of the programme is arranged?

- Is the role of the participating education institutes optimally arranged currently or is there room for sharpening or improvement?

- Has the programme had adequately balanced selection process of participating students and teachers within the institutes, e.g. in terms of gender, teacher-student ratio, expertise areas?

Implementation
The evaluation should analyse the implementation arrangements in general and in a detailed manner where found appropriate.

- Has the guidance and support given to the participating educational institutes been adequate and relevant in implementing their projects in terms of quantity and quality?

- How the lessons learnt through the exchange programme have been utilised within the educational institutes and what kind of dissemination practices have been developed and applied?

- How widely the institutes have committed themselves to the programme or has the participation been based on one or few individuals?

- How the commitment has been shown in practice and how the institutes have used their own monetary and in-kind allocations to the programme?

- How the programme information channels and activities have served the educational institutes in terms of quantity of information and quality of information materials?

Achievements
The evaluation is supposed to produce information about the foreseen extent of the attainment of the set goals and objectives for the programme. The objectives for the programme have been widely defined including many aspects and hence should be analysed part by part.
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What has been the motivation of the applying institutes to participate to the programme?

What has been the connection between the motivation to participate (both institutes and individuals) and enhancement of the Finnish development cooperation principles and strategies?

Has the programme had connections with the strategic plans of the participating institutes?

Can genuine and sustainable partnerships between Finnish and developing country educational institutes be assessed to be born as an outcome of the programme?

What are the qualitative improvements or elements the programme has introduced to the educational institutes? How has the quality of education increased?

**Future**

What could be the optimum funding mechanism for the programme in future (in case it will be continuing)? Could the financing system applied when granting funds to the NGOs be applicable also here, i.e. having clear monetary self-financing requirements14? What implications different financing models would have for the success of the programme?

What implications the Ministry of Education recent instructions for the next strategic planning round in universities and polytechnics to include development policy aspects in their plans should have to the programme?

What could be the ways to enhance genuine commitment of the educational institutes and how in practise the commitment should be shown in future?

Should the programme scope be widened and regulations be opened up to allow a wider group of beneficiaries to participate? E.g. doctoral students, students wishing to graduate from a foreign university or polytechnics, or staff of other scientific and research institutes than educational institutes?

The evaluator should propose a set of criteria to be used in the administrative process when screening the applications from the educational institutes.

5. PLAN OF WORK / METHODOLOGY

The methods used in the evaluation process should be innovative, constructive and participatory. ‘Participatory’ refers here to the respective approach to be used in the discussions and the way how feedback is fed into the evaluation exercise. Different opinions need to have enough room to appear and possibilities to react and make concerns heard is needed.

The team shall ensure adequate involvement of all concerned and interested parties in the evaluation through information delivery and consultations. The counterpart unit in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs will be the Unit for Evaluation and Internal Auditing.

The evaluator is expected to present a suitable evaluation framework within which the analysis is carried out. The current reporting guidelines of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs gives a good outline for the evaluation report.

The evaluation does not require travelling to partner countries.

6. REQUIRED EXPERTISE / COMPOSITION OF THE EXPERT TEAM

The evaluation team is expected to cover the following expertise areas jointly together:

- Expertise and proven experience in project and programme evaluation.
- Expertise in development project management and administration.
- Knowledge in strategies, methods, procedures and processes of the Finnish development cooperation
- Expertise in institutional development issues
- Expertise in higher education
- Ability to analyse, synthesise and write clear reports.

The composition of the team is not fixed, but it is expected that two specialists will carry out most part of the work. Additional expertise to guarantee the full coverage of the expertise areas can be sought outside this core team. Participation of developing country representative and gender balance in the team are considered as assets.

7. TIMETABLE AND REPORTING

The evaluation will be carried out in February-March 2006 with following deadlines:

- Submission of a short interim report to the Ministry including the status of evaluation process and possible preliminary findings by 13.3.2006.
- Submission of the final draft evaluation report, including all the key findings, conclusions and recommendations, for comments and consideration by 31.3.2006
- Collection of comments from different parties by 10.4.2006
- Finalisation and submission of the final evaluation report to the Ministry by 20.4.2006.

The evaluation report shall be produced in English language (UK) including a short (1–2 pages) summary in Finnish language. The team leader is responsible for the report and approves the contribution of the other experts. The report will be handed over to the Ministry in three hard copies and in electronic format both as MS Office and PDF files. The final version has to be proof-read and otherwise in a form allowing direct printing.

---

15 http://global.finland.fi/julkaisut/yleis/pdme/index.html
8. BUDGET

The total costs will be covered by the Ministry according to the general principles (Standard Terms for the Payment of Fees and Reimbursement of Costs\(^{16}\)). The maximum budget for the evaluation is 35,000 Euro (VAT excluded).

9. AUTHORISATION

During the evaluation, the expert team is entitled and expected to discuss with the pertinent persons and organisations any matters related to the assignment. The team is not authorised to make any commitments on behalf of the government of Finland. The final draft evaluation report prepared by the team shall be subject to the approval of the competent authorities.

Pirjo Virtanen
Councillor
Unit for Evaluation and Internal Auditing
Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland

\(^{16}\) http://global.finland.fi/english/procurement/standard_terms_payment.pdf
ANNEX 2: EVALUATION ISSUES

“The aim of the programme is to promote long-term co-operation between Finnish higher education institutions and their developing country partners with the primary objective of improving and enhancing developing country capacities and abilities.”

The evaluation will examine critical questions and issues affecting the success of the program in the following key areas:

- Correspondence of the project with the priority needs of the beneficiaries i.e. relevance
- Assessment of the impact of the project towards its long-term objectives
- Extent of achievement of the project purpose as a consequence of the project, i.e. effectiveness
- Assessment of the efficiency of the implementation

Issues to be addressed:

I. Relevance to Strategic Goals

Issue areas:

- Relevance of programme operations for Finnish Development Policies
- Ownership: who owns the programme?
- Whose objectives are served by the method of implementation?
- Is the tool (student and faculty mobility, institutional partnership) appropriate for meeting the goals and objectives?

Key questions:

- Are the programme’s goals clearly defined and is their relevance to development policies transparent?
- Have the Programme operations contributed to the set Finnish Development Policies and MDGs?
- Are the objectives of the Programme well defined and are they known to the stakeholders?
- Who owns the programme: who participated in setting the programme goals?
- How were eligible countries selected? Are they appropriate for this type of program?
- How were projects selected on institutional and programme levels?
II. Partners and Participation

Issue areas:

- Balance and representivity of partners (geographic, institution type, etc)
- Project selection criteria
- Level of institutional involvement/engagement
- Level of participation in the planning

Key questions:

- Was there sufficient interest and participation from partner institutions? How can participation be increased?
- Were the project selection criteria transparent?
- Are the academic areas of the projects selected relevant for the overall objectives of the programme? Is the relevance monitored by the partners?
- In what countries was participation particularly low, and why? Are there clear geographic gaps?
- Were smaller and less central institutions sufficiently represented?
- Were institutions and their representatives sufficiently engaged in the planning and implementation of the program? How can they be better engaged? How many people were involved in the planning in partner institutions? Was the involvement personal/institutional?
- Did the program have any impacts on the international project planning and implementation structures in the institutions?
- Has interest in working with developing countries increased in Finnish Higher Education?
- Student Flows: how many students were sent and received per project?
- Faculty Flows: how many faculty members were sent and received per project?
- What was the number of twinning partnerships?
- How can discrepancies/balance issues in student flows and faculty mobility flows be explained?
- What were the types of students and faculty from developing country partners (equality issues)? Who decides the transparency of selection process?

III. Program Model and Organization

Issue areas:

- Student Selection Criteria and process
- Recruitment Mechanisms
- Application Model, cycle & mechanisms
- Credit exchange and tuition
Key questions:
- Did the selection criteria result in the desired range of faculty student participants? How could they be improved?
- Does the overall design of the program negatively affect student recruitment (more than information or funding issues, for example)?
- How well did the mechanisms for student application and selection function? How could they be improved?
- Has credit exchange between institutions worked effectively?

IV. Management and Coordination

Issue Areas:
- Overall coordination model
- Decision making
- Support and information
- Functions of Management Group and Project coordinators in Finland and Africa
- Functions of CIMO
- Functions of Institutions & representatives
- Role of Funders?

Key questions:
- Is the coordination model cumbersome or efficient and inclusive?
- Does it provide effective decision-making and support information?
- Does it provide appropriate representation of key participants?
- Has it been effective in improving government-to-government and institution-to-institution cooperation and communication regarding mobility generally?

V. Information dissemination and communications, media relations

Issue Areas:
- Overall communications strategy
- Recruitment and Publicity print material
- Web site and electronic communications
- Relations with media

Key questions:
- Were the print materials effective at recruiting students? How can they be improved?
- Was the website and other electronic communications effective for students and program participants? How can it be improved?
- How were students informed about the program at programme and at institution levels?
• How can information dissemination within participating institutions be improved?
• How can communications among institutions, CIMO, the funders be improved?
• Has awareness of HE cooperation with developing countries increased in the general public, in HE institutions?
• Has awareness of Finnish HE increased in the partner institutions in the developing countries?

VI. Funding Model

Issue Areas:
• Student Grant Levels
• Funding sources & levels
• Funding of common services
• Cost- effectiveness
• Transparency and ownership

Key questions:
• Is the overall funding model fair and effective? Are there other options or suggestions?
• Are student grant levels insufficient or excessive in some cases?
• Is the model for funding African participation effective and at the same time one that is based on equal ownership? How can it be improved?
• Is the model of funding coordination support and information support fair, effective, and sustainable? Are there other options or suggestions?
• How can program funding be sustained beyond the pilot?
• What is the appropriate level of funding for the program?
• The lifespan of projects: should they be sustainable or should they have a broad scope of activity to allow for new partnerships?

VII. Student Support and Services

Issue Areas:
• Preparation and Briefing
• Support at host institution
• Language issues
• Administrative and Practical issues (visas, etc)
• Study experiences
• Financial issues
Key questions:

• Did students receive sufficient and appropriate preparation from their home institutions before departure?

• Did students receive sufficient and appropriate support and services from their host institution during their exchange?

• How can student support services be improved at both the home and host institutions?

• Orientation program at CIMO; did that function well? Was the information effective and available to all?

VIII. Barriers to Mobility

Issue areas:

• Personal barriers of students (applying, having positive exchange experience)

• Institutional barriers (inability to participate, inability to recruit, inability to provide effective student services, etc)

• National barriers

• Program barriers

Key questions:

• Are there major administrative barriers to mobility, such as visa requirements, that can be addressed by governments/national agencies?

• What are the biggest challenges faced by students?

• What are the biggest advantages, positive experiences of participating students?

• Were "non-traditional" mobility students sufficiently represented? If not, what might explain their under-representation?

IX. Evaluation and Quality Assurance Procedures

Issue areas:

• Programme Evaluation and Quality Assurance Tools

• Coordination of Evaluation

Key questions:

• Was participation/feedback in the evaluation representative of key stakeholders?

• Were the methods of student data collection/maintenance effective? How could they be improved?

• Is Quality Assurance an integral part of all program administration aspects?

• What improvements can be made to the quality assurance and evaluation of the programme?

• How are the results of evaluation (feedback from participating faculty and staff, programme administrators) disseminated, and used to improve the future of the program?

• Was the external evaluation organized in an appropriate and efficient manner? What were the problem areas?
ANNEX 3: PERSONS INTERVIEWED IN FINLAND BETWEEN 3.3. –13.3. 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahokas Aija</td>
<td>International coordinator</td>
<td>Helsinki Polytechnic, Stadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airas Maija</td>
<td>Adviser</td>
<td>CIMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antila Sinikka</td>
<td>Head of Unit</td>
<td>MFA, Unit for general development policy and planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashipala Emilie T.</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>University of Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bjorkman Hanna</td>
<td>Head of international relations</td>
<td>Helsinki Polytechnic, Stadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatora Elizabeth</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>University of Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eid Mona-Liza</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator</td>
<td>Oulu University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekbergh Ulla</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>CIMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gachoka Mercy</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Kabarak University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gojobo José</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>UEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halilaha Päivi</td>
<td>International Studies Coordinator</td>
<td>University of Joensuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrala Salla</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Oulu University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirvonen Eila</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator</td>
<td>Tampere University of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holma Aulikki</td>
<td>R&amp;D Manager</td>
<td>Turku University of Applied Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikonen Mari</td>
<td>Study Abroad Coordinator</td>
<td>University of Joensuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaemba Mitwa</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>University of Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kareinen Jussi</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>Seinäjoki polytechnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karhu Tuula</td>
<td>Adm Coordinator</td>
<td>Oulu University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsizeu Mc-Cloud</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>University of Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kessy Diana</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Tumaini University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kivikuru Ullamaija</td>
<td>Academic Coordinator</td>
<td>Helsinki University (SSHK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korhonen Katriina</td>
<td>Administrative coordinator</td>
<td>North Karelia University of Applied Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korkelaamäki Riitta-Kaisa</td>
<td>Professor, Head of Department</td>
<td>Oulu University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuoortti Kimmo</td>
<td>Director of International Relations</td>
<td>Oulu University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Grand Pia</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator</td>
<td>University of Turku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehmusvaara Tiina</td>
<td>Information officer</td>
<td>CIMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Institution</td>
<td>Institution/Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehtovaara Jenni</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>North Karelia University of Applied Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louhija Marja</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>Helsinki Polytechnic, Stadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maasilta Mari</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Tampere University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Määläskä Anja</td>
<td>Institutional coordinator</td>
<td>Oulu University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manjate Juvencio</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>UEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrengala Miguel</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>UEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marutse Felix</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>MMAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metteri Anna</td>
<td>Academic Coordinator</td>
<td>University of Tampere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisana Orquidea</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>UEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moua Lea</td>
<td>Senior Adviser</td>
<td>Helsinki Polytechnic, Stadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagel Lynette</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>University of Pretoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanub Helmuth</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>University of Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neulaniemi Miika</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Scinajoki polytechnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngashikuao Lea</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>University of Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nghikembua Taimi</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>University of Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niskala Maarja</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Oulu University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ollikainen-Autiosaari Annamarja</td>
<td>Principal lecturer</td>
<td>Pirkanmaa Polytechnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkkinen Jussi</td>
<td>Head of Department of Computer science</td>
<td>University of Joensuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennanen Kari</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>North Karelia University of Applied Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Räisänen Rauni</td>
<td>Dr, Project Academic Lead</td>
<td>Oulu University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renland Micke</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Helsinki Polytechnic, Stadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodriguez Ubillus July</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>UNMSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rönkä Marianne</td>
<td>Programme Assistant</td>
<td>CIMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruotsalainen Mirikka</td>
<td>Previous administrative coordinator</td>
<td>Turku University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryhänen Minchun</td>
<td>International Relations Coordinator</td>
<td>University of Joensuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sääksjärvi Ilari</td>
<td>Academic Coordinator</td>
<td>University of Turku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saarikorpi Irja</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator</td>
<td>Pirkanmaa Polytechnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saarinen Jarkko</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Oulu University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Roman Gordillo Rodrigo</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>UNALM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santavuori Maria</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Helsinki Polytechnic, Stadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saramäki Pirjo</td>
<td>Academic coordinator</td>
<td>North Karelia University of Applied Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shikongo Lukas</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Windhoek College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sipilä Tia-Maria</td>
<td>International Coordinator</td>
<td>Helsinki Polytechnic, Stadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skinner Rachel</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Oulu University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tedre Matti</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>University of Joensuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissari Ulla</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Pirkanmaa Polytechnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toivonen Jussi</td>
<td></td>
<td>MFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallo Tanja</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Oulu University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesisenaho Mikko</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td>University of Joensuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser Sandra</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>University of the Western Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zita Carla</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>UEM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 4: PERSONS INTERVIEWED IN AFRICA

### Zambia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Zambia</td>
<td>Prof. Mapopa Mtonga</td>
<td>Tili Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lusaka School of Nursing</td>
<td>Ms. Sally Zulu</td>
<td>Malawi-Zambia Health Care Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Zambia</td>
<td>Dr. D.M. Kalabula</td>
<td>Capacity building in Teacher Education and Management for sustainable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Zambia</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Research-based knowledge for integrated sustainable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNZA</td>
<td>Lecturer Fidelis Musyamba</td>
<td>North-South Higher Education network in Journalism Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Namibia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Namibia</td>
<td>Prof. Kingo Mchombu</td>
<td>Triangular Cooperation in Library and Information Studies between Finland, Namibia and RSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Namibia</td>
<td>Prof. Kingo Mchombu</td>
<td>North-South Higher Education Network in Journalism Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windhoek College of education</td>
<td>Rector Emma Kirchner Ms. Shilongo</td>
<td>Capacity building in Teacher Education and Management for sustainable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Namibia</td>
<td>Prof. Rehabeam K. Auala</td>
<td>Capacity building in Teacher Education and Management for sustainable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Namibia</td>
<td>Prof. Dr Fritz Becker Lecturer Susanne Albl</td>
<td>Sustainability, tourism and Regional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Namibia</td>
<td>Dr Itah Kandjii-Murangi</td>
<td>SARTS++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAM</td>
<td>Mari Nummela (Turku) Jaakko Hauku (Oulu) Maria Keskikuru (Oulu)</td>
<td>Tourism, Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAM</td>
<td>Gerhard Sam Urioukwao Matundu Ringo</td>
<td>Tourism, Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 5: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Objectives:</td>
<td>Academic relevance of the mobility&lt;br&gt;Numer of long-term twinning partnerships established&lt;br&gt;Number of persons involved in the programme working with development countries&lt;br&gt;Monitoring reports of the universities</td>
<td>External evaluation in the year 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Purpose:</td>
<td>Funding mechanism operational by the end of year 2003&lt;br&gt;The efficiency of the Network Programme’s management</td>
<td>CIMO’s monitoring reports&lt;br&gt;Comparison between the management of the Higher Education Network Programme and other mobility instruments</td>
<td>High interest among Finnish and developing country higher education institutions for the programme&lt;br&gt;Several Finnish participants start to work with developing country-related issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results: An efficient and user-friendly information system established at CIMO for the Network Programme. The information system will also cover potential EU-funds for teacher/student mobility with developing country higher education institutions. Information packages and training programmes for cultural adaptation and development co-operation developed for the Finnish students and teachers participating in the programme. In addition, information packages on Finnish society will be developed for the students and teachers travelling to Finland. An efficient management and monitoring system established for the Network Programme. Approximately 220 students and 65 teachers from the developing countries and 140 Finnish students and 45 teachers have participated in the programme by the end of the pilot phase.</td>
<td>The level of knowledge on the programme&lt;br&gt;The quality of applications / approval rate&lt;br&gt;Number and types of problems encountered&lt;br&gt;Number of students and teachers participating in the programme</td>
<td>Survey among the participating Finnish institutions&lt;br&gt;Approval rate of the applications and assessment by the persons appraising the applications&lt;br&gt;Monitoring reports from the participating institutions</td>
<td>Sufficient number of students are interested in the programme&lt;br&gt;Studies abroad will be credited in the out-sending institution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX 6: PARTNERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finnish Partners</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Foreign Partners</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Arcada**       | Training Producers for Ecological Broadcasting | • University Witwatersrand  
• University of Cape Town  
• The South African School for Motion Picture and Live performance | South Africa |
| **Helsingin yliopisto, Metsäekologian laitos/VITRI** | Sudan – Finland North-South Education Exchange | University of Khartoum | Sudan |
| **Helsingin yliopisto, SSKH (coord.)**  
• Jyväskylän yliopisto  
• Tampereen yliopisto | North-South Higher Education Network in Journalism Education | • University of Dar es Salaam  
• University of Namibia  
• University of Zambia | Tanzania  
Namibia  
Zambia |
| **Helsingin yliopisto, Teologinen tiedekunta** | Makumira-Helsinki Exchange in Theology | Makumira University College | Tanzania |
| **Joensuun yliopisto, Tietojenkäsittelytieedele** | SARTS-project | • Kaharuk University,  
Tumain University,  
Iranga University College,  
University of Namibia,  
University of Pretoria | Kenya  
Tanzania,  
Namibia,  
South Africa |
| **Jyväskylän yliopisto, Kasvatustieteen laitos, musiikkikasvatus** | Music education in South Africa | University of Pretoria | South Africa |
| **Jyväskylän yliopisto, Yhteiskuntatieteet** | Research-Based Knowledge for Integrated Sustainable Development | • University of Zambia  
• University of Dar es Salaam  
• Addis Ababa University | Zambia  
Tanzania  
Ethiopia |
| **Kuopion yliopisto** | International Public Health Education in Collaboration with Nigeria and Kenya | • University of Ibadan  
• University of Eastern Africa, Kendu hospital  
• Muhimbili University College of Health Sciences  
• University of Sin Shams | Nigeria  
Kenya  
Tanzania  
Egypt |
| **Kymenlaakson ammattikorkeakoulu,** | Sustainable Management in Sawmilling and Wood-based Panel Technology | Mzuzu University | Malawi |
| **Oulun yliopisto, (coord.)**  
• Åbo Akademi  
• Turun AMK | Triangular Cooperation in Library and Information Studies between Finland, Namibia and South Africa | • University of the Western Cape  
• University of Stellenbosch  
• University of Namibia | South Africa  
South Africa  
Namibia |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Name</th>
<th>Programme Description</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oulun yliopisto, Kasvatustieteen laitos, opettajankoulutus</strong></td>
<td>Capacity building in Teacher Education and Management for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Windhoek College of Education, University of Namibia, University of Zambia, University of Cape Town</td>
<td>Namibia, Zambia, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oulun yliopisto, Maantiede</strong></td>
<td>Higher Education and Management of Sustainable Tourism in Southern Africa</td>
<td>University of Pretoria, University of Cape Town, University of Namibia, University of Botswana</td>
<td>South Africa, Namibia, Botswana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pirkanmaan ammatti-korkeakoulu (coord) • Tampereen yliopisto</strong></td>
<td>Collaborative Education for Social Development and Social Work</td>
<td>Universidade Eduardo Mondlane, Ministerio de Mulher e Acesso Social</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pohjois-Karjalan AMK (coord) • Mikkelin AMK</strong></td>
<td>Omusati Project</td>
<td>Ongongo Agricultural College</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Savonia AMK (coord) • Kuopion yliopisto</strong></td>
<td>Via Dupla FINMOZ</td>
<td>Instituto Superior de Ciencias de Saúde in Maputo, Universidade Eduardo Mondlane</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seinäjoen ammatti-korkeakoulu (coord) • Stadia</strong></td>
<td>Health Africa</td>
<td>Makerere University, Maseno University</td>
<td>Uganda, Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sibelius Academy Music</strong></td>
<td>Finnish-African Exchange Network for Higher Education in Music</td>
<td>University of Ghana, South African College of Music (University of Cape Town)</td>
<td>Ghana, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stadia (coord) • Seinäjoen AMK</strong></td>
<td>Tili Tonsa</td>
<td>University of Zambia</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stadia, Hoitotyö</strong></td>
<td>Malawi-Zambia Health Care Project</td>
<td>University of Malawi, Malawi College of Health Sciences, School of Nursing/University Teaching Hospital</td>
<td>Malawi, Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taidetekelinen korkeakoulu</strong></td>
<td>MaxedMedia-Exchange Programme for Art Education students</td>
<td>Kyambogo University</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampereen teknillinen yliopisto</td>
<td>Teacher and Student Exchange Programme between Tampere University of Technology and University of Eduardo Mondlane Universidade Eduardo Mondlane</td>
<td>Moambaque</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turun yliopisto Biologian, maantieteen ja geologian osastot</td>
<td>Teacher and Student exchange between Peru and Finland: Environment and Development (ENDEV)</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• University La Molina  • University of San Marcos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaasan AMK</td>
<td>Mobility between Ghana and Finland</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cape Coast Polytechnic  • Accra Polytechnic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 7: ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
MARCH 20TH, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ulla Ekberg</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>CIMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airas Maija</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>CIMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antila Sinikka</td>
<td>Unit Head</td>
<td>MFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brolen Kirsi.</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>MFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorschkwow Elena</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>SYL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heikkilä Sakari</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>SAMOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmström Zabrina</td>
<td>Culture Councillor</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilhelmsson Thomas</td>
<td>Vice Rector</td>
<td>Helsinki University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolff Henrik</td>
<td>Managing director</td>
<td>Arcada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rönkä Marianne</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>CIMO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 8: PROJECT CATEGORIES

The evaluators have placed projects into eight separate categories. The categorization has been adopted from the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications. The main categories used for this analysis are numbered 1 – 8 under which exist subcategories. For the purposes of this evaluation only the main categories were noted:

1 Education
   Teacher training
   Education Science

2 Humanities and Arts
   Arts
   Humanities

3 Social Sciences, business and law
   Social and behavioural science
   Journalism and information
   Business and administration
   Law

4 Science
   Life sciences
   Physical sciences
   Mathematics and statistics
   Computing

5 Engineering, manufacturing and construction
   Engineering and engineering trades
   Manufacturing and processing
   Architecture and building

6 Agriculture
   Agriculture, forestry and fishery
   Veterinary

7 Health and Welfare
   Health
   Social services

8 Services (Tourism)
   Personal services
   Transport services
   Environmental protection
   Security services
Table 8: Budget Allocation by Project 2004–2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project:</th>
<th>Budget Allocated</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27550</td>
<td>39000</td>
<td>44200</td>
<td>110750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building in Teacher Education and Management for Sustainable Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>27550</td>
<td>39000</td>
<td>44200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tili Tönse-projekti</td>
<td></td>
<td>20400</td>
<td>38000</td>
<td>42400</td>
<td>324000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makumira-Helsinki Exchange in Theology</td>
<td></td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>11400</td>
<td>11400</td>
<td>22800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education in South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>34300</td>
<td>21400</td>
<td>25800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxed Media 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>54000</td>
<td>14600</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish-African Exchange Network for Higher Education in Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences, business and law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Producers for Ecological Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
<td>15800</td>
<td>49800</td>
<td>39200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Education for Social Development and Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>16000</td>
<td>45600</td>
<td>45200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility between Ghana and Finland - Poikkitieteellisen opintokokonaisuuden kehittäminen teknologian, taloustieteiden ja johtamisen aloilla</td>
<td></td>
<td>35400</td>
<td>27000</td>
<td>28800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-South Higher Education Network in Journalism Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>23200</td>
<td>35200</td>
<td>38400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research-based Knowledge for Integrated Sustainable Development – Masters Programme in Development and International Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td>17500</td>
<td>45000</td>
<td>38200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangular cooperation in library and information studies between Finland, Namibia and R.S.A –</td>
<td></td>
<td>19000</td>
<td>22800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5ARTS-project</td>
<td></td>
<td>36000</td>
<td>37600</td>
<td>35000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Student exchange between the University of Turku, Finland and the University of La Molina and the University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru: Environment and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>32000</td>
<td>47200</td>
<td>47400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, manufacturing and construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampere University of Technology and University Eduardo Mondlane, Mosambique</td>
<td></td>
<td>36800</td>
<td>30600</td>
<td>67400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Forestry and Forest Industries – Sustainable Management in Sawmilling and Wood-based Panel Technology</td>
<td>17200</td>
<td>32000</td>
<td>26000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omusati Project; Forestry and Wood technology</td>
<td>34200</td>
<td>15400</td>
<td>40200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan – Finland Education Exchange</td>
<td>16600</td>
<td>23300</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Health and Welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Africa – project</td>
<td>64800</td>
<td>63200</td>
<td>76800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi-Zambia Health Care Project</td>
<td>40600</td>
<td>13400</td>
<td>26400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Dupla FinMoz</td>
<td>42400</td>
<td>38800</td>
<td>41600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Public Health Education in Collaboration with Nigeria and Kenya</td>
<td>37328</td>
<td>30812</td>
<td>32228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Services (Tourism)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability, Tourism and Regional Development: Higher Education and Management of Sustainable Tourism in Southern Africa</td>
<td>29300</td>
<td>33000</td>
<td>33600</td>
<td>95900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>602578</td>
<td>717512</td>
<td>799028</td>
<td>2119118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 9: NORTH-SOUTH COORDINATORS’ MEETING ON APRIL 3RD, 2006 AT CIMO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aitas Maija</td>
<td>CIMO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Björkman Hanna</td>
<td>Helsingin AMK Stadia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brolen Kirs</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herva Kaisa</td>
<td>Helsingin yliopisto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirvonen Eila</td>
<td>Tampereen tekninen yliopisto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jutaniemi Ritva</td>
<td>Vaasan AMK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaarakka Vesa</td>
<td>Helsingin yliopisto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kareinen Jussi</td>
<td>Seinäjoen AMK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaskulahti Anssi</td>
<td>Arcada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitisenaja Hellevi</td>
<td>Seinäjoen AMK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kontro Paola</td>
<td>Kuopion yliopisto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kontula Lisbet</td>
<td>KPMG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koponen Tuija</td>
<td>Jyväskylä yliopisto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korhonen Katriina</td>
<td>Pohjois-Karjalan AMK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Grand Pia</td>
<td>Turun yliopisto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luikko Henrik</td>
<td>Kymenlaakson AMK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metteri Anna</td>
<td>Tampereen yliopisto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moua Lea</td>
<td>Helsingin AMK Stadia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mälskä Anja</td>
<td>Oulun yliopisto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyström Sonja</td>
<td>SSKH/HY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennanen Eija</td>
<td>Seinäjoen AMK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirkkalainen Päivi</td>
<td>Jyväskylä yliopisto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rönkä Marianne</td>
<td>CIMO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saarilahti Irja</td>
<td>Pirkanmaan AMK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savonlahti Kristiina</td>
<td>Joensuun yliopisto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seppälä Merja</td>
<td>Keski-Pohjanmaan AMK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinikangas Maarit</td>
<td>Kuopion yliopisto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovasto Jussi</td>
<td>KPMG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesisenaho Mikko</td>
<td>Joensuun yliopisto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Teachers leaving</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Teachers coming</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Students leaving</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Students coming</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Total Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Total Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Total Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33(31)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52(50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GLOSSARY

**Bologna Process**: The Bologna Process began in 1999 for the creation of a European Higher Education Area. The expressed goals of the Bologna Process are to increase the mobility and employability of European higher education thereby maintaining competitiveness on a global scale.

**Centre for International Mobility (CIMO)**: CIMO administers scholarship and exchange programmes and is responsible for implementing nearly all EU education, training, culture and youth programmes at national level. CIMO also promotes and organises international trainee exchanges.

**Development Assistance Committee (DAC)**: The Development Assistance committee is the principal body through which the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) deals with issues related to co-operation with developing countries.

**Erasmus Mundus**: The Erasmus Mundus programme is a co-operation and mobility programme in the field of higher education which promotes the European Union as a centre of excellence in learning around the world. It supports European top-quality Masters Courses and enhances the visibility and attractiveness of European higher education in developing countries. It also provides EU-funded scholarships for residents of developing countries participating in these Masters Courses, as well as scholarships for EU-nationals studying in developing countries.

**Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)**: The United Nations eight Millennium Development Goals – which range from halving extreme poverty to halting the spread of HIV/AIDS and providing universal primary education, all by the target date of 2015 – form a blueprint agreed to by all the world’s countries and the world’s leading development institutions. They have galvanized unprecedented efforts to meet the needs of the world’s poorest.

**Nordplus**: Nordplus is mobility programme for students at Nordic institutions of higher education.

**Official Development Assistance (ODA)**: According to the OECD, the aid flows which are provided by official agencies and which are administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as its main objective can be included into ODA. OECD keeps also a list of developing countries which are qualified as recipients of ODA.

**Tili-Tonse Project**: A North-South Higher Education Network Degree Programme in Performing Arts together with University of Zambia UNZA and Seinäjoki Polytechnic.
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