



Canadian International  
Development Agency

Agence canadienne de  
développement international

# **University Partnerships in Cooperation and Development Program Evaluation**

## **Executive Report**

**Evaluation Division  
Performance and Knowledge Management Branch**

**February 2007**

Canadian International Development Agency  
200 Promenade du Portage  
Gatineau, Quebec  
K1A 0G4  
Tel: (819) 997-5006  
Toll free: 1-800-230-6349  
Fax: (819) 953-6088  
(For the hearing and speech impaired only (TDD/TTY): (819) 953-5023  
Toll free for the hearing and speech impaired only: 1-800-331-5018)  
E-mail: [info@acdi-cida.gc.ca](mailto:info@acdi-cida.gc.ca)

**Canada** 



## **Abbreviations and Acronyms**

AUCC	Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
CAUP	CIDA/AUCC University Partnership Program
CARA	Central American Water Resource Management Network
CDPF	Country Development Programming Framework
CI	Canadian Institution
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CPB	Canadian Partnership Branch
CSO	Civil-society organization
DCETO	Developing-country education and training organization
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PDF	Proposal development fund
RBM	Results-based management
UCP	Universities and Colleges Program
UCR	University of Costa Rica
UPCD	University Partnerships in Cooperation and Development Program



## **Table of Contents**

1.0	Introduction.....	1
2.0	UPCD Program Overview .....	1
3.0	Evaluation Scope and Methodology .....	2
4.0	UPCD Investment Profile .....	4
5.0	Findings: Program and Project Performance .....	5
5.1	Relevance .....	5
5.2	Appropriateness of Project Design .....	9
5.3	Partnerships.....	13
5.4	Results and Sustainability .....	14
6.0	Findings: Management Effectiveness .....	17
6.1	Program Management.....	17
6.2	Project Management .....	19
6.3	AUCC Management.....	21
6.4	Partner Project Management.....	22
6.5	Financial Management.....	23
6.6	Consistency and Coordination .....	24
7.0	Lessons Learned.....	25
7.1	Development Lessons .....	25
7.2	Management Lessons.....	27
8.0	Recommendations.....	28
8.1	Program Level Recommendations.....	28
8.2	Project Level Recommendations .....	29
	Appendix I: Management Response .....	31



## **1.0 Introduction**

The Policy for Performance Review of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) calls for the conduct of periodic and independent reviews of its policies, programs, projects and operations. The results allow more enlightened decision-making, practice-based knowledge development, and the promotion of an enabling environment for performance-based reporting. It is in this context that the University Partnerships in Cooperation and Development Program (UPCD) was selected for evaluation, in 2006, of its performance, results and lessons learned.

The evaluation team comprised three experienced independent consultants and one CIDA manager from the Performance and Knowledge Management Branch. The evaluation was conducted between January and November 2006 within the framework of strategies, principles and priorities guiding all CIDA programs, namely aid effectiveness principles, the Millennium Development Goals, Canada's current international policy statement, and relevant CIDA country development programming frameworks (CDPFs) (all found on CIDA's website). In addition, UPCD must meet the human resource development priorities of host countries and support the institutional priorities of Canadian institutions (CIs) and partner developing-country education and training organizations (DCETOs) participating in projects.

## **2.0 UPCD Program Overview**

Canadian Partnership Branch (CPB) has cooperated with institutions of higher learning in Canada and in developing countries for nearly 30 years and has invested more than \$250 million in university partnership programs since 1986.

Until 1994, various mechanisms were used to fund a large number of institutional activities managed by CIDA in a fragmented and administratively heavy way. In 1994, a consolidated funding mechanism was put in place to merge CPB contributions to Canadian institutions of higher learning into a single five-year program, UPCD.

A 1998/99 evaluation identified positive findings for UPCD, highlighting the rationalization of the Program, the application of the single window principle, and the value of close cooperation among CIDA, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) and CIs. Consequently, CIDA decided to renew UPCD for a six-year phase (2001/02 to 2007/08).

As currently defined, the Program is subdivided into two major components:

- Tier 1 managed by CIDA's CPB Universities and Colleges Program (UCP), through which CIDA provides up to \$3 million in funding.
- Tier 2 managed by AUCC, through which CIDA provides up to \$1 million in funding.

Both Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects are jointly executed by Canadian institutions and DCETOs, have a maximum duration of six years, and cannot be renewed for a subsequent phase.

For Phases I and II of UPCD (1993 to 2007), CIDA invested close to \$70 million in 33 projects through Tier I, and some \$81 million in about 100 projects through Tier 2. These projects involve 45 Canadian universities in 65 countries in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), and Asia.

From 1993 to 2007, CIDA disbursed to AUCC \$3.75 million to manage Tier 2 projects and \$1.25 million for selection committees and Project Proposal Development Fund (PDF) management expenditures through a funding mechanism known as the CIDA/AUCC University Partnership Program (CAUP).

The purpose of UPCD is to build the capacities of DCETOs so that they can better contribute to their respective country's sustainable development priorities. Its goal is to build the capacity of these organizations to meet the needs of the communities they serve, in cooperation with Canadian universities.

Principles underlying UPCD include a responsive mechanism whereby the Program responds to joint CI/DCETO proposals; a partnership approach, especially with AUCC; cost-sharing on a 70/30 (CIDA/CI) matching basis; transparency, through an open competitive process; and a selection process based on the merit of proposals judged by a committee of representatives of CIs, CIDA, developing countries and a chairperson.

The project selection process is coordinated by AUCC for both tiers and involves two phases: preparation of a letter of intent and, once the committee approves this letter, drafting of a full proposal by the Canadian and developing-country partners involved.

The main selection criteria are 1) relevance to host countries, DCETOs, CIDA, and other projects or donors; 2) partnership, which implies close institutional relationships and impact on developing-country communities; and 3) project methodology and management in relation to CIDA priorities, including results-based management (RBM), equality between women and men, sustainability, the environment, and the validity of the budget, especially linkages between costs, activities, and expected results.

Approval of the letter of intent allows CIs and DCETOs to access the PDF so they can jointly draft a full proposal. This includes bringing developing-country partners to Canada. CIDA contributes up to \$30,000 from the Fund for Tier 1 proposals and up to \$10,000 for Tier 2 proposals.

### **3.0 Evaluation Scope and Methodology**

The evaluation concerns UPCD's current phase (2001/02 to 2007/08), including Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects. The sample includes projects begun in Phase I of UPCD but completed during Phase II in order to highlight program trends and to ensure that conclusions are at a more strategic level.

The evaluation was structured according to CIDA's Framework of Results and Key Success Factors, and aims to provide CIDA with information concerning its management strategy and future investments in CI/DCETO cooperation.

The UPCD Program evaluation has four main components:

- Profiling of the Program's investments since its implementation in 1986;
- A preliminary review of UPCD management by CIDA and AUCC, complemented by the results of field visits;
- A study of all 46 projects implemented or completed during the current phase for seven countries (China, Vietnam, Ghana, Burkina Faso, Brazil, Costa Rica, and Nicaragua), and field missions to analyze the majority of projects in six of these countries (Nicaragua was dealt with on the basis of documents, telephone surveys, personal interviews in Canada, and e-mail exchanges). These studies resulted in three mission reports for Asia, Africa, and LAC respectively; and
- Preparation of the final report, summarizing all findings, recommendations, and lessons learned for each component of the evaluation.

The evaluation has several limitations. The team was not able to obtain all requested documents for Tier 1 projects; some documents were missing from project files. RBM and its underlying tools were not formalized until the late 1990s and many projects do not have logical frameworks that allow easy comparison. Similarly, the Program's objectives and requirements evolved over time and care must be exercised in comparing projects. Given time, budget and logistical constraints, it was not possible to visit all projects and elicit all points of view.

There were many data sources and collection methods:

- Countries and projects were selected on the basis of a series of criteria: distribution between the three continents where UPCD is active, concentration of projects, variety of sectors, representative sample of both tiers, start-up dates, and logistical feasibility.
- A wide-ranging literature review was conducted on each project, including CIDA strategies, policies and guidelines; all AUCC documents, management tools, methodologies, and reports; and strategic and policy documents of selected countries.
- Interviews were conducted in Canada with CIDA program managers, AUCC's UPCD managers, project selection committee members, UPCD international relations officers and project managers in Canada, all project managers and other participants.
- An automated questionnaire was sent to about 40 Canadian universities (whether participants in UPCD or not); 65 percent were duly completed and returned.
- Missions were conducted in Africa (Burkina Faso and Ghana), Asia (Vietnam and China), and LAC (Brazil, Costa Rica). A review of projects in Nicaragua was covered from Canada. This allowed interviews with CIDA Post personnel, DCETO managers, and administrators, project team members, students, and representatives of local governments, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), civil-society organizations (CSOs) and project recipient communities (more than 200 people in all).

It should be noted that there were no problems in quickly gathering documentation on Tier 2 projects managed by AUCC. However, for Tier 1 projects managed by CIDA, several documents were missing from files or difficult to locate. Staff turnover or a flawed filing system may explain these difficulties.

## 4.0 UPCD Investment Profile

### CPB Financial Support for Canadian Universities 1986 through 2005

Period	Components	Amount (\$ million)	Annual Average (\$ million)
<b>1986–1994</b>	<b>Pre-UPCD</b>	<b>51.30</b>	<b>6.41</b>
1994–2001	UPCD Phase I, Tier 1	69.78	9.96
1994–2001	UPCD Phase I, Tier 2	33.11	4.73
<b>1994–2001</b>	<b>Subtotal Phase I</b>	<b>102.89</b>	<b>14.69</b>
2001–2005	UPCD Phase II, Tier 1	38.07	9.51
2001–2005	UPCD Phase II, Tier 2	27.86	6.96
<b>2001–2005</b>	<b>Subtotal Phase II (until 2005)</b>	<b>65.93</b>	<b>16.47</b>
<b>1986–2005</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>220.12</b>	<b>12.22</b>

A CIDA/AUCC contribution agreement (known as CAUP) entrusts AUCC with Tier 2 project management and a budget to meet the expenditures involved in the AUCC-managed selection process for both tiers. AUCC administration accounts for nearly 15% of the value of Tier 2 projects. However, this includes project selection committee costs and the Proposal Development Fund for both tiers.

The 133 UPCD projects (Phases I and II, 1994 to present) are sometimes executed in more than one country, especially Tier 1 projects. There are 185 country projects in all: in Africa, there are 61 projects; in LAC, 78 projects; and in Asia, 46 projects.

The 133 projects involve 65 countries. Nine countries (five in the Americas, two in Asia, and two in Africa) account for 83 projects, or 60% of all projects.

#### Geographic Distribution of 83 Projects in 9 Countries

Country	Number of Projects	Country	Number of projects
Vietnam	15	China	8
Cuba	11	Ghana	7
Mexico	11	South Africa	6
Chile	10	Brazil	6
Costa Rica	9	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>83</b>

The geographic distribution of UPCD projects no longer reflects CIDA's current guidelines regarding developing country partners. UPCD's country selection was made before—often many years before—CIDA chose its countries of focus. More than half of UPCD project host countries are in Africa. Of the 185 country projects identified, 57 projects are found in CIDA's partner countries.

UPCD projects (Tier 1 and Tier 2) are highly concentrated in a few sectors. Of the 133 projects identified, 47 concerned basic human needs (including 37 in health), 24 dealt with sustainable agriculture, and 23 with private-sector development. Equality between women and men and the environment are crosscutting themes in all projects.

## **5.0 Findings: Program and Project Performance**

### **5.1 Relevance**

**Relevance to Local Priorities and Development Challenges:** UPCD projects are generally consistent with the development priorities of host governments, especially those that have produced a poverty reduction strategy paper. Projects mainly reflect the key sectors identified in development plans. Most of the universities visited are public institutions that incorporate the government's higher-education strategy.

Three issues must be considered concerning the relevance of projects to local priorities:

- First, especially in very poor countries, higher education is rarely a priority in itself and its role in development may be poorly defined. The Program is legitimate at the sectoral level, i.e., training highly qualified human resources in key development sectors, rather than institution building in higher education and in DCETOs as a whole. This dichotomy between strengthening human resources and building institutional capacities can be a major constraint in terms of impact and sustainability.
- Second, while projects are in sectors that governments have identified as priorities, they sometimes address only specific portions of problems, and do not always clearly play a role in overall plans to develop the education sector. This is particularly true in very poor countries. In countries undergoing industrialization, the contribution of DCETOs to the education and other development priorities is far better articulated.
- Third, CIDA's decision to give priority to Africa has resulted in a directive that 50% of new UPCD investments must be made in Africa. The relevance of this directive is questionable. With regard to overall institution building of DCETOs, the rationale should be re-examined, since higher education in itself is not a priority for CIDA, nor is it for most African countries where CIDA has programs. Further, UPCD is seriously limited in terms of results in countries that have virtually no absorption capacity and a very low level of DCETO institutional development.

**Relevance to CIDA Programming Priorities:** CIDA's Universities and Colleges Program (UCP) and AUCC have sought to assure CIDA that UPCD reflects its new directions. However, the Program is scattered and lacks consistency with CIDA's overall programming; it tries to meet too many objectives at once. Nevertheless, by targeting civil society, the Program significantly offsets the risk that CIDA runs by making governments the focus of its programming.

Although higher education in itself is not a priority for CIDA, UPCD remains entirely relevant, at least theoretically, in terms of capacity building of civil society and training of highly qualified human resources in key development sectors identified as priorities in CDPFs.

UPCD-funded projects are scattered geographically and sectorally. This scattering has a negative impact on cost-effectiveness. It multiplies administrative procedures and increases transaction costs without maximizing synergy. Consistency is not clearly established with overall CIDA programming, especially the value added of UPCD investments in relation to CIDA's areas of intervention and funding mechanisms.

Moreover, the Program must meet a very large number of general objectives (aid effectiveness, Millennium Development Goals, priority areas of intervention, crosscutting themes, country strategies). These many objectives can only make projects less relevant.

Given CIDA's focus on governments, UPCD—like other partnership programs designed to strengthen civil society—can counterbalance the risks of the new approaches whose effectiveness remains to be demonstrated. At the same time, UPCD can build civil society's capacities to promote good governance and hold government accountable.

The current focus on Africa leads to the risk of the Program not being able to derive the full benefits (especially potential transfers between developing countries) of sustainable partnerships developed as a result of past projects. In LAC and Asia, the quality and duration of partnerships have had major impacts on confidence, ownership and appropriateness of project design—in short, on program results.

With the current selection process, there is a risk that some high-quality proposals may be left behind less interesting proposals, merely because these focus on Africa. Projects with higher budgets may be selected to achieve the quota for Africa.

The evaluation team considers that thought should be given to the requirement that 50% of UPCD investments be made in Africa. New approaches and methods should be developed and tested for very poor countries or institutions to increase UPCD's effectiveness, impact and sustainability of results.

UPCD projects are consistent with the priorities and areas of intervention of CIDA's CDPFs, both geographically and sectorally. UPCD projects promote ownership of results by DCETOs when local institutions have matured enough to identify and express their needs, and have the absorption capacity to institutionalize results.

CDPFs lead to a wide range of projects and approaches whose common thread is sometimes only their designated sector. There are very few linkages between UPCD projects in a given country, since no satisfactory mechanism ensures their coherence and synergy.

Projects should continue to be designed to build local capacities in areas of key importance to a country's development (rather than to build capacities of institutions of higher learning). Strengthening specialized human resources in the service of development is the value added and the area of expertise of the majority of UPCD projects, not the strengthening of institutional capacities.

**Relevance to DCETO Strategic Needs and Priorities:** UPCD is gaining in experience and expertise, and is becoming more relevant to developing-country institutions. Its relevance depends on several key factors:

- The institutional status of DCETOs, such that when prerequisites are met (in terms of governance, administration, leadership, and human, financial, and material resources), DCETOs are able to broadly define their strategic directions, position themselves in relation to their environment, and determine what they expect from the Program. The duration and depth of CI/DCETO partnerships, specifically the relationships between those directly involved in projects.
- Consistency between projects and the demands stemming from the contextual environment, especially practical policies and host-country government applications; and.

- How closely partners relate to their overall environment (government agencies or bodies, NGOs, CSOs, the private sector).

There are two kinds of DCETOs: those that are decidedly weak, fragile, ineffective, even inoperative; and those that have weaknesses, but their organizations include all the components of a genuine institution—governance, administration and some resources.

The majority of UPCD's DCETO partners have promising potential. They are generally very satisfied with the Program's relevance. At most of the institutions visited, project ideas stem from developing-country partners, resulting in close cooperation with partner CIs. The PDF embodies this cooperation. Building academic capacities, as opposed to gaining access to funding or facilities, is the real motivation for most DCETOs that have achieved a degree of maturity.

DCETOs are most receptive to capacity building, more proactive, and more likely to apply their capacities in practice when they have a strong sense of a mission to the surrounding community. The evaluation showed that LAC has more DCETOs with a mission to the community than the other two continents.

UPCD is known to promote globalization, or at least openness between DCETOs. This provides significant leverage and an indirect benefit that makes the Program more relevant. Even smaller DCETOs become more confident, start to seek other funding, and interact more intensively with other development stakeholders at home and abroad. This has a sustainable effect on building capacity to manage international projects and gain access to other funding.

UPCD projects are of more limited and even marginal relevance for poor partners with very low capacity. These DCETOs, mainly in Africa, require much more general institutional support than academic capacity building, the sustainability of which is far from guaranteed. UPCD is seen as stemming from CIs (supply-driven) rather than from DCETOs (demand-driven).

Institution building, especially for large, poor, inoperative DCETOs, does not constitute an appropriate area of intervention for UPCD. For poor institutions with serious weaknesses, an overall institution-building approach is desirable, as opposed to mere strengthening of human resources. UPCD is not a suitable vehicle for overall institution building because 1) higher education in itself is not a priority for CIDA or for most very poor countries, making it very difficult to justify the resources that an overall institution-building project would require; and 2) UPCD basically focuses on human capacity building to help DCETOs carry out their mandates of teaching, research and community services.

The University of Ouagadougou is a good example of a DCETO whose needs far exceed UPCD's capacities. With its 25,000 students (up 300% in the past 10 years), the University has an annual budget of less than C\$14 million, of which 90% is used to pay salaries. A minimum of resources is available to cover basic administration, maintenance and replacement costs. There is one computer for every 20 professors. Each session, 1000 students register for undergraduate courses. This constitutes a major limitation on the quality of teaching. It also makes academic innovation virtually impossible. Moreover, full professors are not paid well enough to devote themselves entirely to their academic duties. This considerably reduces the time available to them, and thus student opportunities for applied research. In these circumstances, UPCD projects are understandably of very limited relevance in building the University's institutional capacities.

The development of new approaches is required. There have been experiences where support for poor institutions has yielded good results. These experiences should be documented, as should new approaches that are being tested, such as

- The development of strategic foci for DCETOs with good capacities or potential and, through transfers between developing countries, the development of specialties and skills in poorer institutions in the same country or neighbouring countries.
- The establishment of centres of excellence that are attached to DCETOs, but remain autonomous financially and administratively, with their own boards of directors, which could include representatives of CIDA and/or CIs involved.
- The establishment of guidelines for the Program's responsive aspects, by setting up regional or national consultation committees between countries of focus, to develop strategic programming lines that reflect genuine development needs.

The Central American Water Resource Management (CARA) Network (developed with the University of Calgary) initially helped to strengthen the University of Costa Rica (UCR) in the field of hydrology. A UPCD Tier 1 project was then implemented with the participation of two other far weaker universities (Guatemala and Nicaragua). Through this project, academic personnel at these two DCETOs took master's degree courses at UCR. The project helped to develop an area of specialization for each of the three DCETOs (hydrology, water quality and irrigation) to help establish complementary capacities, and thus a network. Moreover, UCR continues to register students from the other two DCETOs for master's degree courses. The CARA network has increased its membership over time. Another project (Tier 2) is now starting up. This project will allow universities in other Central American countries (Honduras, El Salvador and Belize) to develop capacities in hydrology, with students granted scholarships and taking master's degree courses at UCR.

**Relevance to Canadian Institutions:** Fifteen or 20 years ago, major Canadian universities started to become international in scope. UPCD (or previous funding mechanisms) constituted an ideal tool to allow universities to continue in this direction.

CIs note that professors and students have derived significant benefits from their international experience through exchanges and new program development. UPCD has helped to open up their institutions internationally, to establish ties with—and to access funding from—other donors and to share their knowledge and research findings.

At present, most major universities are international in scope. Many now regard UPCD as a “cost” rather than an asset and are looking to other sources of funding with less unwieldy administration. These CIs find it harder and harder to convince their senior managers of the value of participating in UPCD, which is costly to administer, does not give research its rightful place, and, above all, does not cover the cost of replacing professors who are given lighter workloads to participate in partnership projects.

UPCD remains relevant to universities that have more recently started to become international in scope. Many CIs (or many faculties) continue to submit project proposals to the Program. UPCD's investment profile shows that, of the 91 Canadian universities that are members of AUCC, about 50 signed UPCD agreements from 2000 to 2005.

Support and encouragement for UPCD participants vary significantly, depending on the importance universities attach to international development and how progressive and socially involved they are. The value attached to projects also varies: in some cases

international projects receive the same recognition as other research projects, while in others international projects are not rated as highly. Given UPCD's administrative red tape and the significant additional workload involved, most professors participating in UPCD are driven by strong personal motivation.

CIIs have many questions about CIDA's proposed new overhead compensation policy. They feel that the policy is to their disadvantage. It also limits project results, mainly because capacity-building projects require significant investments in human resources, whereas the allowable overhead rate will decrease. This means that some universities will decide not to submit proposals, or that project budgets will lean toward direct costs rather than personnel costs to minimize any losses in overhead that might be incurred.

## **5.2 Appropriateness of Project Design**

Initially, university partnership projects were designed primarily to encourage Canadian universities to become active in international development. At that time, projects were more supply- than demand-driven. Professors from Canadian universities led the way and involved DCETOs to varying degrees in defining projects. UPCD still has many vestiges of a supply-driven concept: it signs agreements with CIIs, covers only a portion of their overhead, and selects projects through them. However, major changes have been made to ensure that proposals, and thus projects, reflect partners' needs.

**The Proposal Development Fund (PDF):** The PDF is managed by AUCC and applies to Tiers 1 and 2. In principle, the Fund allows all stakeholders to express their needs, expectations and mutual contributions. More and more projects go beyond DCETOs themselves, in a gradual move toward involving all partners (civil society, communities and NGOs), if not in project design, at least in project implementation and management.

In many cases, more recent projects have included the participatory approach to ensure shared understanding of—and consensus on—activities, schedules, lines of communication, and respective responsibilities. As a result of this approach, many project management committees encompass all partners, and not just academic partners.

**Quality of partnerships and mutual understanding:** When projects are developed on the basis of a close relationship between CI and DCETO partners, they are likely to express a specific host-country need, promote local motivation and participation, and thus produce relevant proposals. This is in opposition to projects developed on a CI's initiative, based on its area of expertise. Mutual trust, cultural sensitivity, and open and honest discussion are essential. They require time, effort and investment.

There are still proposals whose vision is not shared between partners, where the CI has a directive rather than a participatory approach, and where developing-country partners do not express themselves or understand the Program well enough to state their real needs and the difficulties they foresee. Despite

Entrepreneurship: University – Industry, China (Tier 2) is a good example of a long-lasting relationship that enabled mutual understanding and trust to develop between partners. A relationship between the École de technologie supérieure and the Harbin University of Science and Technology developed well and, four years after completion of the project, three Chinese Professors are completing their PhDs at the CI. Both sides continue to maintain contact.

the PDF, there are still situations where projects are not suited to the needs of local partners and where lack of mutual trust seriously limits project definition.

Moreover, it is much harder to establish and maintain partnerships where the partner is a weak DCETO in a poor country, where proposals must consider significant cultural differences, weaknesses in communications and project monitoring. Project selection criteria are unfavourable to proposals that involve high travel costs, although such costs are essential in establishing new partnerships. Lack of time may also have a negative impact on the quality of proposals. Selection criteria should better reflect these constraints.

In Asia, there is a widespread perception among DCETOs that Canadian project managers and CIDA do not share important information with them. Apart from financial information, which some suspect is intentionally kept from them, the problem is generally attributed to the lack of an effective information sharing system. Most Tier 1 project participants highlighted this difficulty.

Barriers may stem from the Canadian partner's poor knowledge of the local language, or the local partner's poor knowledge of English and/or French. These are constraints in drafting proposals and executing projects, especially in Asia, but less so in LAC, where most Canadian professors speak the local language, or in Africa, where English and French are often official languages.

AUCC should not interfere in the project selection process but should maintain its impartiality. However, AUCC could perhaps be involved in the preliminary drafting of proposals, especially by commenting on the relevance and feasibility of projects. This also applies to CIDA Post personnel, who should be more closely involved in providing information and advice prior to the drafting of proposals.

**Capacities of CI project managers:** The quality of proposals is improving with time and more in-depth knowledge, showing the success of UCP and AUCC efforts with regard to the quality of Results-based Management (RBM) frameworks. Nevertheless, proposals vary in quality in terms of merit, clarity of objectives, results chain logic, activities and budgeting. In most cases, these differences can be attributed to the Canadian project manager's degree of development experience and expertise. The existence of champions is a significant asset for projects, which generally are seriously damaged when teams change.

**Knowledge of partners' institutional capacities:** Few projects are preceded by even a partial institutional assessment of DCETOs. Most of the time, projects focus on building partners' academic capacities. More and more, this includes service to the community. The Program does not offer a conceptual approach to meeting the overall management and institution-building challenges of DCETOs. Moreover, budgets are not sufficient to allow projects to address all of the institutional challenges of poor partners, who often register tens of thousands of students.

Insufficient knowledge of the institutional capacity of DCETOs may have a negative impact on the appropriateness of proposals (and thus on results and their sustainability) and may lead to tensions in partner relations. A basic knowledge of their institutional status is indispensable for new partnerships or DCETOs with weak institutional capacity.

Moreover, poor, weak institutions find it difficult to institutionalize the results of UPCD projects unless they adopt innovative approaches tailored to their needs. This requires a better appreciation of the status of the DCETO as a whole, making it possible to decide whether or not a DCETO has the potential to become a project partner.

CIDA Post personnel and AUCC could play a more active role and advise on the institutional status of DCETOs, especially when new partnerships are formed and DCETO capacity is weak. UPCD project budgets definitely do not allow in-depth institutional assessments and it is unclear whether UPCD is the appropriate program for overall institutional building of DCETOs, even if major changes are made.

The Program should continue to focus on what it knows how to do, i.e., to build the capacities of universities in their basic functions (teaching, research and service to the community) so that universities are better able to reduce poverty. However, an approach focusing on building academic capacities does not exclude additional activities to strengthen certain peripheral aspects (decision-making bodies, small equipment, better accounting systems) that will increase the chances of sustainable results.

**Equality between women and men:** Depending on the proposal and the project, equality between women and men is reflected in varying degrees. UCP and AUCC have made many efforts to define, promote and support the reflection of this crosscutting theme, especially by preparing continually upgraded guidelines in this regard.

AUCC has developed tools to promote equality—tools that help plan, execute and monitor projects, in addition to organizing seminars to explain and operationalize the concept. This is also an integral component of UCP and AUCC monitoring.

Despite efforts to develop tailored methodologies and tools, and to support CIs, UPCD is weak in analyzing and promoting equality, especially in African and Asian countries. Partners show too little concern for equality and do not realize the benefits of including this dimension in their projects. Concern for equality between women and men is often an artificial adjunct. Few UPCD projects have formal strategies to promote it, and these are often limited to objectives and quantitative indicators concerning the participation of women.

Best practices for addressing equality between women and men include

- Projects specifically target women.
- Projects are designed and/or executed in association with government organizations or NGOs that specialize in promoting equality.
- CIs and DCETOs establish multidisciplinary teams, including specialists in equality, from the project design stage.

The University of Costa Rica has established a UPCD-funded centre promoting equality as a crosscutting theme at the University (awareness, training sessions, teaching and audio-visual materials). All students in all faculties receive training in this area. Moreover, the centre not only has a research and support function vis-à-vis government and women's organizations, it also produces communications tools, initially for the University, but also for a much wider audience (video, workshops, representation, television broadcasts) in Costa Rica and LAC.

**Tier 1 versus Tier 2 projects:** The distinction between the two tiers is supported by tenuous logic concerning the scope, area, impact and relevance of development. Many CIs and DCETOs reported that the only difference between the two tiers had to do with their respective budget limitations.

In Africa, few differences were observed in the scope, nature or direction of the Tier 1 and 2 projects visited. As a result, the merits of projects are not always clear in terms of development results expected in relation to budget levels for projects in both tiers.

The fact that CIDA manages Tier 1 projects and AUCC manages Tier 2 projects seems to have more to do with the desire of UPCD managers to maintain a direct role in project management than with any distinct difference between the two tiers and the specific development results they are expected to achieve.

The evaluation team considers that, even if the two tiers are to be kept separate rather than merged, they should be managed by a single executing agency (logically AUCC). This would allow the UCP team to focus on strategic management of the Program. At the same time, it would allow more efficient administration of UPCD, avoid duplication of effort, and promote the synergy and thus the potential development impact of projects. If the choice is made to keep two tiers, it will be necessary to clarify the relevance of this decision in development terms and define the specific results expected from each tier.

A single executing agency managing all UPCD projects would reflect the trend at CIDA to spend less time and effort managing partnership projects and to focus more on building strategic ties and developing knowledge and more productive interaction with partners.

In this regard, Tier 1 projects may have some advantages over Tier 2 projects. They allow economies of scale with several partners able to share communications and exchange systems for students, professors, curricula, and teaching and learning tools. Tier 1 projects promote learning through the transfer of knowledge between developing countries and promote international cooperation between DCETOs. They also allow partners to build multilateral, multicultural, multilingual and/or multidisciplinary capacities.

Tier 1 projects seem to yield the best results in terms of sustainable partnerships when they support networks that have emerged naturally in the course of previous projects, or when they are executed in partnership with multilateral or regional DCETOs.

The Model for Inter-cooperation of the Americas is an example of a sustainable network. As a result of previous projects, including a UPCD Tier 1 project, an Institute at Sherbrooke University has been able to grant master's degrees to several professors from LAC universities, especially UCR. These professors have, in turn, built the capacities of professors in other countries of the region. The network emerged naturally from this cooperation. Partners are driven by their faith in a common cause. They have long demonstrated their commitment to networking. They are also qualified partners who have demonstrated their know-how and ability to deliver in the past. The Institute has established close ties with its developing-country partners and has been a source of academic development.

Experience has shown that, when Tier 1 projects are defined, certain prerequisites must be met for these projects to succeed:

- Consortia must be established, choosing institutions with some degree of compatibility or complementarity.
- Previous experience in multilateral management methodologies is required to avoid wasted time and administrative red tape.
- CIs, or one or more DCETOs, must have significant international experience.
- The strengths, weaknesses, capacities and roles of the DCETOs involved must be realistically evaluated.
- There must be a joint desire, a common mandate, a “natural and shared” rationale, and the existence of sufficient resources to ensure the network survives the project.

If these prerequisites are not met, difficulties may arise in managing Tier 1 projects. Linkages may be forced, such as between universities at very different levels that are competing rather than cooperating. Partners’ expectations may not be shared and objectives may be too generally defined. Projects may be too ambitious, bringing together several universities with very different cultures, mandates, languages, management systems and levels of institutional development. Establishing effective methods of project management requires significant multilateral expertise that CIs do not always possess. It takes time to establish management processes, often at the expense of implementation.

The results of Tier 1 projects are too often lost after their completion. Outputs are not necessarily shared. Each university institutionalizes its own outputs because they reflect its specific needs, and partnerships are not necessarily sustainable. In other words, due to organizational weaknesses, projects are rarely true multilateral projects, but rather an agglomeration of projects with Canadian Partnership at the core.

### **5.3 Partnerships**

Partnerships are increasingly adopting an approach that focuses on exchanges between developed and developing countries rather than mere transfers of knowledge between them. Within projects, transfers between and among developing countries are more frequent. The partnerships are generally sustainable and seem to work best when they are based on two champions (the CI and the DCETO) that have known each other for a long time, have had previous experience cooperating in the UPCD program, share interests and visions of development and properly appreciate their respective capacities.

A good practice to promote transparency and to create bonds of trust between CIs and DCETOs is to provide developing-country partners with the full CI/CIDA contribution agreement, including the appendix concerning the detailed budget.

The quality of partnerships closely depends on the time spent strengthening them and the resources invested in them. The team continues to find a degree of mistrust in Africa and Asia, where some partners believe that CIs are keeping information from them. These are often recent partnerships that have not yet deepened bonds of mutual trust and that lack a communications infrastructure. Partners must meet face to face and allocate financial resources for such meetings. The focus on Africa must take this factor into account.

Finally, it should be noted that partnerships between developing countries (i.e., networks) for Tier 1 projects are not always sustainable. Often, when projects end, partnerships

remain between Canada and developing countries. However, ties between DCETOs are tenuous or simply fade due to a lack of means to continue and/or to lack of interest.

#### 5.4 Results and Sustainability

**Academic capacity building:** The three missions found that UPCD significantly builds the academic capacity of DCETOs. It improves the skills of professors, develops state-of-the-art programs that include new teaching methods, and enhances the quality of research. To quote a project manager in Burkina Faso: *“All of the training we received is used in our daily work. We adapt what we have learned and apply it in supervising our students’ theses, organizing seminars and workshops on specific themes, and developing new courses on topics such as RBM or decentralization.”*

Capacity building in academic fields that meet significant needs, especially those reflecting government policies, are more likely to yield sustainable results.

In Asia and LAC, DCETOs have widely institutionalized curricula, educational tools, applied research findings and other outputs that constitute the basic functions of DCETOs. Acquisition of knowledge is intrinsically a factor in the sustainability of results. In several projects in LAC, including Nicaragua, strengthening human resources most often goes beyond the academic level (professors and students) to CSOs, NGOs, government and business. At the same time, again in LAC, applied research is becoming more rooted in the reality of contextual communities.

One area for improvement is the rate at which research is effectively transferred to communities. A more flexible and modular approach would be suitable to avoid undue delay in the capacity-building activities of the communities involved.

Very poor institutions do not meet all of the prerequisites for sustainable institutionalization of UPCD’s academic results. Governance is very weak and there are not enough financial resources to ensure the sustainability of the capacities built (to pay salaries, provide space and equipment, and meet operational costs).

DCETOs experiencing difficulties sometimes institutionalize the results of UPCD projects at the expense of other teaching modules. Seeking external funding, especially for research, should be an integral part of project implementation strategies where financial resources are insufficient to ensure that gains are maintained. UPCD significantly leverages the capacity of DCETOs to access other funding.

Other limitations to institutionalizing results include lack of political will on the part of DCETO authorities, insufficient registration of students (often due to a lack of scholarships) to generate the revenue needed to maintain the capacities built and lack of means to maintain peripheral capacities, such as documentation centres and community

The water resource management project (York University/São Paulo, Brazil) illustrates the need to improve the transfer of research. The project operates with two key local partners, a university and an NGO that specializes in community development. They share the common goal of building the capacity of grass-roots communities to take part in water resource management committees. However, they differ on how to achieve this. The university is still working on its hydro-demographic inventory. The NGO feels that, because of the university’s delay in producing a database, the project is not following the schedule established for working directly with communities.

service centres. Utilizing the Canadian Francophone Scholarship Program to support UPCD would increase the scope and sustainability of results.

**Community impact and policy influence:** UPCD increasingly emphasizes the community impact component of projects. If well executed and combined with policy influence, this component can lead to poverty reduction and promote sustainability of project impacts. A project is likely to have sustainable impacts if it directly interests or involves progressive government agencies, which then support targeted grass-roots associations or poor communities.

The Program's community impact and policy influence results vary widely. In some cases, this component of projects is ineffective and may even be a burden to the community. The main reason for difficulties lies in a flawed approach to communicating and managing activities: lack of practical means to visit communities (travel difficulties, lack of financial resources), faulty analysis of community interests and needs, implementation of activities that benefit DCETOs more than community members and "artificial" inclusion of activities in DCETOs without a real community service mandate.

Brazil's Santo André Foundation University Centre is implementing a promising project involving community impact and policy influence. The core of the Centre's mandate is to serve the community through teaching and research, while seeking to cooperate as much as possible with progressive government institutions. Partners in the Sustainable Management of Solid Waste Project include a university, women's NGO, municipal government, and an association representing civil society (recyclers' forum).

The project aims to improve applied knowledge of recyclable waste and its popularization, and to strengthen civil-society organizations by bringing together the poorest and most excluded members of society (rag pickers/recyclers), mostly women.

The project is having a major impact on the inclusion of groups formerly regarded as pariahs within the society. It is building their organizational capacity, adapting their technology, increasing their incomes, giving them direct responsibility for making civil society aware of the importance of waste management, and giving them a sense of pride.

The work done by partners among the poor has shown the solid waste collection and recycling industry's importance in including and supporting very poor and excluded members of society. The project makes it possible to promote income-generating environmental activities. At the same time, it addresses major social problems (health and inclusion of women).

Community impact is a major challenge in view of the gap between the function of universities and academic culture and the socio-economic status and needs of communities. Approaches and methodologies should be developed from sources such as the documentation, lessons learned, and best practices of projects that have yielded good results. Several of these projects are found in LAC and, to a lesser degree, in Asia.

Project results also vary in terms of policy influence. This component represents a key tool in ensuring the sustainability of results. This is especially true where projects make it possible to train government officials, where DCETOs are ex officio members of policy committees, or where projects are in line with local political priorities.

The community impact and policy influence of projects are key tools in ensuring poverty reduction and sustainability of impacts. Prerequisites are the following:

- Association with universities or other DCETOs with an express mandate to serve the community;
- A good knowledge of community needs and interests, which means that CSOs, NGOs, and government agencies must be directly involved early in project design;
- A multidisciplinary and participatory approach and an iterative methodology; and
- Material and financial means that make it possible to establish bonds of trust and ongoing interaction between DCETOs and communities.

**Impact and multiplier effects:** Academic capacity building (qualifications of faculty members, program development, modernization of teaching methods) entails significant multiplier effects. To the extent that partner DCETOs institutionalize these effects, they will allow the training of successive graduating classes of all students.

Multiplier effects are most likely in innovative fields that are in line with the strategies of partner DCETOs and have linkages with the local government and donor activities. Projects that seek to achieve community impact and/or policy influence generally lack a strategy for replicating results. To promote the replication and multiplier effects of innovative projects, efforts should be made to achieve more strategic cooperation between universities, governments, CSOs and the private sector.

In future years, given accumulated experience and expertise (participatory approach, multidisciplinary teams and greater involvement of stakeholders in project planning and execution), it is important to document conditions for success and best practices that will supply knowledge to increase replicability, multiplier effects, and the sustainability and impact of UPCD projects as tools to reduce poverty.

**Internationalization of CIs:** UPCD plays an important role in internationalizing CIs. This impact is lessening to some degree for CIs that have achieved internationalization and are turning to other sources of funding. Apart from sustainable internationalization of professors and students who have participated in projects, internationalization includes

- Development of units to promote and manage international projects.
- Organization of conferences, seminars and workshops in Canada with developing-country partners to make CIs, the community, the media, and the general public more aware of development issues, especially the results of UPCD projects.
- Exchanges of professors, researchers and students from CIs and DCETOs.
- Granting of scholarships to allow professors, students and representatives of government or civil society in developing countries to pursue studies in Canada.
- Organization of numerous colloquia, seminars, etc, in various countries.
- Production of videos, CD-ROMs, and other new information technology materials to promote UPCD projects, widely disseminated via the Internet.

CIs vary in integrating internationalization in their culture. Internationalization is sustainably rooted in professors, researchers and students who have participated in projects. It is integrated and continues to develop in socially progressive CIs (such as York and Sherbrooke). It is more random—and more limited—in faculties of universities with more scientific and traditional mandates (Victoria, Regina and Toronto).

The bulk of internationalization activities have been executed as planned, but the scope of their effect depends on the culture and the receptiveness of the milieu in which they are executed.

**Internationalization of DCETOs:** UPCD has had a variable yet significant impact on DCETO internationalization. For institutions that are especially poor, this impact is sometimes limited to participating professors who have built their project management capacities. In other cases, there is genuine institution building by improving the capacity of DCETOs to seize opportunities and to leverage funding from other agencies.

In many cases, UPCD projects have allowed the development of cooperative relationships between developing-country universities within a country or between developing countries at different levels of development.

## **6.0 Findings: Management Effectiveness**

### **6.1 Program Management**

**Design based on aid effectiveness principles:** The Program's positioning in relation to aid effectiveness principles was addressed in Section 5.1. UPCD projects reflect the political priorities of CIDA and partner countries. Nevertheless, UPCD remains a large responsive program whose linkages with other CIDA branches should be more systematic and sustained to better reflect CIDA's overall policy and programming coherence.

As a responsive program focusing on higher education, UPCD offers significant benefits: innovation and development of knowledge, ownership of results by partners, involvement of highly qualified human resources at reasonable rates for CIDA (given partner contributions), and openness that encourages Canadian civil society to participate in development in a wide range of sectors.

However, this same responsive nature has disadvantages. UPCD is scattered among projects, partners and countries, increasing transaction costs and limiting economies of scale. UPCD could benefit from better lines of communication and a closer, ongoing interface with CIDA as a whole to ensure better coordination and tap synergies between and among CIDA-funded projects in the field. Finally, the obligation to achieve results for objectives that are too numerous and too general reduces the relevance of programs.

UPCD lacks systemic ties with other CIDA branches that would link it to CIDA's overall environment and programming principles. Given the current policy environment at CIDA, the Program's strategic management processes should be reviewed to develop new approaches generating activities that are more focused in relation to CIDA's other investments, to better position UPCD in relation to its programming objectives, and to better coordinate the Program within CIDA to promote synergy and increase impact.

**Strategic role within CIDA:** UPCD plays a unique role in CIDA. It gives CIDA considerable access to—and knowledge of—Canada's academic community and, to some degree, the international academic community. The Program has cultivated an interface with Canadian universities, allowing CPB and the UCP management team to modify the

Program's requirements and tools to reflect changes in CIDA's policies and approaches, while taking into account the characteristics of CIs.

The Program's two-tier administrative structure does not allow a clear distinction between strategic decision making and operational management. This prevents UCP from fully playing its rightful role of providing strategic leadership. Moreover, UPCD does not maximize its potential value added. It lacks effective ties with other areas of CIDA that could create synergy and allow UPCD to participate in decision making. The potential value of UCP lies at a more strategic level than its focus on program implementation.

UCP/CIDA's role, vis-à-vis UPCD, should be to provide monitoring and leadership, guidelines for policy directions, and consistency with changes at CIDA.

**Dual program management structure:** The UCP management team and AUCC continually seek to cooperate. Nevertheless, the Program's two-tier management suffers from three major weaknesses.

First, the Program suffers from a lack of internal consistency. UPCD is not designed or managed as an integrated program but as a two-tier organization with two funding mechanisms. This entails significant administrative costs. AUCC produces an annual report on its contribution agreement while CIDA produces annual progress reports for each project. There is no annual report on UPCD as a whole. CIDA and its partners thus do not possess comprehensive information on the Program's overall performance.

Second, efforts have been made to standardize management of Tier 1 projects by UCP and Tier 2 projects by AUCC. However, these efforts focus mainly on the Program's operational aspects rather than its strategic aspects. There are no formal coordination mechanisms to promote consistency and joint decision making, and no fora to discuss themes such as the rationale for UPCD, its relevance to the policy environment, and lessons learned. The steering committee role should be revised to give it a mandate to discuss strategic directions for the Program as a whole.

Third, the separation of the Program into two tiers is unwarranted and costly. The team believes that nothing warrants separating the Program into two tiers with a view to project definition, areas of intervention, amount of time, scope, relevance and expected results. Tier 1 projects experience proportionally more difficulties with implementation than with management and sustainability of results. This means that Tier 1 projects are often less cost-effective than Tier 2 projects.

There are two possible options for the management structure:

1. Merge the administration and content of the two tiers, as recommended by the 1998 program evaluation. An executing agency would then manage the Program. This should logically be AUCC, since the present study stresses the quality of its management. The Program would have flexible funding scales (possibly from \$1 million to \$3 million).
2. Keep the two tiers separate. Here again, an executing agency would manage projects. There would have to be an in-depth review of how the tiers are defined, and how they differ in their nature and specifications, and their specific expectations in terms of development results.

Management of both tiers by an executing agency would allow economies of scale (one logical framework, one reporting system) and would reflect the trend at CIDA toward

building knowledge and systems for interacting with partners. The two project selection processes should be reconsidered based on which option is chosen.

## **6.2 Project Management**

**Administrative red tape:** Several factors combine to give the impression that the Program includes a lot of red tape. Management decisions are unduly delayed, particularly with regard to project approval. Possible reasons include high turnover of UCP staff, changes in regulations and procedures, and shifts in CIDA's policy priorities. These adversely affect project performance and the development of partnerships between CIDA and CIs, and between CIs and DCETOs.

UCP project officers are deemed qualified, available and willing to support all partners to the best of their abilities. However, high staff turnover is costly in terms of delays and leads to weaknesses in CIDA file management. One Canadian Project manager noted: *“From the start-up of the project to date, we have had four different managers at CIDA. Each manager has shown the greatest possible willingness to support us. Yet the fact remains that, each time, we must explain our project and its history, objectives, activities, difficulties, and issues all over again...”*

Administrative guidelines specify requirements including the number of documents to produce, the frequency of monitoring reports, and auditing techniques. These requirements are unwieldy, excessive and unsuited to academic reporting procedures. Everyone agrees that accountability is necessary. In many ways, however, partners—and even many Partnership Branch managers—feel that reporting requirements are counterproductive and time-consuming. This time could be more profitably be spent carrying out projects.

Each of the 133 projects to date must produce an implementation plan, quarterly financial reports, a mid-term evaluation report and an end-of-project report. The vast majority are Tier 2 projects with budgets up to \$1 million over six years, or about \$165,000 per year. Monitoring missions in Canada and in the field, by CIDA (and its evaluation team) and by AUCC complement this monitoring system. Given that CIs contribute a minimum of 30% of project budgets, not to mention contributions by DCETOs, these requirements seem even more questionable.

Canadian and host-country partners question CIDA's use of all this information. Too often, partners receive no feedback concerning the documents they produce. Partnership Branch itself finds it very cumbersome to manage all these reports and has difficulty reaching general conclusions, although most projects yield good results.

Program managers (UCP and AUCC, in cooperation with CIs and DCETOs) should consider streamlining the reporting system. They should also consider how to achieve a better balance between information about project results and information about the overall performance of the Program.

**Results-based Management:** There is currently no RBM framework for UPCD as a whole. AUCC produced an RBM framework for UPCD Tier 2 in 2003. However, this framework reflects scattering in many respects, including many objectives to be met. The framework should be reviewed in light of the changes being made to the Program in terms of its strategic vision and its consistency with CIDA's overall programming.

There are a very large number of monitoring activities and constraints noted about them. First, about 100 Tier 2 projects are found scattered among the continents and in many sectors, making it difficult for AUCC to aggregate project results. Second, although the mid-term evaluations consulted were of good quality and highly valued by managers, there is still a risk that they may fail to be objective and systematic. Third, AUCC's annual report is largely based on self-evaluations by partners without adequate validation of data. Finally, annual reports (AUCC, Tier 2) could be used more effectively for decision making. UCP does not report annually on Tier 1 or on UPCD as a whole.

**CIDA's policy on local costs:** To ensure ownership and sustainability of results, CIDA does not pay the overhead costs of public-sector partners in developing countries. This means that CIDA does not pay a portion of the salaries of professors or other DCETO staff, for whom managing UPCD projects implies an added workload. The vast majority of stakeholders, including AUCC, CIs, CIDA Posts, and, of course, DCETOs, challenge this standard.

CPB's (and thus UCP's) increasing administrative requirements have resulted in costs for Canadian projects being higher than those of other donors. Budgets do not necessarily reflect these costs. Small DCETOs cannot easily absorb the added burden of administering UPCD projects. They do not even have the resources they need for their own general management.

Local cost policy is interpreted as a way to give preference to Canadian partners at the expense of developing-country partners. DCETOs feel that project activities burden them more than CIs, resulting in higher administrative costs. Yet only Canadian partners are given priority when it comes to financial resources.

Considering the limitations CIDA has imposed on the restrictive salary guidelines of developing countries and the low salaries paid by many DCETOs, the evaluation team feels that the Program should pay a portion of DCETO overhead, up to 5% of project budgets. This would help DCETOs bear the added burden of managing UPCD projects and improve their effectiveness by allowing them to hire a manager or external coordinator. This is especially true for DCETOs that are carrying out international partnership for the first time and lack resources for management support.

It has been shown that, when executed in partnership with promising DCETOs with some institutional capacity, UPCD projects provide significant leverage. Acquiring knowledge about project management and RBM builds confidence, encourages openness, and provides easier access to other funding. "Internationalizing" DCETOs, like CIs, could be seen as an expected result in terms of capacity building. In this sense, it could be eligible for program funding—i.e., an allowance representing a percentage of the project budget to avoid penalizing the DCETOs carrying out project activities.

**Valuing of local contributions:** Developing-country partner contributions are generally high in relation to CIDA's and CI's. DCETOs provide professors' time, students for research, administrative management resources, and space and equipment as they are able. This is especially praiseworthy, considering many partners severely lack resources.

Despite this, little value or express recognition is given to this contribution in organizational relations with CIDA. Moreover, scales are not established for DCETO contributions. Recognizing this contribution by writing a letter of thanks or appreciation would give developing-country partners an incentive and acknowledge CIDA's gratitude.

**CIDA's policy on reimbursing CI administrative costs:** According to AUCC, CIDA's overhead policy does not cover the actual management costs of CIs, which would total 37% of project budgets instead of the 30% required by CIDA. This and project red tape make university administrators reluctant to approve UPCD projects.

CIDA's proposed new overhead compensation policy is even more disadvantageous for CIs. It discourages human-resource intensive capacity-building projects in favour of projects with proportionally higher direct costs. Under the new method of calculation being considered, AUCC's eligible management costs would decrease from 73.6% of total management costs (i.e., salary and benefits) to 12% of expenditures applicable to developing countries. This would be particularly unfavourable for AUCC and could significantly affect the level and quality of its management services under its contribution agreement with CIDA. Roles, responsibilities and results should thus be renegotiated.

### **6.3 AUCC Management**

The vast majority of Canadian and developing-country partners recognize AUCC as an excellent administrator. AUCC combines a good knowledge of CIDA with an in-depth understanding of Canada's academic environment. It provides valuable support for CIs, possesses a recognized capacity for relations and communications with all Canadian institutions of higher learning, and is well known for its efforts to respond to changes in direction and for its ability to publicize CIDA's policy and administrative requirements.

AUCC has developed many tools for UPCD, including: a detailed management plan for Phase II of its agreement with CIDA; a plan covering all aspects of project management, proposals, selection, implementation, monitoring and evaluation; an RBM framework for Tier 2 projects; a framework for analyzing equality between women and men; models for reports and evaluations; monitoring tools and questionnaires; a continually updated procedures manual; and systems for communications with stakeholders.

The value of AUCC's support for the selection process for both tiers of the Program is widely recognized in terms of developing proposals; management of the selection process, including committee selection for both tiers; and feedback to CIs submitting proposals. Each year, AUCC organizes workshops across Canada that are often open to partners in both tiers. They allow communication and discussion of strategic aspects of UPCD and presentations on the Program in numerous countries.

AUCC prepares an annual report that systematically compiles project data. This report constitutes a good reference document for Tier 2 in terms of expected and achieved results, the Program's contribution to CIDA's priorities, and its management. AUCC systematically analyzes results achieved and makes recommendations concerning the Program as a whole. AUCC also identifies operational or development lessons learned.

AUCC conducts special studies and case studies (in areas such as equality between women and men, and leverage) to develop knowledge about UPCD Tier 2, and to develop models to help improve projects and enhance the Program.

There are some areas identified for improvement:

- The RBM framework should be tightened and better focused as CIDA applies this study's recommendations concerning the Program's effectiveness.

- A clearer distinction should be made between outputs, outcomes and impacts. There should be less emphasis on outputs in favour of a clearer definition of outcomes and impacts. In particular, the meaning of capacity building should be defined.
- Finally, there should be an annual report that focuses more specifically on program decision making (assuming CIDA approves this evaluation's recommendation that AUCC be entirely responsible for project management).

## 6.4 Partner Project Management

**Roles and responsibilities, communications and coordination:** By following the steps involved in drafting full proposals, using the PDF and developing an implementation plan, it is possible to arrive at a satisfactory definition of the stakeholders' responsibilities and lines of communication. This requires partners with a good understanding of one another and an experienced Canadian project manager with support from his or her CI.

Few difficulties were noted in project management, except perhaps for partners that had not previously had the opportunity to work together, or for certain Tier 1 projects that were complex to manage. A number of factors were identified that make sharing roles and responsibilities, coordination and communication easier to achieve:

- Developed and developing country managers meet to finalize proposals and define the project's roles, responsibilities and *modus operandi*.
- Institutions (CIs and DCETOs) have had the opportunity to work together.
- Partners are knowledgeable about international project management.
- Institutions provide managers access to specialized resources to help them manage.
- DCETOs have access to reliable telecommunications systems.
- Projects come under Tier 2 (Tier 1 projects have more complex and more uncertain methodologies, management and implementation procedures.)

**Partner monitoring and evaluation:** UCP and AUCC project officers are generally satisfied with project management and monitoring by Canadian and developing-country institutions. Apart from a few inconsequential delays, progress reports and financial reports are submitted in accordance with guidelines.

However, monitoring a large number of UCP or AUCC projects scattered on several continents represents a challenge and significant costs, especially for new partnerships with weak institutions that require close monitoring, coaching, and high ongoing support. Specific project monitoring approaches have to be developed for these DCETOs.

Projects systematically undergo mid-term evaluations. Project managers find these external evaluations useful to take stock, identify lessons learned, and make decisions about changes in direction needed to maximize results. However, these evaluations do not seem to be properly used for knowledge development and there is a concern that the choice of evaluators may be left too much to the discretion of CIs, risking objectivity.

End-of-project reports are produced in a standardized manner. They are generally of good quality, having been drafted by qualified people. They contain a wealth of information, including lessons learned and best practices that can be applied to the Program.

Gaining knowledge in RBM monitoring and evaluation allows partners to build their project management capacities and to benefit from these capacities to undertake other university partnership projects.

Partners most often criticize CIDA audits. Partners believe that accountability is essential to good governance. However, their audit experiences raise some questions. According to the CIs, methods used are ill suited to academic operations and administrative processes.

## **6.5 Financial Management**

**Appropriate resources allocated to program:** UPCD as a whole is directly managed by approximately 13 person-years, which seems reasonable. Given the Program's current management structure, resource allocation reflects the volume of activities of AUCC and CIDA. AUCC allocates 8.7 person-years to execute the CAUP contribution agreement. Among other things, it manages 100 Tier 2 projects, handles the selection process for both tiers, organizes seminars for partners in both tiers, produces specialized studies, and develops tailored tools. CIDA allocates 4.35 person-years to monitor the CAUP agreement which includes 33 Tier 1 projects. The UCP team used to have an additional position (an analyst), who relieved other managers of some of their duties.

**Project cost-effectiveness:** On the whole, project cost-effectiveness appears to be satisfactory. CIDA's project costs are relatively low (up to \$1 million for Tier 2 and up to \$3 million for Tier 1), since these six-year projects involve the contribution of some of the most qualified human resources in Canada and in the field and CIDA pays no DCETO management or salary costs. There are many significant results in proportion to the budgets allocated. Projects offer useful opportunities for leverage and partners know-how to capitalize on these opportunities.

The good governance of Canadian institutions that manage projects is generally recognized. Project managers have faith in what they are doing, although they gain no financial benefit and little professional recognition from their participation. DCETOs own and manage projects, and, where appropriate, partner with government and civil society. This promotes sustainable results. Student efforts contribute significantly to UPCD projects and are a key to achieving low-cost results. By their very nature, CIs have access to multidisciplinary resources that are catalysts for results. Finally, CIs and DCETOs make significant in-kind contributions, often exceeding CIDA's contributions.

Project managers maximize the results of activities through the widespread use of new information technologies, which increasingly include distance training. The training-cost ratio has improved from the Program's previous phases. Canadian professors travel to developing countries making it possible to train more people at a lower cost. Coaching is increasingly used to build the capacities of DCETOs and to implement new curricula, methodologies and educational tools. Project managers are aware of budget constraints and seek to maximize the results of various events (steering committee meetings, workshops and conferences). Most partners have made it part of their culture to seek synergy and find ways to top-up funding.

Some constraints were noted with regard to cost-effectiveness. The scattering of projects increases transaction costs and limits synergy, making it impossible for the Program to fully explore potential for economies of scale and multiplier effects. Projects sometimes tend to be too ambitious and must meet an ever-increasing number of objectives with limited resources. Knowledge of partners' capacities may be inadequate, which would be a major obstacle to sustainability. Management systems are sometimes flawed, especially for Tier 1 projects, delaying production of results. Inexperienced CIs or DCETOs may

target unrealistic objectives and execute projects inefficiently. Finally, project red tape diverts resources that could be used more productively elsewhere.

## **6.6 Consistency and Coordination**

Like the evaluations of the Canadian Colleges Partnership Program and the Canadian Francophone Scholarship Program, this study found very little communication among the three programs. Instead of tending toward greater consistency and tapping potential synergy, they have few statutory ties, little or no coordination, and the Programs sometimes suffer from duplication and waste of effort. Consistency between CIDA's corporate programming and that of institutions of higher learning must begin by ensuring that these three programs are logical and consistent.

In terms of field coordination, it was found that, given the strategic sectors where they are deployed and their importance in strengthening human resources, UPCD projects offer Canada many opportunities for prestige and potential multiplier effects. Thanks to Canada's contribution, there is a pool of highly qualified local resources that can be used to execute bilateral projects for CIDA and other donors. Sectors reflect national issues and challenges, and cooperation between developing countries. However, this potential remains underdeveloped for a number of interrelated reasons:

- Posts are consulted for feedback on letters of intent and their opinion appears to be considered. However, Posts are not kept routinely informed of decisions and do not have access to full proposals and other program documentation.
- The UPCD project managers of CIs rarely visit missions to let them know about their projects. Such meetings are left to the discretion of the individuals involved.
- CPB's UPCD officers have very little room financially for field visits. Like AUCC officers, however, they should provide key documentation to the Posts involved.
- Finally, CPB has no communications strategy to give CPB-funded projects the high profile they deserve and to tap potential synergy of results with other Canadian bilateral projects or projects funded by other countries.

Posts must play a more strategic role in the Program, especially in countries where CIDA possesses more significant resources. Canadian field representatives should be given more responsibility for UPCD. They should play an active role in developing strategic directions, advising on program issues and monitoring project activities.

Managers and specialists could make an important contribution to the Program. They could advise on capacities and needs of proposed partner DCETOs, value added of higher education in country development strategies, activities of other donors in fields related to higher learning, key sectors with a demand for qualified human resources, integration of UPCD with CDPFs, lessons learned in the field, potential synergy with other programs... in short, they could advise on all the elements too focused on bilateral projects.

New methods are being tried to strike a balance between the responsive approach of some CIDA programs and a more strategic direction. Posts could play an active role in consulting an array of partners to identify programming lines and complementary sectors between countries and potential synergy. All would make UPCD more effective.

## **7.0 Lessons Learned**

### **7.1 Development Lessons**

**Strengthening of Human Resources and Institutional Development:** UPCD's approaches basically focus on human resource development. They do not necessarily ensure success, and above all sustainable results, in the absence of more broad-based support for DCETO institution building, especially in Africa.

Experience has shown the need for a comprehensive and integrated approach to capacity building, based on prior institutional assessment and followed by a whole range of support including budget support for current expenditures, provision of equipment, infrastructure and training. This particularly applies to higher education in Africa, where there is a disproportionate gap between academic and management concerns. If academic strengthening is to be sustainable, it must form part of an overall institutional strategy and be accompanied by broadly defined institution building.

This overall institutional support does not seem to be achievable through UPCD. A bilateral or multilateral funding mechanism would be more appropriate.

**Knowledge of Partners' Institutional Capacities:** In the same vein, some projects run into trouble because they do not pay enough attention to capacity building, and especially the partners' institutional weaknesses, at the start. A realistic timetable for the delivery of results depends on the degree to which the partners' capacities are known. This is especially true for very poor universities.

Project team members are directly affected by the weaknesses of their environment. Projects may sometimes become very stressful and even threatening for them. They cannot produce outputs at the expected rate and are afraid of losing their credibility if results are not achieved on time and in accordance with the indicators defined. Moreover, without support, UPCD administrative management often represents a considerable burden for partners. Poor universities pay low salaries so it is very common for professors to have a second or even a third job to earn a livelihood.

**Models Based on Environmental Needs and Changes:** Capacity building is effective when designed and managed by strategic leaders of an institution or sector. UPCD's initial purpose was to encourage Canada's academic community to become involved in development. Program procedures (project identification, management, funding and consultation) still basically reflect a supply-driven approach. This constitutes an irritant for some partners. It may limit ownership, capacity building and project performance.

Despite everything, the evaluation team notes that UPCD projects generally and increasingly tend to stem from the DCETOs that execute them, or from close consultation between CIs and DCETOs. There is also an increasingly widespread philosophy of exchanging knowledge between partners, instead of merely transferring it from developed to developing countries. This should be documented to learn lessons to improve UPCD.

**Mutual Trust:** One prerequisite for sustainable project results is the existence of mutual trust based on long-term partnerships that include a shared understanding of the partners' respective needs, capacities, perspectives and environment.

Building strategic partnerships between developed and developing countries takes time and requires ongoing communication, as well as frequent personal contact where communications systems are weak. It is necessary to invest in travel costs and dialogue between partners, especially at project start-up. Procedures must also ensure transparent decision making and equal relationships between partners. Several UPCD projects were compromised or slowed down by the DCETO's perception of a lack of transparency and fairness. These considerations are especially important in view of the shift in focus to Africa.

**Universities Serving the Community:** Approaches have developed over time to increase and deepen the impact that projects have on the community. Some feel that this project component is essential to ensure sustainable results and to have a direct impact on poverty reduction.

Direct ties between universities and grass-roots associations have always entailed significant challenges. Among other things, the parties must communicate. They must understand each other's inherent culture and the project's objectives. Their activities must be designed to meet both academic obligations and community needs. Technical solutions must be appropriate, not too grandiose or too abstract. DCETOs and CSOs must trust and respect each other.

However, community-based projects often have trouble producing expected results. This is because they lack adequate logistical means and appropriate approaches, including a good understanding of community needs. Relatively speaking, there are many conditions for success. This involves organizing projects in a more nuanced manner:

- CSOs or NGOs should work with grass-roots associations as integral partners from the start to steer activities in the right direction, to generate good understanding of community issues and challenges, and quickly to establish cooperation ties.
- Projects must involve government agencies or representatives wherever possible. Projects will then reflect government policies and priorities. They will promote or raise awareness of policies or legislation that support project benefits and provide direct training for government representatives, who will then convey the project's vision and objectives. They will provide material and financial support for governments or government agencies to leverage or strengthen impacts.
- A project's success depends on the philosophy of the partners involved and how they define their mandate. It will be hard to establish ties and to produce sustainable results if partners do not have a mandate firmly based on service to the community.
- Where community impact is a major objective, projects must form multidisciplinary teams that can address different concerns such as production techniques, health, education, equality between women and men, and the environment.
- A participatory approach, flexibility and iterative management are key ingredients in the success of this component. Experimentation and questioning are necessary to generate and maintain the interest and trust of the communities concerned.
- Project managers must demonstrate strong leadership skills. Everyone may agree on the initial objectives, but each party has different requirements.

The evaluation highlights two factors that support good results: 1) projects are more likely to produce multiplier effects of community impact if projects accompany public policies—provided that these policies are given the means to achieve their goals; and 2)

to generate critical mass and give activities a greater impact, it is necessary to have a strategy that defines the means to be used to ensure the replicability of pilot experiments.

## **7.2 Management Lessons**

**Responsive Mechanism and Country Focus:** Responsive approaches (demand-driven programs) have benefits: innovation, risk taking and local ownership. However, they also have costs: loss of synergy, program coherence and administrative efficiency. UPCD is becoming irrelevant and inefficient because it is trying too hard to please everyone. The Program must shift in the direction of greater consistency with CIDA programming and a more demand-driven approach. CIDA has other higher-education programs that are experimenting with new models whose results could be useful to UPCD.

At the same time, significant investments must be made in program management to ensure that it remains strategic and demand-driven, generates synergy and knowledge, and is based on a responsive funding mechanism. This requires good context analysis, regular project monitoring, and ad hoc activities. UPCD must thus focus on fewer countries and provide effective, ongoing support for operational projects. Among other things, Canadian field representatives must be empowered.

**DCETO Management Costs:** To ensure ownership and sustainability of results, CIDA does not pay DCETO overhead, that is, a portion of the salaries of DCETO faculty or other staff, for whom managing UPCD projects involves an additional workload. The vast majority of stakeholders regard this standard as unfair.

For DCETOs that are just beginning to execute international projects, or DCETOs that lack even the necessary resources to manage themselves satisfactorily, UPCD projects pose a major challenge in terms of learning to manage projects and to establish support mechanisms to execute international projects. They need financial support to cover the additional costs and heavy workload imposed by CIDA's administrative and reporting requirements, which end with the partners. It would also be fairer to cover at least a portion of DCETO overhead, while of course considering CIDA's strict limitations on the salaries of public servants, since a portion of CI overhead is eligible for program funding.

UPCD has the unquestionable result of internationalizing developing-country partners. The capacity-building benefits of projects encourage DCETOs to pursue this type of partnership with CIs and with other organizations. At the same time, UPCD projects make participating DCETOs more aware of their capabilities, more visible and more credible. Capacity building naturally makes DCETOs more attractive for external funding by national or international organizations. CIs have international liaison officers. Similarly, DCETOs establish internal mechanisms, however small scale they may be, to build their management capacity and give them better access to external funding.

This means that internationalizing DCETOs is a major result of UPCD. However, DCETOs must build their project management capacities along the way so they can pursue and capitalize on opportunities for external funding. This support is all the more relevant since CIDA wishes to focus its programming on very poor countries, with the institutional weaknesses that this entails. Project management capacity building could be a UPCD objective as such and thus benefit from budget support like other objectives.

**Field Consistency:** A longstanding problem for CIDA is the difficulty of ensuring coordination and consistency among CPB, bilateral branches, Multilateral Programs Branch, and CIDA Field Offices. UPCD exemplifies this problem. Program monitoring officers are not regularly informed about projects. As a result, CIDA loses opportunities for visibility and synergy with other projects. UPCD develops high-quality human resources, and creates a local pool of skills for project execution that is less costly than using foreign specialists. The concept of partnership is a pillar of aid effectiveness but is not being properly applied in the field.

## **8.0 Recommendations**

### **8.1 Program Level Recommendations**

#### **Relevance**

**Recommendation 1:** That thought be given to how the standard of allocating 50% of UPCD's new investments to Africa affects the Program's relevance and performance, and that this standard be measured against the advantages and disadvantages of shifting the focus of programming to CIDA's partner countries, while seeking to reduce the number of countries where UPCD projects are found.

**Recommendation 2:** That the UPCD program focus on what represents its value added to CIDA, i.e., on building the academic (teaching and research) capacities of developing-country partners, in keeping with its core mandate, so that they are better equipped to develop and promote knowledge in developing-country societies and their governments, and to train highly qualified human resources in key areas of local development, while being expressly in line with CIDA priorities as identified in CDPFs and their implementation strategies.

#### **Management**

**Recommendation 3:** That a committee (including high-level strategic decision makers at CIDA) be formed to monitor the Program, with a mandate to guide the UPCD Program, based on changes in CIDA's policy and programming environment; to promote the establishment of ties with other components of CIDA, so that the Program can be represented; to argue the positive and negative effects of CIDA's decisions on its performance, and develop its own specific applications of CIDA decisions; to give the Program a vision that reflects the changing environment; to strengthen the Program's strategic decision making; and to monitor its performance.

**Recommendation 4:** That, even if CIDA decides to keep UPCD's two tiers separate, a single executing agency (possibly AUCC) manage all projects. This would allow the UCP team of CPB to focus more on the Program's strategic management. It would also reduce the administrative costs that a two-tier management structure entails. This would mean greater synergy among projects, monitoring coordination, standardized production of RBM tools, production of a consolidated program report, and so on. However, this alternative means that CIDA and its partners must thoroughly examine how the two tiers

are defined, their nature and characteristics, and above all their rationale in terms of the development results specifically expected for each tier.

**Recommendation 5:** That, in cooperation with AUCC and the Program's partners, UCP conduct an in-depth review to reduce red tape and undue costs due to project management requirements, while ensuring that partners are satisfactorily held accountable for reporting as required to CIDA.

**Recommendation 6:** That the Tier 2 RBM framework be revised to specify and prioritize its objectives to better target and define expected results and to eliminate confusion in the results chain by clearly distinguishing and defining the results chain (outputs, outcomes and impacts) to bring it more into line with the Program's objectives, i.e., to build the capacities of DCETOs to develop knowledge and to train highly qualified human resources to meet development priorities, as opposed to broad-based institution building; and that the framework be extended to the UPCD program as a whole.

**Recommendation 7:** That CIDA's higher education programs (universities, colleges, scholarships) be brought together under the same roof to ensure that this sector is coordinated; that it makes a more focused and strategic contribution to CIDA programming, especially in terms of the development priorities of host countries and CIDA programming; that potential synergies are tapped at CIDA Headquarters and in the field; and that interfacing with partners focuses on a single portal.

**Recommendation 8:** That, given UPCD's high level of intervention and potentially significant multiplier effects, Canadian field representatives, and especially Heads of Aid, should assume the same strategic, advisory and monitoring responsibilities for UPCD as for bilateral programming, especially in countries of focus where CIDA possesses relatively significant resources.

## **8.2 Project Level Recommendations**

### **Relevance**

**Recommendation 9:** That an in-depth study be conducted, in view of the focus of CIDA programming on very poor countries, to develop new approaches and methods to increase the relevance and performance of projects executed within DCETOs with very poor overall institutional capacity.

### **Appropriateness of Project Design**

**Recommendation 10:** That research be done on success stories, difficulties and best practices in including equality between women and men in university partnership projects, to improve the strategic approach, to ensure that specific activities promote this approach, and thus to improve project results.

### **Results and Sustainability**

**Recommendation 11:** That, given the potential major impact of the community impact and policy influence components on the sustainability of results and poverty reduction, a study be conducted to identify methods, approaches and best practices that improve the likelihood of success and performance of projects with regard to these two objectives that promise potentially significant multiplier effects.

### **Management**

**Recommendation 12:** That, considering CIDA's restrictive guidelines on local salaries, partial compensation of DCETO management costs be eligible under the Program, to help DCETOs bear the added burden of administering UPCD projects. A small percentage could be prescribed for this purpose, in addition to the budget allocated for local expenditures. This would allow DCETOs to hire the resources they need to monitor projects in light of CIDA's RBM requirements.

**Recommendation 13:** That project monitoring and evaluation techniques be revised to make them more systematic and more objective, and that greater use be made of them for decision making and knowledge development.

## **Appendix I: Management Response**

### **Introduction**

CPB has been supporting the involvement of Canadian universities in international development for over 30 years. The latest such program, the University Partnerships in Cooperation and Development Program (UPCD) has been in place since 1994. The first six years of the program (1994-2001) are commonly referred to as Phase I. Treasury Board approval for a second phase was obtained in March 2001 for an additional 6 years to 2007 and this phase got underway in September 2001.

As we approached the end of the second phase, discussions were held with AUCC on the future of this program. AUCC was presented with the following options:

- 1) The existing program could be renewed via a Request for Proposals on MERX;
- 2) CIDA/CPB could assume full responsibility for the management of the renewed program; or
- 3) AUCC could assume the role of program partner under this renewed arrangement.

AUCC chose to pursue the third option of assuming the role of program partner. CPB obtained the Minister's approval for an eighteen-month extension of the second phase (September 2007 to March 2009) to permit CPB and AUCC to finalize a partnership renewal process whereby AUCC's relationship with CPB could be transformed from that of an executing agency to program partner. Over the last many months, AUCC has consulted with its 92 member universities on the components to be included in its program proposal to CIDA. This proposal is to be submitted to CIDA in January 2008 and CPB will then seek approval to transform AUCC into a program partner.

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Commitments / Actions</i>	<i>Responsibility Centre</i>	<i>Target Completion Date</i>	<i>Status</i>
<b>Program level Recommendations 1-8</b>				
1. That thought be given to how the standard of allocating 50% of UPCD's new investments to Africa affects the Program's relevance and performance, and that this standard be measured against the advantages and disadvantages of shifting the focus of programming to CIDA's partner countries, while seeking to reduce the number of countries where UPCD projects are found.	<p>Agree.</p> <p>CPB amended the UPCD selection criteria in 2003 to require that at least 50% of new projects recommended for funding support African institutions of higher learning.</p> <p>This change was approved by the Minister and was seen as consistent with CIDA's overall efforts to devote greater attention to Africa through its programming. Prior to this change, roughly 25% of UPCD projects focused on Africa.</p> <p>The evaluators correctly noted that this quota has impacted on the overall success of UPCD. Due to their relatively weak infrastructure and limited ability to cover recurrent costs, many African institutions of higher learning are unable to achieve sustainable results through this type of collaboration with Canadian universities.</p> <p>Through the proposed new program approach, AUCC and its members will determine where their expertise would ensure the greatest results. In consultation with AUCC, CPB will review this criterion to determine whether it should be removed or modified.</p>	AUCC	Start of new programmatic approach April 2009	Program under development

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Commitments / Actions</i>	<i>Responsibility Centre</i>	<i>Target Completion Date</i>	<i>Status</i>
2. That the UPCD program focus on what represents its value added to CIDA, i.e., on building the academic (teaching and research) capacities of developing-country partners, in keeping with its core mandate, so that they are better equipped to develop and promote knowledge in developing-country societies and their governments, and to train highly qualified human resources in key areas of local development, while being expressly in line with CIDA priorities as identified in CDPFs and their implementation strategies.	<p>Agree.</p> <p>As the evaluators have noted, strengthening specialized human resources in the service of development is the value-added area of expertise of the majority of UPCD projects.</p> <p>CPB would ensure that the new program being developed by AUCC would continue to reflect this focus.</p> <p>Consistent with this recommendation, the new program would also be closely aligned with CIDA's priorities, as identified in the CDPFs for the chosen countries and the countries' implementation strategies.</p>	CPB	April 2009	Review of program – Jan 2008
3. That a committee (including high-level strategic decision makers at CIDA) be formed to monitor the Program, with a mandate to guide	<p>Agree.</p> <p>As with all program proposals, CPB ensures a consultative approach (geographic desks, sector specialists, Canadian diplomatic missions, etc.) is used to help guide the program and ensure its continued</p>	CPB	June 2008	Program under development

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Commitments / Actions</i>	<i>Responsibility Centre</i>	<i>Target Completion Date</i>	<i>Status</i>
the UPCD Program, based on changes in CIDA's policy and programming environment; to promote the establishment of ties with other components of CIDA, so that the Program can be represented; to argue the positive and negative effects of CIDA's decisions on its performance, and develop its own specific applications of CIDA decisions; to give the Program a vision that reflects the changing environment; to strengthen the Program's strategic decision making; and to monitor its performance.	<p>relevance to CIDA's policy and programming environment.</p> <p>Should a new programmatic approach be approved, monitoring would take place to ensure that the program attains the results agreed upon in the proposal.</p>			
4. That, even if CIDA decides to keep UPCD's two tiers separate, a single executing agency	<p>To be reviewed.</p> <p>CPB recognizes the merits of a programmatic approach. The administrative cost and two tier</p>	CPB	April 2009	Program under development

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Commitments / Actions</i>	<i>Responsibility Centre</i>	<i>Target Completion Date</i>	<i>Status</i>
<p>(possibly AUCC) manage all projects. This would allow the UCP team of CPB to focus more on the Program's strategic management. It would also reduce the administrative costs that a two-tier management structure entails. This would mean greater synergy among projects, monitoring coordination, standardized production of RBM tools, production of a consolidated program report, and so on. However, this alternative means that CIDA and its partners must thoroughly examine how the two tiers are defined, their nature and characteristics, and above all their rationale in terms of the development results specifically expected for each tier.</p>	<p>management structure are unlikely to be issues under the new programmatic approach being proposed.</p> <p>The role of CPB's Universities and Colleges programs (UCP) team would be adapted to the new approach.</p>			

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Commitments / Actions</i>	<i>Responsibility Centre</i>	<i>Target Completion Date</i>	<i>Status</i>
5. That, in cooperation with AUCC and the Program's partners, UCP conduct an in-depth review to reduce red tape and undue costs due to project management requirements, while ensuring that partners are satisfactorily held accountable for reporting as required to CIDA.	<p>Agree.</p> <p>CPB has informed AUCC which fully supports this recommendation and will incorporate suggested improvements in its proposed program.</p> <p>The need to satisfy CIDA's reporting requirements would also be addressed through the programmatic approach.</p>	CPB	April 2009	Program under development
6. That the Tier 2 RBM framework be revised to specify and prioritize its objectives to better target and define expected results and to eliminate confusion in the results chain by clearly distinguishing and defining the results chain (outputs, outcomes and impacts) to bring it more into line with the Program's objectives, i.e., to build the capacities of Developing Country Education and	<p>Agree.</p> <p>The revised RBM framework would be incorporated in the proposed program.</p> <p>*Developing Country Education and Training Organization (DCETO)</p>	CPB	April 2009	Program under development

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Commitments / Actions</b>	<b>Responsibility Centre</b>	<b>Target Completion Date</b>	<b>Status</b>
Training Organizations (DCETOs)* to develop knowledge and to train highly qualified human resources to meet development priorities, as opposed to broad-based institution building; and that the framework be extended to the UPCD program as a whole.				
7. That CIDA's higher education programs (universities, colleges, scholarships) be brought together under the same roof to ensure that this sector is coordinated; that it makes a more focused and strategic contribution to CIDA programming, especially in terms of the development priorities of host countries and CIDA programming; that potential synergies are tapped at CIDA Headquarters and in the	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Over the past year, CPB's scholarship programs were transferred to the Voluntary Sector Projects and Education Directorate (VSPE) to promote synergies between scholarship and university and college activities.</p>	CPB	Nov 2006	No action required

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Commitments / Actions</i>	<i>Responsibility Centre</i>	<i>Target Completion Date</i>	<i>Status</i>
field; and that interfacing with partners focuses on a single portal.				
8. That, given UPCD's high level of intervention and potentially significant multiplier effects, Canadian field representatives, and especially Heads of Aid, should assume the same strategic, advisory and monitoring responsibilities for UPCD as for bilateral programming, especially in countries of focus where CIDA possesses relatively significant resources.	<p>Agree.</p> <p>CPB has always encouraged the interest and involvement of Canadian field representatives in its programs.</p> <p>UPCD has been particularly active in this regard, as its guidelines stipulate that all Canadian university proposals are sent to the Canadian diplomatic mission in the country (ies) being targeted, for comments.</p> <p>The involvement of our field representatives will continue to be sought through the consultative process for evaluating AUCC's proposed program.</p>	CPB	Current procedure	No action required
<b>Project level Recommendations 9-13</b>				
9. That an in-depth study be conducted, in view of the focus of CIDA programming on very poor countries, to develop new approaches	<p>Agree.</p> <p>CPB will undertake such a study in consultation with AUCC.</p>	CPB	April 2009	Program under development

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Commitments / Actions</i>	<i>Responsibility Centre</i>	<i>Target Completion Date</i>	<i>Status</i>
and methods to increase the relevance and performance of projects executed within Developing Country Training and Education Organizations (DCETOs) with very poor overall institutional capacity.				
10. That research be done on success stories, difficulties and best practices in including equality between women and men in university partnership projects, to improve the strategic approach, to ensure that specific activities promote this approach, and thus to improve project results.	<p>Agree.</p> <p>In recent years, the UPCD program has made great strides in promoting gender equality.</p> <p>With over 100 UPCD projects funded since 1994, the program is well placed to identify factors contributing to the success or failure of efforts to foster equality among women and men.</p> <p>We are taking steps to extract data from these projects in order to identify best practices and lessons learned for potential applications to future programming.</p>	CPB	Jan. 2009	Initiate Jan. 2008

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Commitments / Actions</i>	<i>Responsibility Centre</i>	<i>Target Completion Date</i>	<i>Status</i>
11. That, given the potential major impact of the community impact and policy influence components on the sustainability of results and poverty reduction, a study be conducted to identify methods, approaches and best practices that improve the likelihood of success and performance of projects with regard to these two objectives that promise potentially significant multiplier effects.	<p>Agree.</p> <p>With over 100 UPCD projects funded since 1994, the program is well placed to identify methods, approaches and best practices that improve the likelihood of success.</p> <p>We are taking steps to extract data from these projects in order to identify best practices and lessons learned for potential applications to future programming.</p>	CPB	Jan. 2009	To be initiated in Jan. 2008
12. That, considering CIDA's restrictive guidelines on local salaries, partial compensation of developing-country education and training organization (DCETO) management costs be eligible under the Program, to help	<p>CPB will ensure that the new programmatic approach being proposed is aligned with all CIDA policies and directives.</p> <p>AUCC as a program partner would be accountable for the monitoring and the results attained within its program, as detailed in its RBM.</p>	CPB	April 2009	Program under development

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Commitments / Actions</i>	<i>Responsibility Centre</i>	<i>Target Completion Date</i>	<i>Status</i>
DCETOs bear the added burden of administering UPCD projects. A small percentage could be prescribed for this purpose, in addition to the budget allocated for local expenditures. This would allow Developing Country Education and Training Organization (DCETOs)* to hire the resources they need to monitor projects in light of CIDA's RBM requirements.	*Developing Country Education and Training Organization (DCETO)			
13. That project monitoring and evaluation techniques be revised to make them more systematic and more objective, and that greater use be made of them for decision making and knowledge development.	<p>Agree.</p> <p>This recommendation will be incorporated in CPB's analysis of AUCC's proposed program.</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation of the proposed program would be undertaken as for all CPB program-funded partners. This information will form a key part of CPB's decision in renewing any program. Lessons learned will be collected and data from program activities extracted in order to identify best practices.</p>	CPB	April 2008	To be initiated in Jan. 2008