

# Evaluation

## The North-South-South Higher Education Programme



**Evaluation report 2009:7**

**MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF FINLAND**

- REPORT 2009:7 The North-South-South Higher Education Network Programme  
ISBN: 978-951-724-790-0 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-791-7 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2009:6 DEMO Finland Development Programme  
ISBN: 978-951-724-784-9 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-785-0 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2009:5 Finnish Aid in Western Kenya; Impact and Lessons Learned  
ISBN: 978-951-724-783-2 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-786-3 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2009:4 Meta-analysis of Development Cooperation on HIV/ AIDS  
ISBN: 978-951-724-769-6 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-770-2 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2009:3 Support to Development Research  
ISBN: 978-951-724-755-9 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-756-6 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2009:2 Agriculture and Rural Development. A Preliminary Study  
ISBN: 978-951-724-746-7 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-747-4 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2009:1 Finland´s Development Cooperation in Central Asia and South Caucasus  
ISBN: 978-951-724-728-3 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-729-0 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2008:7 Kosovo Country Programme  
ISBN: 978-951-724-716-0 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-717-7 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2008:6 The Cross-cutting Themes in the Finnish Development Cooperation  
ISBN: 978-951-224-714-6 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-224-715-3 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2008:5 Finnish NGO Foundations  
ISBN: 978-951-724-709-2 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-710-8 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2008:4 FIDIDA: An Examble of Outsourced Service 2004–2008  
ISBN: 978-951-724-690-3 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-691-0 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2008:3 Evolving New Partnerships between Finland and Namibia  
ISBN: 978-951-724-701-6 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-702-3 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2008:2 Local Cooperation Funds – Role in Institution Building of Civil Society Organizations  
ISBN: 978-951-724-701-6 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-702-3 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2008:1 Finnish Partnership Agreement Scheme  
ISBN: 978-951-724-672-9 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-673-6 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- SPECIAL EDITION  
2008:1 (SWE) FAO: Utmaning till förnyelse. Sammanfattning  
ISBN: 978-951-724-670-5 (print), ISBN: 978-951-724-671-2 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- SPECIAL EDITION  
2008:1 (FI) FAO: Haasteena uudistuminen. Lyhennelmä  
ISBN: 978-951-724-655-2 (painettu), ISBN: 978-951-724-659-0 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- SPECIAL EDITION  
2008:1 (ENG) FAO: The Challenge of Renewal. Summary  
ISBN: 978-951-724-657-6 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-661-3 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2007:3 Implementation of the Paris Declaration – Finland  
ISBN: 978-951-724-663-7 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-664-4 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2007:2 Meta-Analysis of Development Evaluations in 2006  
ISBN: 978-951-724-632-3 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-633-1 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2007:1 Finnish Aid to Afghanistan  
ISBN: 978-951-724-634-7 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-635-4 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2006:3 Review of Finnish Microfinance Cooperation  
ISBN: 951-724-569-6 (printed), ISBN: 951-724-570-X (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618

# **Evaluation**

## **The North-South-South Higher Education Institution Network Programme**

Evaluation report 2009:7



# Evaluation

## The North-South-South Higher Education Institution Network Programme

Tuija Stenbäck  
Nigel Billany

Evaluation report 2009:7

MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF FINLAND

---

This evaluation was commissioned by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland to Constelle. The consultants bear sole responsibility for the contents of the report.

The report does not necessarily reflect the views of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.

This report can be accessed at <http://formin.fi> nland.fi  
Hard copies can be requested from: EVA-11@formin.fi  
or  
Development Evaluation (EVA-11)  
The Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland  
P.O. Box 519  
FI-00023 GOVERNMENT  
Finland

ISBN 978-951-724-790-0 (printed)  
ISBN 978-951-724-791-7 (pdf)  
ISSN 1235-7618  
Cover photo: Nigel Billany  
Cover design: Anni Palotie  
Printing house: Hakapaino Oy, Helsinki, 2009

Anyone reproducing the content or part of the content of the report should acknowledge the source. Proposed reference: Stenbäck T & Billany N 2009 *The North-South-South Higher Education Institution Network Programme*. Evaluation report 2009:7. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Hakapaino Oy, Helsinki, 81 p.  
ISBN 978-951-724-790-0.

## CONTENTS

PREFACE .....	iii
ACRONYMS .....	v
ABSTRACTS .....	1
Finnish .....	1
Swedish .....	2
English .....	3
SUMMARIES .....	4
Finnish .....	4
Swedish .....	9
English .....	15
1 INTRODUCTION .....	25
1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation .....	25
1.2 Objectives of the Evaluation .....	25
1.3 Scope and Main Issues addressed .....	25
1.4 Methodology and Data Collection .....	26
1.5 Evaluation Indicators and Analysis .....	28
2 DESCRIPTION OF THE NORTH-SOUTH-SOUTH PROGRAMME .....	31
2.1 Background .....	31
2.2 Lessons Learned from the Pilot Phase – Highlights of the Evaluation .....	32
2.3 Objectives and Components of the N-S-S Programme .....	32
2.4 Stakeholders .....	33
2.5 Implementation of the Activities .....	33
2.5.1 Activities at Central Level .....	33
2.5.2 Activities at Institutional Level .....	35
3 KEY FINDINGS .....	35
3.1 Overall Progress of the Project Implementation .....	35
3.1.1 Programme Concept and Scope .....	35
3.1.2 Programme Planning .....	36
3.1.3 Implementation and Management of the Activities .....	37
3.1.4 Instruments and Modalities of Implementation .....	45
3.2 General Issues .....	46
3.2.1 Thematic and Geographical Distribution .....	46
3.2.2 Equality and Cross-cutting Dimensions .....	50
3.2.3 Good Governance and Transparency .....	51

4 CONCLUSIONS.....	52
4.1 Relevance.....	52
4.2 Efficiency.....	54
4.3 Effectiveness.....	55
4.4 Impact.....	56
4.5 Sustainability.....	57
4.6 Finnish Value-added.....	58
4.7 Good Governance and Transparency.....	58
4.8 Cross-cutting Issues.....	59
5 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	59
5.1 Planning the Network Projects.....	60
5.2 Additional Funding Mechanisms.....	61
5.3 Accounting and Management.....	62
5.4 Other.....	64
6 LESSONS LEARNED.....	65
7 RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS.....	66
REFERENCES.....	68
ANNEX 1 TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	69
ANNEX 2 PEOPLE INTERVIEWED <sup>1)</sup>	
ANNEX 3 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED <sup>1)</sup>	
<sup>1)</sup> Annexes 2 and 3 are non-edited and contained in the attached CD	
TABLES	
Table 1 Indicator matrix.....	28
Table 2 N-S-S financing levels (EUR '000) and mobility data (exchanges) in 2006–08.....	42
Table 3 Ministry for Foreign Affairs granted and own funds applied by one university.....	43
Table 4 Gender distribution of the participants 2007–08.....	50
BOXES	
Box 1 A coordinator's view.....	57



## PREFACE

The major onus of the evaluation of the North-South-South Higher Education Institution Network Programme (N-S-S- Programme) was on the implementation of the Programme since the first evaluation in 2006. Yet, the evaluation took into account also the pilot phase since its inception in 2004. The major evaluation questions included the validity of the N-S-S exchange concept, the relevance of the thematic distribution of the networks, the materialization of the cross-cutting dimensions, such as gender equality in the selection of exchange candidates, the mix of the type of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), geographic distribution as well as the compliance of the programme concept and goals with the global development policies and the current development policies of Finland and, likewise, with the strategies of the stakeholder institution. An important dimension of the evaluation was to look at the governance structures, coordination mechanisms and administration of the N-S-S Programme.

The findings of the evaluation are derived from document analysis, interviews of a large number of stakeholders as well as from field visits to participating institutions in two countries, Uganda and Nepal. The work was carried out by two senior consultants, with long experience in different disciplines of education and capacity building at the institutional and individual levels. Ms. Tuija Stenbäck and Mr. Nigel Billany, from Constelle consultancy performed the evaluation.

The evaluation suggests that the N-S-S network programme has been meaningful and achieved positive results, in particular in the advancement of individual capacities. The short duration of the programme has not yet allowed firm conclusions to be made on the institutional capacity building. The evaluation confirmed that the individual networks are generally well managed and organised, although there is still room for improvement of monitoring and evaluation of the impact of the programme. The evaluation recommends a log frame analysis to be utilized at the network planning stage to facilitate the monitoring and reporting. The evaluation also recommends that the programme be even better focussed around the needs of both the northern and the southern partners.

All in all, the N-S-S- Programme was found to be a valuable instrument among the Finnish development cooperation modalities, and within the sphere of the cooperating higher education institutions and systems. It is recommended that the programme be continued with some readjustments.

Helsinki, 04.11.2009

Aira Päivöke  
Director  
Development Evaluation



## ACRONYMS

AG	Advisory Group
CIMO	Centre for International Mobility
CR	Cost Recovery
EUR	Currency Euro
EVA-11	Evaluation of Development Cooperation/ Office of the Under Secretary of State, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
HEI	Higher Education Institution
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
IC	Intensive Course
ICI	Institutional Cooperation Instrument
ICT	Information Communication Technologies
IOCID	Community-based Radio
IT	Information Technology
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MFA	Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
MoE	Ministry of Education of Finland
MTR	Mid-term Review
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
N-S-S	North-South-South
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee
PD	Programme Document
PhD	Doctor of Philosophy
p-y	person year
S-S	South-South
SWAp	Sector-wide Approach programme
TOR	Terms of Reference
UAS	University of Applied Science
UN	United Nations



# Korkeakoulujen Pohjoinen-Etelä-Etelä Verkostoitumisohjelman Evaluointi

*Tuija Stenbäck ja Nigel Billany*

Ulkoasiainministeriön evaluointiraportti 2009:7

ISBN 978-951-724-790-0 (painettu); ISBN 978-951-724-791-7 (pdf);  
ISSN 1235-7618

Raportti on luettavissa kokonaisuudessaan [http://formin.fi\\_nland.fi](http://formin.fi_nland.fi)

---

## TIIVISTELMÄ

N-S-S ohjelman evaluaatio kohdistui ohjelman viisivuotiseen toteuttamiskauteen (mukaanlukien North-South pilottivaihe) ja sen tarkoituksena oli laatia suosituksia seuraavaa vaihetta varten. Arviointi perustui dokumenttianalysiin, kenttäkäynteihin kahteen esimerkkimaahan (Nepal ja Uganda) sekä avainhenkilöiden haastatteluihin suomalaisissa yliopistoissa ja ammattikorkeakouluissa. Kaksikymmentakolme verkostoa 34:tä verkostosta katettiin haastatteleamalla ja lopuille lähetettiin sähköpostikyselyt. Ohjelman yleiset tavoitteet ovat yhdenmukaisia Suomen kehityspolitiikan ja -prioriteettien kanssa. Vaikuttavuus on pääasiassa ollut positiivista, vaikka se on ilmennyt enemmän yksilö- kuin instituutiotasolla. Vaikka ohjelma ja yksittäiset verkostot ovat olleet hyvin hallinnoituja ja organisoituja, kehittämistarpeita on vielä monitoroinnissa ja vaikuttavuuden arvioinnissa. Loogista viitekehysanalyysiä suositellaan käytettäväksi verkoston suunnitteluvaiheessa. Tämä tukisi myös tuloksiin pohjaavaa raportointia aktiviteettipohjaisen raportoinnin sijasta. Verkostojen tavoitteiden tulisi painottaa enemmän sekä Pohjoisen että Etelän partnereiden tarpeita. N-S-S ohjelma on arvokas lisä Suomen kehitysyhteistyölle samoin kuin Etelän korkea-asteen koulutusjärjestelmille ja sen toteuttamista tulisi jatkaa.

*Avainsanat:* korkea-asteen koulutus, kapasiteetin kehittäminen, liikkuvuus, päätulokset, suositukset

# Utvärdering av Nord-Syd-Syd Nätverksprogrammet för Institutioner för högre Utbildning

*Tuija Stenbäck och Nigel Billany*

Utrikesministeriets utvärderingsrapport 2009:7

ISBN 978-951-724-790-0 (print); ISBN 978-951-724-791-7 (pdf);

ISSN 1235-7618

Rapporten finns i sin helhet på adressen <http://formin.fi/nland.fi>

---

## ABSTRAKT

Den aktuella utvärderingen av N-S-S-programmet har undersökt programmets fem implementeringsår (inklusive pilotfasens Nord-Syd-program) med syfte att göra rekommendationer för nästa fas. Utvärderingen baseras på dokumentgenomgångar och besök på plats i de länder som har ingått i studien (Nepal och Uganda) samt vid HEI:s i Finland där senior HEI-tjänstemän och nätverksmedlemmar har intervjuats. 23 av de 34 befintliga nätverken undersöktes på detta sätt och resterande intervjuades med hjälp av frågeformulär som skickades via e-post. Programmets översiktliga målsättningar följer Finlands policy och prioritet för utveckling. Resultatet har huvudsakligen varit positivt även om det hittills är mer tydligt för den individuella kompetensutvecklingen än den institutionella. Medan programmet och de individuella nätverken vanligen är väl skötta och har en god organisation finns utrymme för förbättringar av övervakningen och resultatutvärderingen med hjälp av analys av det logiska ramverket under nätverkets planeringsskede. Det stödjer även resultatbaserad rapportering istället för aktivitetsbaserad rapportering. Nätverksmålen bör fokusera mer på de behov som både programmets nordliga och sydliga partners har. N-S-S-programmet är en värdefull tillgång för det finländska utvecklingssamarbetet och även för de mottagande systemen för högre utbildning i Syd och en fortsättning är därför önskvärd.

*Nyckelord:* högre utbildning, kompetensutveckling, rörlighet, huvudresultat, rekommendationer

# Evaluation of the North-South-South Higher Education Institution Network Programme

*Tuija Stenbäck and Nigel Billany*

Evaluation Report of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2009:7

ISBN 978-951-724-790-0 (printed); ISBN 978-951-724-791-7 (pdf);  
ISSN 1235-7618

The full report can be accessed at <http://formin.fi/land.fi>

---

## ABSTRACT

The current evaluation of the N-S-S Programme examined the five years of implementation of the programme (including the pilot phase North-South Programme) with a view to making recommendations for the next phase. The evaluation was based on document reviews as well as field visits to case study countries (Nepal and Uganda) and to HEIs in Finland to interview HEI senior officials and network participants. Twenty-three of the 34 existing networks were covered in this manner, and the remainder were interviewed by e-mailed questionnaires. Overall programme objectives are in line with Finland's development policies and priorities. Impact has mainly been positive, though to date this shows more clearly in individual rather than institutional capacity development. While the programme and the individual networks are generally well managed and organised, there is room for improvement in monitoring and evaluation of impact through using a log frame analysis at the network planning stage. This will also support results-based rather than activity-based reporting. Network objectives should focus more on needs of both the Northern and Southern partners. The N-S-S Programme is a valuable asset to Finnish development cooperation as well as to the recipient higher education systems in the South and it is worth continuing.

*Keywords:* higher education, capacity building, mobility, main results, recommendations

## YHTEENVETO

North-South-South Higher Education Institution Network Programme (N-S-S Ohjelma) toteutettiin vuosina 2007–2009. Se on pyrkinyt sekä yksilöiden- että insituutioiden tasolla tapahtuvaan kapasiteetin kehittämiseen, joista jälkimmäinen on tapahtunut opetussuunnitelmien kehittämisen, henkilöstövaihdon ja intensiivikurssien kautta. Ohjelma on jatkoa pilottivaiheelle (North-South Ohjelma), joka käynnistyi vuonna 2004. Korkea-asteen koulutusohjelmalle oli suuri kysyntä johtuen vuosituhattavoitteiden (MDGs) aktiivisesta toteuttamisesta, mikä on lisännyt koulutusmahdollisuuksia perusasteella ja näin ollen myös kysyntää toisen ja kolmannen asteen koulutukseen. Pilottivaiheessa tukea sai vuosittain 23 verkostoa. Tämä vaihe evaluoitiin vuonna 2006, jota seurasi uuden vaiheen suunnittelu. Tässä otettiin opiksi pilottivaiheen kokemuksista. CIMOn (Centre for International Mobility) asiakirjoista käy ilmi, että vuonna 2009 toiminnassa oli 34 verkostoa.

Tämän evaluaation päätarkoitus oli analysoida ohjelman toteuttamista viime viisivuotiskaudella ja laatia sen perusteella suosituksia N-S-S ohjelman edelleen kehittämistä varten. Arviointi kohdistui: 1) ohjelman konseptiin, suunnitteluun ja toteuttamismalleihin, sekä ohjelman hallinnointiin ja läpinäkyvyyteen; 2) ohjelman eri verkostojen temaattiseen jakaumaan; 3) läpileikkaaviin periaatteisiin (kuten tasa-arvo, sukupuoli, eri tyyppiset korkea-asteen oppilaitokset, maantieteellinen ulottuvuus); ja 4) ohjelman yhteyksistä sekä Suomen kehityspolitiikkaan että globaaliin kehityspolitiikkaan (ilmaistu vuosituhattavoitteissa). Arvioinnin koko ohjelmaa koskevat yleiset johtopäätökset perustuvat yksittäisten verkostojen arviointeihin. Lisäksi arvioitiin ohjelman tuki- ja koordinaatiomekanismien (CIMO; Ohjausryhmä; Ulkoasiainministeriön, UM) tehokkuutta ja vaikuttavuutta.

Evaluaatio suoritettiin 17.6.–30.9.2009 välisenä aikana käyttäen seuraavia tiedonkeruumenetelmiä: (i) kirjallisen aineiston analyysi Suomessa; (ii) tilannekartoitus haastattelemalla ulkoasiainministeriön, ohjausryhmän, CIMOn henkilöstön ja Suomen Ylioppilaskuntien Liiton (SYL) edustajia (yhteensä 15); (iii) vierailut ohjelmaan osallistuviin yliopistoihin ja ammattikorkeakouluihin Suomessa, joissa haastateltiin 149 henkilöä (akateemisia ja hallinnollisia koordinaattoreita, ohjelmaan osallistuneita opettajia ja opiskelijoita sekä johdon edustajia, kuten rehtoreita ja dekaaneja); (iv) sähköpostikysely (kts. Liite 5) niille verkoistoille, joissa ei vierailtu (20 vastausta); (v) kenttäkäynnit Nepalissa ja Ugandassa, jossa haastateltiin yliopistojen akateemisia ja hallinnollisia koordinaattoreita, vaihto-ohjelman ja intensiivikurssien osanottajia (opettajia ja opiskelijoita); (vi) Ugandassa vierailtiin myös kyläyhteisö- ja paikallishallintotasolla, jossa keskusteltiin edunsaajien kanssa suomalaisten vaihto-opiskelijoiden ja opettajien panoksista kyläyhteisön kehittämisessä; (vii) evaluaatiotiimin kokoukset jokaisen kriittisen vaiheen yhteydessä (tietojen keruun suunnittelu, kenttäkäynnit, analyysit jne.), joissa keskusteltiin ja sovittiin johtopäätöksistä ja suosituksista. Kolmestakymmenestä neljästä verkostosta haastateltiin kaksikymmentäkolme.

N-S-S Ohjelma on toteutettu erillisten projektien kautta, joissa suomalaiset ja Etelän yliopistot ja ammattikorkeakoulut (jatkossa vain termi yliopisto) muodostavat yhteistointaverkostoja. Aloitteet näihin verkostoihin ovat useimmiten tulleet Suomesta (muttei



aina). Aiemmat henkilökohtaiset kontaktit ovat olleet avainasemassa verkostoja muodostettaessa, ja usein jo toiminnassa ollut yhteistyöverkosto on liittynyt N-S-S ohjelmaan. Jotkut olemassa olevat verkostot ovat olleet jatkoa pilottivaiheessa muodostetuista yhteistoimintamekanismeista. Uusilla verkostoilla oli mahdollisuus anoa rahoitusta vuoden mittaiseen suunnittelu- ja valmisteluvaiheeseen. Kapasiteetin kehittäminen yksilötasolla on muodostunut N-S-S ohjelman ensisijaiseksi toimintamuodoksi. Toissijaisesti on myös pyritty instituutioiden kapasiteetin kehittämiseen opetussuunnitelmien kehittämisen, henkilöstö- vaihtojen ja intensiivikurssien avulla. Kunkin verkoston saama rahallinen tuki on ollut suhteellisen pientä, jolloin painopiste yksilöiden kapasiteetin kehittämiseen on ollut ymmärrettävää. Nykyisellä rahoituksella on vain vähäiset mahdollisuudet instituutioiden kehittämiseen. Tästä huolimatta evaluaatiotiimi pitää verkosto-ohjelman mallia ja konseptia validina, vaikkakin vähäinen rahoitus kullekin verkostolle rajoittaa toimintojen vaikuttavuutta. Tämän lisäksi tiimi korostaa hyötyjen vastavuoroisuuden tunnustamista sekä Pohjoisen että Etelän yliopistoille, joskin tavoitteet tulisi määritellä molemmille osapuolille erikseen. Projektien tavoitteiden tulisi heijastaa sekä Etelän että Pohjoisen yliopistojen prioriteetteja, kuten on usein tapahtunut intensiivikurssien kohdalla. Opiskelija- ja opettajavaihdot sekä intensiivikurssit ovat hyödyllisiä toimintoja ja kytköksissä ohjelmadokumentin tavoitteisiin. Evaluaatiotiimi suhtautuu varauksella sille esitettyyn ehdotukseen, jossa N-S-S ohjelman hakuprosessi avattaisiin myös Etelän yliopistoille, koska tämä johtaisi ajallisiin viivästyksiin sekä ohjelmasuunnittelun ja hallinnoinnin tehottomuuteen. Etelän yliopistojen kyky tuen vastaanottamiseen myös vaihtelee. Joillakin Etelän yliopistoilla on niin monia verkostopartnereita ja ohjelmia, että N-S-S ohjelman pienten resurssien strategista merkitystä on vaikea arvioida. Tämä ei kuitenkaan välttämättä vähennä ohjelmien akateemista merkitystä yliopistoille. Suurimmalle osalle Etelän partnereita N-S-S ohjelma on ainoa mahdollisuus osallistua verkostoon tasa-arvoisena partnerina. Koordinoivat yliopistot ovat olleet tehokkaita aktiviteettien toteuttamisessa. Eroja havaittiin opiskelijoiden lähtövalmennuksessa, vaikkakin kaikki haastatellut pitivät CIMOn järjestämää orientaatio-ohjelmaa hyödyllisenä ja korkeatasoisena. Joissakin tapauksissa verkoston hallinnointi partneri-instituutioissa ei ole ollut tyydyttävää. Tämä on ollut merkillepantavaa eritoten uusissa verkostoissa, joilla ei ole ollut aiempaa kokemusta yhteistyöstä. Kaikesta huolimatta useimmat haastatellut ja kyselyyn vastanneet suomalaisopiskelijat olivat tyytyväisiä opinto-/työharjoitteluohjelmiinsa ja niiden järjestelyihin. Melkein kaikki haastatellut ja kyselyyn vastanneet opiskelijat olivat tyytyväisiä opiskeluunsa Suomessa (sekä akateemisiin sisältöihin että opinto-ohjaukseen ja käytännön järjestelyihin). Opettajavaihdot olivat myös hyödyllisiä ja useimmiten tehokkaasti järjestettyjä. Ongelmana oli kuitenkin usein niiden lyhytkestoisuus, usein vain korkeintaan pari viikkoa. Kapasiteetin ja opetussuunnitelmien kehittäminen eivät ole mahdollisia näin lyhyissä ajanjaksoissa. Kaikki haastatellut pitivät intensiivikursseja onnistuneena yhteistyömuotona. Ne vastasivat hyvin kehittämistarpeisiin, koska ne oli suunniteltu yhdessä Etelän ja Pohjoisen partnereiden kesken. Lisäksi ne olivat sisällöltään korkeatasoisia ja hyvin organisoituja.

Talousraportointi on ollut tarkasti ja luotettavasti ylläpidettyä. Eräs talousraportoinnin puutteista kuitenkin on ollut, ettei muiden kuin UM/CIMOn kautta tulevien varojen raportointi ole ollut mahdollista tai luvallista. Kaikki yliopistot ovat jossain muodossa

käyttäneet myös muita rahoituslähteitä verkostoihinsa. Tämä ei näy verkoston talousraportoinnissa CIMOLle ja näin ollen ei myöskään CIMOn raportoinnissa UM:lle. Taloushallinnon jäykät säännökset luovat tarpeetonta lisätyötä (sekä CIMOLle että yliopistoille) ja lisäävät myös hallinnon kustannuksia. Yleisesti ottaen N-S-S on hyvin hallinnoitu ohjelma. Työn- ja vastuunjako on selkeä organisaation eri osissa. Lähes kaikki suomalaiset verkostokoordinaattorit olivat tyytyväisiä CIMOn toimintaan ohjelman yleishallinnoinnissa. Myös UM:n virkamiehet pitivät CIMOa hyvänä yhteistyöpartnerina.

Yleisesti ottaen varojen käyttö on ollut tehokasta ja tasapainoista hyvin erityyppisten toimintojen kesken. Varat on myös jaettu verkostoille nopeasti niiden myöntämisen jälkeen. Yliopistojen statuksen muuttuessa 2010 alussa kaikki koordinoivat yliopistot saavat varoja ennakkoon. Suurin osa vaihto-ohjelmassa mukana olleista piti apurahan suuruutta riittävänä, vaikka joillakin Suomeen tulleilla oli ongelmia varojen riittävydessä (esim. Helsingissä). Tämä tulisi ottaa huomioon suunniteltaessa vaihto-ohjelman budjettia. Joidenkin toimintojen budjetit ovat olleet riittämättömiä. Esimerkiksi intensiivikurssien maksimibudjetti 15 000 euroa ei riitä silloin, kun verkostossa on useita partnereita laajalla maantieteellisellä alueella. Hallinnolliset kustannukset, kuten N-S-S website ja sähköinen raportointi, ovat olleet kohtuullisia ja jopa vähenemässä. Vaikka Etelä-Etelä (S-S) yhteistyö on ohjelman yhtenä tavoitteena, varoja toimintaan on osoitettu joko liian vähän taikka säännöt ovat sulkeneet pois niiden käytön. Kaikki ohjelmaan osallistuvat yliopistot sijoittavat myös omia varojaan ("counterpart" funding) ohjelman toteuttamiseen (24.1% yhden koordinaattorin ilmoitus). Tämän lisäksi osallistuvat yliopistot rahoittavat hallinnolliset kulunsa, kuten akateemisten ja hallinnollisten koordinaattoreiden työajan ja akateemisen henkilöstön työpanoksen intensiivikurssien suunnitteluun ja toteutukseen ja vaihto-ohjelmaan. Kriitistä huolimatta yksittäiset verkostot ovat ratkaisseet monet ongelmat luovasti ja innovatiivisesti ja ovat osoittaneet vahvaa sitoutumista N-S-S ohjelmaan.

Opettajavaihdot ovat yleensä olleet lyhytkestoisia vierailuja suomalaisiin ja Etelän yliopistoihin. Ne ovat olleet erittäin hyödyllisiä yhteistyön vahvistamisessa, hyvien suhteiden luomisessa ja vuosittaisten vaihto-ohjelmien sekä intensiivikurssien suunnittelussa. Opiskelijavaihdot ovat olleet pitempikestoisia, noin 3 kuukauden mittaisia. Vaihto-opiskelijat ovat opiskelleet kotimaan opintojensa kannalta relevantteja opintokokonaisuuksia. Suomen yliopistojen kirjastoja ja muita fasiliteetteja sekä akateemista tukea arvostettiin. Monet suomalaiset ammattikorkeakouluopiskelijat tekivät kenttätutkimusta ja työharjoittelua vaihdon aikana. Opintojen hyväksilukeminen kotimaan yliopistossa on ratkaisua vaativa kysymys kaikissa verkostoissa (lähinnä Etelän yliopistoissa). Intensiivikurssit ovat olleet onnistuneita ja niiltä odotetaan tulevaisuudessa jatkuvuutta ja linkittymistä yliopistojen opinto-ohjelmiin. Tällöin niistä voidaan kehittää yhteisiä alueellisia opintomoduleita ja ne voivat toimia opetussuunnitelmien kehittämistyön mekanismeina. Yksi selkeä hyöty intensiivikursseista on ollut Etelän partnereiden verkostoitumisen edistäminen.

CIMOn tietokannan mukaan vuonna 2009 oli toiminnassa 34 verkostoa, joiden maantieteellinen keskittymä oli Afrikassa (32), kaksi verkostoa oli Aasiassa (Nepal ja Vietnam) ja kaksi latinalaisessa Amerikassa (Peru). Jakauma on yhdenmukainen Suomen kehitys yhteis-

työn pääkohdemaavalikoiman kanssa. Pitkäkestoisinta kehitysyhteistyö on ollut Afrikassa. Ohjelmaan osallistuneet Afrikan maat ovat Botswana, Burundi, Egypti, Etiopia, Ghana, Kenia, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mosambik, Namibia, Nigeria, Ruanda, Swasimaa, Tansania, Senegal, Etelä-Afrikka, Sudan, Uganda, ja Sambia. Maavalikoiman laajuus on ollut etu ohjelmalle, koska se on laajentanut suomalaisten yliopistojen kokemuksia vieraista kulttuureista ja erityyppisistä sosiaalisista ja taloudellisista yhteisöistä. Se on myös antanut mahdollisuuden laajemmalle kirjolle suomalaisia yliopistoja osallistua yhteistyöhön. Suomalaisten yliopistojen partnerimaavalikoima on laajentunut ja pienellä N-S-S rahoituksella on luotu pohjaa rahoituksellisesti vahvempien instrumenttien käyttöön yhteistyössä, kuten Institutional Cooperation Instrument (ICI). Etelä-Etelä yhteistyötä on myös edistänyt maiden suurempi lukumäärä, eritoten naapurimaiden mukanaolo ohjelmassa.

N-S-S ohjelman verkostot kattavat laajan kirjon temaattisia alueita ja eri sektoreita. Sosiaalitieteet ja luonnontieteet ovat parhaiten edustettuina ohjelmassa, 6 verkostoa kutakin tieteenalaa kohden. Insinööritieteet ja teknologia, opettajainkoulutus, kommunikaatio ja informaatioteknologia ovat seuraavina luettelossa, kussakin 5 verkostoa. Lääketieteellä, maataloudella sekä taiteella ja designilla on kullakin 4 verkostoa. Yhdestä kolmeen verkostoa on matematiikassa, informaatiotieteessä, humanistisissa tieteissä, maantieteessä, geologiassa, liiketaloudessa ja johtamisessa sekä kategoriassa muut. Temaattiset alueet kattavat hyvin Suomen kehitysyhteistyön perinteisiä sektoreita kuten metsätaloutta, maataloutta, terveyttä, opetusta ja informaatioteknologiaa, joissa suomalainen tieto-taito ja kokemus ovat huomattavia. Jotkut verkostot ovat sisällöllisesti yhdenmukaisia läpileikkaavien ulottuvuuksien kanssa, kuten sukupuolten välinen tasa-arvo, ihmisoikeudet, demokratia, taloudellinen aktiivisuus ja ympäristönsuojelu. Muutamia verkostoja toimii myös perinteisten sektoreiden ulkopuolella, esim. kulttuuri ja musiikki. Ohjelma koostuu monista tieteenaloista ja se on avoin kummallekin sukupuolelle.

Vuosituhattavoitteet (MDGs), joiden päämääränä on vähentää köyhyyttä, ovat Suomen kehitysyhteistyöpolitiikan kulmakiviä. N-S-S ohjelma on yhteneväinen köyhyyden vähentämistavoitteen kanssa, vaikka se ei voikaan tuottaa suoria kehitysvaikutuksia kansallisella tasolla. N-S-S ohjelma on myös yhdenmukainen sekä Etelän että Pohjoisen yliopistojen strategisten prioriteettien kanssa.

CIMO on ponnistellut luotettavan, web-pohjaisen keskusjohtoisen suunnittelu- ja monitorointijärjestelmän kehittämisessä ja tulokset ovat vaikuttavia. Vuoden 2006 evaluaation jälkeen CIMO on ylläpitänyt ja parantanut hallintokulujen sisäistä tehokkuutta. Miltei kaikki vaihto-ohjelmaan ja intensiivikursseille osallistuneet ovat olleet tyytyväisiä sekä järjestelyihin että kurssien akateemisiin sisältöihin.

Ohjelma on vaikuttanut myönteisesti Etelästä tuleviin opiskelijoihin, joilla on ollut mahdollisuus osallistua korkeatasoiseen opetukseen. Jotkut opiskelijat ovat työllistyneet hyvin kotimaassaan Suomessa opiskelun ansiosta (esim. turismin palveluksessa). Jotkut Etelän yliopistot ovat myös ilmaisseet aikomuksensa rekrytoida tiedekuntiensa palvelukseen Suomessa väitöskirjaopinnoissa olleita opiskelijoita. Jotkut haastatellut opiskelijat kertoivat

Suomessa opiskelun olevan osa heidän urasuunnitelmiaan. Ohjelman vaikuttavuus suomalaisiin opiskelijoihin on ollut vaihteleva; jotkut ilmaisivat kiinnostuksensa luoda uraa kehitysyhteistyössä ja olivat muuttaneet opintojensa suuntaa palattuaan Suomeen. Vaikutukset instituutioiden kehittämiseen ovat olleet vähäisiä; kuitenkin pitkäaikaisilla verkostoilla, joilla on ollut myös muita rahoituslähteitä, on ollut paremmat mahdollisuudet tässä suhteessa. N-S-S ohjelma on täydentävä instrumentti ja täten tärkeä rahoitusmuoto kansainvälisessä yhteistyössä, eritoten Etelän instituutioille. Intensiivikurssien vaikuttavuus on jo jossain määrin todennettu ja niillä on potentiaalia suurempaan vaikuttavuuteen, mutta ne ovat alirahoitettuja tätä tarkoitusta varten.

Mitä tulee taloudelliseen kestävyYTEEN, enemmistö vastaajista pitää ulkoista rahoitusta ratkaisevana, mikäli opiskelijavaihtoja Etelästä Pohjoiseen jatketaan. Rahoituksen loppuminen tälle instrumentille merkitsisi melko varmasti, että Etelästä Pohjoiseen tapahtuva vaihto kuihtuisi kokonaan (tai lähes). On käynyt ilmeiseksi että N-S-S ohjelma on toiminut hautomona alkuvaiheessa oleville verkostoille, joista jotkut ovat nyt valmiita itsenäiseen elämään. Enemmistö verkostoista kuitenkin tarvitsee vielä tukea.

**N-S-S ohjelmasta saatuja opetuksia voidaan käyttää seuraavassa ohjelmavaiheessa. Näitä ovat:**

- Sellaiset N-S-S ohjelmaverkostot, joilla oli yhteistyötä esim. tutkimuksen, aka teemisen yhteistyön ja työharjoittelun piirissä ennen N-S-S ohjelmarahoitusta olivat tehokkaampia kehitysvaikutusten tuottamisessa. N-S-S ohjelma on erittäin hyvä täydentävä instrumentti;
- N-S-S ohjelma on myös hyvä instrumentti uudelle yliopistolle päästä mukaan kansainväliseen yhteistyöhön, koska sen avulla voidaan luoda suhteita Etelän yliopistoihin. Sen arvo on vastavuoroisuudessa, koska vain harvaan instrumenttiin kuuluu liikkuvuus Etelästä Pohjoiseen;
- N-S-S ohjelman vahvuus on siinä, että opinnot tulee hyväksyä ja lukea osana tutkintoa kotimaan yliopistossa eikä ohjelmarahoitusta voi käyttää koko tutkinnon suorittamiseen. Tämä ehkäisee aivovuotoa;
- N-S-S ohjelmassa on luotu hyvin toimivia malleja Suomeen tulevien opiskelijoiden ja opettajien vastaanottamiseen (kuten starttipaketit, orientaatio-ohjelmat) ja erilaisia mentorointi, tutorointi ja tukijärjestelmiä opiskelua varten. Ei ole syytä keksiä pyörää uudelleen aina, kun uusi verkosto aloittaa toimintansa. Esimerkiksi Oulun yliopiston, Savonia ammattikorkeakoulun, Joensuun yliopiston, Jyväskylän yliopiston ja Kuopion yliopiston aloitus- ja tukipaketteja voidaan hyödyntää ja jakaa muille yliopistoille. Hyvien käytänteiden levittäminen ehkäisee ongelmien syntymistä.

Evaluaatiotiimi on tehnyt 19 suositusta, jotka on ryhmitelty eri teemojen alle ja priorisoitu kahteen kategoriaan. Evaluointi tiimi pitää ohjelman jatkamista tärkeänä ja se on evaluoinnin pääsuositus. N-S-S ohjelma on etu Suomen kehitysyhteistyölle samoin kuin vastaanottavien maiden korkea-asteen koulutusjärjestelmille.

## SAMMANFATTNING

Utvecklingsprogrammet North-South-South Higher Education Institution Network Programme (N-S-S-programmet) implementerades under 2007 till 2009 med huvudsaklig fokus på individuell och institutionell kompetensutveckling genom utveckling av läroplaner, personalutbyten och intensivutbildningar. Det är en fortsättning av en pilotfas (North-South Programme - N-S-programmet) som startades i mars 2004. Underlaget för programmets lansering på tertiär nivå var den stora efterfrågan på en insats för den högre utbildningen: Att uppnå millenniets utvecklingsmål (MDG) ger större utvecklingsmöjligheter på primär nivå och ökar efterfrågan på utbildning på sekundär och tertiär nivå. Under pilotfasen ingick 23 nätverk, vilka fick årligt stöd och utvärderades 2006, och följdes av planeringen av den nya fasen där tidigare erfarenheter togs i beaktan. Enligt dokumentation från Centre for International Mobility (CIMO) fanns 34 aktiva nätverk 2009.

Huvudsyftet med den aktuella utvärderingen var att analysera de föregående fem årens implementeringsarbete för att få ett underlag för rekommendationer för ytterligare utveckling av N-S-S-programmet. Utvärderingen behandlade: 1) programkoncept, planering och implementeringsmetoder samt programledning och transparens, 2) tematisk distribuering av de olika nätverken inom programmet, 3) tvärsnittsfrågor (t.ex. jämlikhet, kön, olika typer av institutioner för högre utbildning (Higher Education Institutions, HEI), geografisk dimension), och 4) länkar till de finansiella och globala utvecklingspolicys som uttrycks i olika MDGs. Under utvärderingen har generella slutsatser dragits för hela programmet utifrån rön från individuella nätverk och mekanismerna för support och koordination (d.v.s. CIMO, granskningsråd och Finlands utrikesministeriet, UM) har bedömts efter deras effektivitet och resultat under processerna.

Utvärderingen gjordes mellan 17 juni och 30 september 2009 och omfattade: (i) en skrivbordsstudie av dokument i Finland; (ii) intervjuer med 15 MFA, granskningsråd, CIMO-personal och tjänstemän vid universitetens studentorganisationer (SYL) för situationsanalys och underlag; (iii) besök vid deltagande universitet och universitet med inriktning mot tillämpad vetenskap (Universities of Applied Science - UAS:s) i Finland där 149 intervjuer gjordes med akademiska och administrativa samordnare, lärare och studenter som deltog i programmet samt institutionernas högre ledning (t.ex. rektorer, dekaner, o.s.v.), (iv) e-postundersökning (se bilaga 5) för att inkludera de nätverk som inte kunde besökas (20 mottagna svar), (v) fältuppdrag till Nepal och Uganda för att intervjua akademiska och administrativa samordnare vid universiteten, deltagare i rörlighets- och intensivkurser (föreläsare och studenter), (vi) besök på plats i Uganda för diskussioner med understödstagare på kommun- och bynivå, bidrag till finansiella N-S-S-studenter och N-S-S-lärare på samhällsnivå, samt (vii) regelbundna teammöten i samband med alla kritiska faser av utvärderingen (datainsamling, besök på plats, analys o.s.v.) och för att diskutera och komma överens om rön och rekommendationer. 23 av 34 nätverk intervjuades.

N-S-S-programmet implementerades genom olika projekt där finansiella HEI:s och HEI:s i

Syd etablerade nätverk för samarbete. Initiativen till nätverken har i de flesta fall, men inte alla, kommit från Finland. Tidigare personalkontakter har varit viktiga för sammansättningen av nätverken och i många fall har redan fungerande nätverk för samarbete anslutit sig till N-S-S-programmet. Vissa av de befintliga nätverken är fortsättningar av pilotfasen som redan har etablerade mekanismerna för samarbete. Nya nätverk kunde ansöka om ettårig förprojektfinansiering för planering och förberedelser. Den primära inriktningen för N-S-S-programmet är individuell kompetensutveckling. Institutionell kompetensutveckling är också ett förväntat resultat av N-S-S-programmet genom utveckling av läroplaner, personalutbyten och intensivkurser. Med tanke på de relativt små ekonomiska tilldelningarna till varje nätverk gäller fokus på individuell kompetensutveckling inom programkonceptet. Med den aktuella finansieringsnivån är bidragen till institutionell kompetensutveckling mycket små i de flesta fallen, men utvärderingsteamet betraktar fortfarande programmets koncept och omfattning som giltiga, även om den ringa omfattningen för varje nätverk begränsar den effekt aktiviteterna har. Dessutom understryker teamet behovet av att uppmärksamma de ömsesidiga fördelarna för HEI:s i Norr och i Syd, och att målen därmed bör definieras för parterna i både Nord och Syd. Nätverkens mål bör hämtas från prioriterade områden för HEI:s i både Syd och Nord, vilket ofta har varit fallet när innehållet i intensivkurserna (IC) har definierats. Student- och lärarutbyten samt intensivkurser är meningsfulla aktiviteter som kopplas till programmets mål i det samlade projektdokumentet (PD). Teamet ställer sig tvekan till förslaget som presenterades för teamet om att öppna N-S-S-programmets programprocess för HEI:s i Syd. Detta skulle oundvikligen leda till tidsmässiga förseningar och ineffektiv programplanering och programledning.

Absorptionsgraden varierar avsevärt mellan olika HEI:s. Vissa HEI:s i Syd har så många utvecklings- och nätverkspartners att de små resurserna via N-S-S-programmet har liten strategisk vikt, även om det inte nödvändigtvis förringar deras akademiska betydelse. För lejonparten av deltagarna från Syd tycks N-S-S-programmet vara den enda möjligheten att delta som en jämbördig partner i ett nätverk. Aktiviteterna har implementerats på ett effektivt sätt genom att samordna olika HEI:s. Förberedelser för avgångsstuderenter har gjorts i varierande grad, men alla intervjuade personer lovprisade orienteringsprogrammet som organiserades av CIMO och ansågs vara mycket användbart och hålla hög kvalitet. I vissa fall, har nätverkets ledning vid partnerländernas institutioner inte varit tillfredsställande. Svårigheter har påträffats i synnerhet när ett nätverk nyligen har etablerats utan en lång samarbetshistoria. Icke desto mindre, var de flesta av de intervjuade finska studenterna och de som svarade på frågeformulären nöjda med perioderna som innehöll studier och arbetspraktik samt de logistiska arrangemangen. Nästan alla studenter som intervjuades eller fyllde i frågeformuläret var mycket nöjda med sina studier i Finland, både akademiskt och med handledningen och de logistiska arrangemangen. Lärarutbyten var också nyttiga och implementerades i de flesta fall på ett effektivt sätt. Problemet var i många fall den korta varaktigheten; ofta bara två veckor. Kompetensutveckling och utveckling av läroplaner är inte möjliga under så korta besök. Alla intervjuade personer ansåg att intensivkurser var en lyckad metod. De planerades gemensamt av programmets partners och fokuserade på aktuella behov; de höll hög kvalitet och hade god ledning.



Rapporteringen av ekonomiska aktiviteter sköts minutiöst. En allvarlig brist i de existerande ekonomiska rapporteringssystemen är dock att de inte uppmuntrar och, i vissa fall, inte tillåter rapportering av något annat än finansiering som kommer direkt från UM/CIMO. Det står klart att samtliga HEI:s bidrar på ett eller annat sätt till nätverkens resurser, men dessa insatser syns vanligen inte i vare sig nätverksrapporterna till CIMO eller (som en följd av detta) i CIMO:s rapporter till MFA. Reglerna för budgethantering av olika HEI:s är mycket stränga, vilket ger upphov till onödigt arbete (både för CIMO och olika HEI:s) och har ibland även resulterat i att kostnader blivit högre än nödvändigt. I allmänhet sköts N-S-S-programmet väl. Det finns tydliga uppdelningar och ansvarsfördelningar mellan organisationens olika delar. Nästa alla finansiiska nätverkssamordnare uttrycker tillfredsställelse över CIMO som övergripande ledningsfunktion. Även MFA-tjänstemän uttryckte tillfredsställelse över CIMO som samarbetspartner.

I allmänhet fördelas tillgängliga medel på ett effektivt sätt och med en bra balans mellan de tre aktivitetstyperna. Utbetalningsrutinerna för tillgängliga medel fungerar utmärkt och inga rapporter har inkommit om svårigheter att erhålla finansiering när medlen tilldelats. I och med förändringen av HEI-status från början av 2010 kommer alla samordnande HEI:s att erhålla finansiering i förväg. Även om utbytesdeltagare vanligen har uttryckt att storleken på de beviljade medlen var tillräcklig hade brist på medel antingen gett upphov till extra utgifter eller svårigheter för vissa besökare, och detta bör beaktas när budgetar för utbyten fastställs. Budgetar för specifika aktiviteter tenderar att vara för snålt tilltagna. Exempelvis är budgeten på 15 000 euro för IC:s ofta otillräcklig, i synnerhet om nätverket är stort och har många partners. De administrativa kostnaderna, inklusive kostnaden för N-S-S webbsida och elektronisk rapportering, har hållits på en relativt låg nivå och uppvisar en fallande trend. Trots att samarbete mellan Syd-Syd är ett av projektets mål är anslagen för att främja det antingen för små eller har åtminstone upplevts som svåra att erhålla enligt gällande bestämmelser. Alla deltagande HEI:s bidrar med sina egna medel i form av "motviktsfinansiering" i åtminstone någon grad (24,1 % enligt en samordnare). Dessutom finansieras samtliga administrativa kostnader, som gäller arbetstiden för administrativa och akademiska samordnare samt arbetstimmar vid fakulteten i samband med intensivkurser och utbyten, av de deltagande institutionerna utan senare ersättning. Trots denna kritik är det viktigt att notera att individuella nätverk har klarat utmaningarna med hjälp av kreativa och innovativa metoder, och de har visat prov på ett starkt engagemang för N-S-S-programmet.

Lärarytbyten har vanligen utgjorts av korta besök vid finansiiska HEI:s och vid HEI:s i Syd. De har varit särskilt användbara för att stärka samarbetet, etablera goda relationer och att varje år planera utbytesprogrammet och intensivkurserna. Studentutbyten har skett under längre perioder, vanligen tre månader, och studenterna har i allmänhet deltagit i studieprogram som är relevanta för deras fältstudier i deras respektive hemländer. Det akademiska stödet, bibliotek och andra faciliteter vid de finansiiska universiteten var mycket uppskattade. Många finansiiska studenter från olika UAS:s kunde göra fältstudier och arbetspraktik under sina utbytesperioder. Ackreditering är en fråga för alla nätverk. Intensivkurserna har varit effektiva och förväntas i framtiden bli mer kontinuerliga processer som kopplas till stu-

dieprogrammen vid universiteten så att de kan erbjudas som gemensamma moduler i de olika områdena, som mekanismer för utveckling av läroplaner. En klar fördel med intensivkurserna har varit nätverkssamarbetet med programmets partner i Syd.

Enligt CIMO-dokumentationen fanns 34 nätverk 2009. Deras geografiska täckning har kraftig fokus på Afrika (32) med två nätverk i Asien (Nepal och Vietnam) samt två i Latinamerika (Peru). Uppdelningen är förenlig med de valda fokusländerna för det finländska utvecklingssamarbetet som har en långvarig relation till Afrika. De 20 afrikanska länder som för närvarande deltar i nätverken är Botswana, Burundi, Egypten, Etiopien, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Madagaskar, Malawi, Moçambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, Swaziland, Tanzania, Senegal, Sydafrika, Sudan, Uganda och Zambia. Ett större urval länder är en tillgång för programmet, eftersom det breddar den finländska erfarenheten av andra kulturella, sociala och ekonomiska sammanhang och innebär en möjlighet för ett bredare spektrum av HEI:s att delta i samarbetet. Det har breddat urvalet länder för finländska HEI:s och har tillhandahållit startfinansiering för eventuella starkare samarbetsmekanismer i framtiden, såsom verktyg för samarbete mellan institutioner (Institutional Cooperation Instruments - ICI). Syd-Syd-samarbetet har också lyfts fram, i synnerhet grannländer emellan när flera länder är inblandade.

N-S-S-programmets nätverk omfattar stora tematiska områden och sektorer. Sociala vetenskaper och naturvetenskap är bäst representerade i programmet med sex nätverk för varje ämne. Ingenjörskonst och teknik, lärarutbildning och kommunikation samt informationsvetenskap är näst mest populära med fem nätverk var. Medicinsk vetenskap, jordbruksvetenskap och konst och design har vardera fyra nätverk. Övriga, som har mellan ett och tre nätverk, innefattar matematik, informatik, humaniora, geografi, geologi, företagsstudier och företagsledning samt övriga områden. De tematiska områdena innefattar väl de traditionella sektorerna inom det finländska utvecklingssamarbetet såsom skogsbruk, jordbruk, hälsa, utbildning och informationsteknik där finländsk know-how och expertis är mycket stor. Vissa nätverk är innehållsligt inriktade mot tvärsnittliga dimensioner såsom kön, jämlikhet, mänskliga rättigheter, demokrati, ekonomisk aktivitet och miljöhänsyn. Det finns också nätverk utanför de traditionella sektorerna, t.ex. kultur och musik. En viktig observation är att programmet som helhet består av många olika ämnen som är öppna för båda könen.

Utformningen av olika MDG:s som har som slutgiltigt syfte att minska fattigdomen är en hörnsten i det finländska utvecklingsarbetet. N-S-S-programmet är kompatibelt med mål att lindra fattigdomen även om den inte har någon direkt inverkan på nationell nivå. N-S-S-programmet är också kompatibelt med strategiskt prioriterade områden för HEI:s i Syd och i Norr.

Stora ansträngningar har gjorts för att bygga upp ett solitt, webbaserat system för central planering och övervakning av projektaktiviteter och budgetar, och resultatet är imponerande. Under perioden sedan den senaste utvärderingen 2006 har CIMO upprätthållit eller förbättrat de interna effektivitetsåtgärderna vad gäller de administrativa kostnaderna



(åtminstone uttryckta i termer av nivåer för kostnadsåterhämtning från MFA). Intressenternas nöjdhetsgrad är hög och detsamma gäller, nästan utan undantag, för deltagare i utbyten och olika IC:s som har varit mycket nöjda med både de logistiska arrangemangen för aktiviteterna och det akademiska innehållet.

Programmet har haft en positiv inverkan på studenter från Syd där många har haft möjlighet att delta i kurser som håller hög kvalitet. Vissa studenter har fått bra jobb i sina hemländer tack vare studierna i Finland (t.ex. inom turism). Universiteten i Syd har uttryckt sin avsikt att rekrytera de studenter som har varit doktorander i Finland till sina fakulteter. Vissa studenter som intervjuades uttryckte att deras erfarenhet av N-S-S-programmet utgör en integrerad del av deras karriärplaner. Inverkan på de finländska studenterna varierar. Vissa säger sig vilja göra karriär inom utvecklingsarbetet och ändrade studieinriktning när de återvände till Finland. Inverkan på den institutionella kompetensutvecklingen är fortfarande blygsam; de nätverk som har långvariga relationer med andra finansieringskällor befinner sig i en bättre position i detta avseende. N-S-S-programmet är både en kompletterande metod och en viktig finansieringsmetod i deras internationella samarbete, i synnerhet för institutionerna i Syd. Intensivkurser har redan haft effekt till en viss grad och har potential för större inverkan, men de erhåller inte tillräckliga medel för detta syfte.

Vad gäller ekonomisk hållbarhet känner större delen av deltagarna mycket starkt att extern finansiering av N-S-S är absolut nödvändig för att studentutbyten från Syd till Nord ska kunna fortsätta. Om finansieringen i detta syfte upphör skulle det med största sannolikhet innebära att inga eller mycket få utbyten från Syd till Nord vore möjliga. Det står allt mer klart att N-S-S-programmet har fungerat som en inkubator för nya nätverk varav några få nu är redo att lämna boet och klarar sig på egen hand. Majoriteten av nätverken kommer även i fortsättningen att behöva omsorg och stöd innan de blir helt oberoende.

#### **De främsta erfarenheterna av N-S-S-programmet som direkt påverkar nästa fas är:**

- De av N-S-S-programmets nätverk som hade befintliga avtal för samarbete, exempelvis för forskning, akademiskt samarbete och internship/arbetspraktik, innan finansieringen via N-S-S-programmet var mer effektiva i arbetet med att producera utvecklingsresultat. N-S-S-programmet är ett utmärkt kompletterande verktyg;
- N-S-S-programmet är ett bra sätt för en ny HEI att ta sig in på området internationellt samarbete i skapandet av relationer med olika HEI:s i Syd. Värdet ligger i dess ömsesidiga natur eftersom det finns mycket få verktyg i Finland och på andra platser som möjliggör rörlighet från Syd;
- N-S-S-programmets styrka är att studier ackrediteras vid hemmauniversitetet och att det inte är möjligt att använda finansiering av N-S-S-programmet för att läsa en hel utbildning, vilket på ett effektivt sätt förhindrar att välutbildade personer lockas bort från sina hemländer, oavsett rörelseriktning;
- Modeller från väl fungerande system finns för mottagande av studenter och lärare (startpaket, orienteringssystem, o.s.v.) till Finland och för hur man tillhan-

dahåller råd, handledning och socialt stöd under vistelsen. Det är inte nödvändigt att uppfylla hjulet på nytt varje gång ett nytt nätverk börjar fungera. Paket tillhandahålls av t.ex. Uleåborgs universitet, Savonia yrkeshögskola, Joensuu universitet, Jyväskylä universitet och Kuopio universitet. Spridning av bästa praxis skulle ha förhindrat att vissa problem uppstod.

Utvärderingsteamet har gjort 19 rekommendationer, som har delats upp under olika rubriker och prioriteras i två kategorier. N-S-S-programmet är en värdefull tillgång för det finansiella utvecklingsarbetet och även för de mottagande systemen för högre utbildning i Syd och är därför värt att fortsätta.

## SUMMARY

The North-South-South Higher Education Institution Network Programme (N-S-S Programme) has been implemented during 2007–09 with a primary focus on capacity building of individuals, as well as institutional capacity development through curriculum development, staff exchanges and intensive courses. It is a continuation of a pilot phase (North-South Programme) that was launched in March 2004. The justification for launching a programme at tertiary level was the great demand for an intervention in higher education: attainment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) is creating greater educational opportunities at primary level and increasing the demand for education at secondary and tertiary levels. The pilot phase included 23 networks which received support on an annual basis and was evaluated in 2006, followed by planning of the new phase in which the lessons learnt were taken into account. According to the Centre for International Mobility (CIMO) documentation 34 networks were operational in 2009.

The main purpose of the present evaluation was to analyse the previous five years of implementation as the basis for recommendations for further development of the N-S-S Programme. The evaluation considered: 1) the programme concept, planning, and implementation modalities, and the programme governance and transparency; 2) thematic distribution of the various networks within the Programme; 3) crosscutting issues, (e.g. equality, gender, different types of Higher Education Institutions (HEI), geographical dimension); and 4) links with the Finnish and Global development policies as expressed in the MDGs. The evaluation has drawn general conclusions for the entire Programme from findings on individual networks, and has assessed the support and coordination mechanisms (i.e., CIMO, Advisory Group and Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, MFA) in terms of their efficiency and effectiveness in the processes.

The evaluation was undertaken between June 17 and September 30, 2009, and comprised: (i) desk study of documents in Finland; (ii) interviews with 15 MFA, Advisory Group, CIMO staff and University Student Union (SYL) officials for situation analysis and briefing; (iii) visits to participating Universities and Universities of Applied Science (UASs) in Finland to conduct 149 interviews with the academic and administrative coordinators, teachers and students who have participated in the programme, and top management of the institutions (e.g. principals, deans etc); (iv) e-mail survey (see Annex 5) to cover those networks that could not be visited (20 responses received); (v) field missions to Nepal and Uganda to interview the University academic and administrative coordinators, participants in mobility and intensive courses (lecturers and students); (vi) field visits in Uganda to discuss with district and village level beneficiaries the contributions of the Finnish N-S-S students and teachers at the community level; and (vii) regular team meetings in connection with every critical phase of the evaluation (data collection, field visits, analysis etc.) and to discuss and agree the findings and recommendations. Twenty-three out of 34 networks were interviewed.

The N-S-S Programme is implemented through separate networks in which Finnish HEIs

and HEIs in the South establish cooperation networks. Initiatives for the networks have in most, but not all, cases come from Finland. Earlier personal contacts have been instrumental in network formulation, and in many cases an already functioning cooperation network has joined the N-S-S Programme. Some of the existing networks are continuations from the pilot phase which had already established cooperation mechanisms. New networks were able to apply for one year pre-project funding for planning and preparation. The primary scope of the N-S-S Programme is on capacity building of individuals. Institutional capacity development is also an expected output from the N-S-S Programme through curriculum development, staff exchanges and intensive courses. Considering the rather small financial allocations to each network the focus on individual capacity development is valid in the programme concept. With the current level of funding, contributions to institutional capacity development remain rather minimal in most cases, but the evaluation team considers the programme concept and scope still valid, even though the small volume of each network limits the impact of the activities. In addition, the team emphasizes the need to acknowledge the reciprocity of the benefits to the HEIs in the North and in the South, whereby the objectives of the networks should be defined for both Northern and Southern partners. The objectives of the networks should be derived from the priorities of the HEIs in the South and in the North, as has often been the case in defining the contents of the intensive courses (IC). The student and teacher exchanges and intensive courses are worthwhile activities and are linked to the programme objectives in the overall Project Document (PD). The team would caution the idea presented to the team to open the N-S-S Programme application process to the HEIs in the South. This would inevitably lead to time delays and inefficiencies in programme planning and management.

Absorption capacity varies greatly between HEIs. Some Southern HEIs have so many development and network partners and programmes that the small resources of the N-S-S Programme have little strategic importance, though that does not necessarily diminish their academic importance. For the majority of partners from the South, the N-S-S Programme seems to be the only opportunity they have to participate as an equal partner in a network. The activities have been implemented efficiently by the coordinating HEIs. Preparation for the leaving students has been arranged somewhat variably, though all interviewees praised the orientation programme organized by CIMO as being very useful and high quality. In some cases the network management in the partner country institutions has not been satisfactory. Difficulties have been encountered particularly when the network has been newly established without a long history of cooperation. Nevertheless, most of the interviewed Finnish students and those who responded to the questionnaires were satisfied with their study/work practice periods and the logistical arrangements. Almost all students who were interviewed or responded to the questionnaire expressed great satisfaction with their studies in Finland, both academically and with tutoring and logistical arrangements. Teacher exchanges were also useful and in most cases efficiently implemented. The problem in many cases was their short duration, often two weeks maximum. Capacity development and curriculum development are not possible during very short visits. All interviewees considered intensive courses a successful modality. They

were planned jointly between the partners and responded to current needs, they were of high quality and well managed.

Reporting of financial activities is rigorously maintained. However, a serious deficiency of the existing financial reporting systems is that they neither encourage nor, in some instances, permit reporting of anything other than funds coming directly from MFA/CIMO. It is clear that all of the HEIs contribute in some form or another to the resources of the networks, but these inputs are generally not reflected in either network reports to CIMO or (consequently) CIMO's reports to MFA. There are very rigid rules on budget management by the HEIs, which create unnecessary work (for both CIMO and the HEIs) and also have resulted at times in higher than necessary costs. Generally the N-S-S Programme is well-managed. There are clear divisions and lines of responsibility between various parts of the organization. Almost all Finnish network coordinators expressed their satisfaction with CIMO as the overall managing body. Similarly, MFA officials also expressed their satisfaction with CIMO as a working partner.

Generally funds are applied efficiently, with a good balance between the three types of activity. The procedures for disbursement of the funds work very well, and no reports were received of difficulties in receiving funds once they had been allocated. With the change of HEI status from the beginning of 2010, all coordinating HEIs will receive funds in advance. While exchange participants generally responded that the level of grants was sufficient, lack of funds had created either extra expenses or hardship for some visitors, and this should be considered when defining exchange budgets. Budgets for specific activities tend to be too low. For example, the EUR 15,000 budget for ICs is often insufficient, especially where the network is widespread and has many partners. Administrative costs, including the cost of the N-S-S website and electronic reporting, have been kept reasonably low, and show a declining trend. Even though South-South cooperation is a goal of the programme, funds to promote this are either too little or have at least been perceived to be precluded under the regulations in place. All participating HEIs contribute their own funds as "counterpart" funding to at least some extent (24.1% quoted by one coordinator). In addition, all administration costs in terms of working hours of administrative and academic coordinators as well as faculty working hours on intensive courses and exchanges are funded by the participating institutions without reimbursement. Despite these criticisms, it is essential to note that individual networks have met the challenges in creative and innovative ways, and have demonstrated strong commitment to the N-S-S Programme.

Teacher exchanges have usually consisted of short visits to the Finnish HEIs and to the HEIs in the South. They have been particularly useful in strengthening the cooperation, establishment of good relations, and planning annually the exchange programme and intensive courses. Student exchanges have been of longer duration, usually of three months, and students have generally participated in study programmes relevant to their field of studies in their home countries. Academic support and library and other facilities of the Finnish Universities were highly appreciated. Many Finnish students from the

UASs were able to undertake field studies and do their work practice during their exchanges. Accreditation is an issue with all networks. Intensive courses have been a successful modality and are expected in the future to become more continuous processes linked to study programmes in the universities that could be offered as joint modules in the regions, as mechanisms for curriculum development. One clear benefit from the intensive courses has been the networking of the Southern partners.

According to the CIMO documentation 34 networks were operational in 2009. Their geographical coverage has a strong focus on Africa (32) with two networks in Asia (Nepal and Vietnam) and two in Latin America (Peru). This division is compatible with the focal country selection of Finnish Development Cooperation that has a long-standing relationship with Africa. The 20 countries in Africa currently participating in the networks are Botswana, Burundi, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, Swaziland, Tanzania, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Uganda and Zambia. Wider country selection is an asset to the Programme, because it broadens the Finnish experience to other cultural, social and economic contexts and gives an opportunity for a broader spectrum of HEIs to participate in the cooperation. It has widened the country selection for the Finnish HEIs and provided seed funding for possible stronger cooperation mechanisms in the future, like Institutional Cooperation Instruments (ICI). South-South cooperation has also been promoted, particularly between neighbouring countries, when more countries are involved.

The N-S-S Programme networks cover a wide range of thematic areas and sectors. Social sciences and natural sciences are best represented in the programme, 6 networks for each discipline. Engineering and technology, teacher training and communication and information science are the next most popular, having 5 networks each. Medical sciences, agricultural sciences and art and design all have 4 networks. The rest with one to three networks cover mathematics, informatics, humanities, geography, geology, business studies and management, and other areas. The thematic areas cover well the traditional sectors of Finnish development cooperation like forestry, agriculture, health, education and information technology, where Finnish know-how and experience are prominent. Some networks are content-wise aligned with the cross-cutting dimensions like gender equality, human rights, democracy, economic activity and environmental protection. There are also networks from outside the traditional sectors, e.g. culture and music. A crucial observation is that the Programme as a whole consists of a multitude of disciplines open to both sexes.

The MDGs, which are designed ultimately to reduce poverty, are a cornerstone of Finnish development policy. The N-S-S Programme is compatible with poverty alleviation goals even though it cannot have a direct impact at national level. The N-S-S Programme is also compatible with the strategic priorities of the HEIs in the South and North.

A lot of effort has been put into building a solid, web-based central planning and monitoring system for network activities and budgets, and the results are impressive. During

the period since the previous evaluation in 2006, CIMO has maintained or improved its internal efficiencies in relation to administrative costs (at least as expressed in terms of cost recovery rates from MFA). Stakeholder satisfaction is high, as, almost without exception, participants of exchanges and ICs have been highly satisfied with both the logistical arrangements of their activities as well as the academic content.

The Programme has had a positive impact on students from the South, many of whom have had an opportunity to participate in high quality courses. Some students have found good jobs in their home country because of the studies in Finland (e.g. in tourism). Universities in the South have expressed their intention to recruit into their faculties the students who have done PhD studies in Finland. Some interviewed students expressed their N-S-S Programme experience as integral to their career plans. The impact on the Finnish students is mixed; some express willingness to follow a career in development cooperation and changed their study focus on their return to Finland. Impacts on institutional capacity development are still modest; the networks that have long-term relationships and other funding sources are in a better position in this respect. The N-S-S Programme is a complementary as well as an important funding modality in their international cooperation, especially for the Southern institutions. Intensive courses are already seen as having impact to some extent, and have a potential for greater impact, but they are under-funded for this purpose.

In terms of financial sustainability, the majority of respondents feel very strongly that external funding to N-S-S is crucial if student exchanges from the South to the North are to continue – a termination of funding for this instrument would almost certainly mean that no or only very few South to North exchanges would be possible. It has become increasingly apparent that the N-S-S Programme has functioned as an incubator for fledgling networks, a few of which would now be ready to leave the nest and continue to fly on their own. The majority of networks will continue to need careful nurturing and feeding before they are truly independent.

**The main lessons learned from the N-S-S Programme that can directly influence the next phase are:**

- The N-S-S Programme networks that had existing cooperation arrangements for example in research, in academic cooperation and internship/work practice before N-S-S Programme funding were more effective in producing development results. The N-S-S Programme is an excellent complementary instrument;
- The N-S-S Programme is a good instrument for a new HEI to enter the field of international cooperation in building relationships with the HEIs in the South. Its value lies in its nature of reciprocity as there are very few instruments in Finland or elsewhere that allow mobility from the South;
- The N-S-S Programme strength is that the studies are accredited in the home university and it is not possible to use N-S-S Programme funding to study for an entire degree, which effectively prevents brain drain in either direction;
- Models exist from well functioning systems to receive students and teachers



(start-up packages, orientation systems etc) to Finland and how to provide mentoring, tutoring and social support during their stay. There is no need to reinvent the wheel every time a new network starts to function. Packages can be provided by e.g. – University of Oulu, UAS Savonia, University of Joensuu, University of Jyväskylä and University of Kuopio. Dissemination of best practices would have prevented some problems from occurring.

The evaluation team has made 19 recommendations, were grouped under various headings and prioritised under two categories. The N-S-S Programme is a valuable asset to Finnish development cooperation as well as to the recipient higher education systems in the South and it is worth continuing.



Findings	Conclusions	Recommendations <i>(See section 5 for numbering)</i>
<b>Relevance</b>		
<p>- Difficult to show direct alignment of each individual network with specific policy goals, but overall N-S-S Programme aligns to Finnish policies of poverty reduction, and achievement of MDGs.</p>	<p>The N-S-S Programme is generally aligned with Finnish development policy, but the level of funding and activities of individual networks are too small to expect real impact, for example on poverty alleviation.</p>	<p>R 1 Apply log frame approach to planning. R 3 &amp; 9 Training in planning to be provided.</p>
<p>- Specific networks seen to support specific southern country development policy issues. Priorities identified by individual HEIs are not necessarily the same as national priorities. - Most network members indicated alignment with their own HEI strategies.</p>	<p>The N-S-S Programme is compatible with Southern development policies. As the N-S-S Programme is aimed at institutional and not national level, the emphasis should be on local level priorities as identified by the HEIs. The N-S-S Programme corresponds to the internationalization strategies of the universities in Finland and the South</p>	<p>R 2 Plans should express objectives and expectations of Northern and Southern partners.</p>
<b>Efficiency</b>		
<p>- Good level of governance and transparency, but room for improvement in some networks.</p>	<p>The N-S-S is well planned, and well managed in terms of advertising, application and selection of the N-S-S networks.</p>	<p>R 4 Include Quality Assurance and commitments on administrative and academic coordinators from each institution in the network.</p>
<p>- Cost-efficiency in the system planning and management is relatively good.</p>	<p>Cost efficiency is high at both network and programme levels, but there is room for improvement through re-arrangement of Project Budget and more flexible application of individual network budgets.</p>	<p>R 5 Proposals and reports should include estimates of HEI costs not reimbursed by the programme. R 8 Apply 3+2 year funding scheme to established networks. R 10 Part of budget should be revised to permit more efficient application and reporting of funds. R 11 Allow more flexible application of budgets by Network Coordinators. R 12 Double approval of 2-year plans should be avoided. R 13 Give some discretion to coordinators on application of funds for administrative costs in the South.</p>
<p>- Administrative guidelines are provided in English and Finnish and easy to access. Selection criteria are clear, and applied transparently and efficiently in the selection process. - Programme monitoring system is quantitative, and lacks capacity to draw conclusions on Programme impact.</p>	<p>The financial management &amp; reporting systems generally support smooth implementation of the N-S-S Programme but some changes could improve efficiency. Information on impact is available at network level and revisions to proposal preparation and reporting formats would permit this information to be accessed more</p>	<p>R 1 Apply log frame approach to planning. R 14 Revise CIMO's reporting guidelines. R 19 Formalising the recommendations in an exchange of letters.</p>

	widely. Monitoring should be results-based instead of the present activity-based system.	
<b>Effectiveness</b>		
- Application of the selection criteria have generally resulted in anticipated outcomes: funds allocated to student mobility have been consistently at least 60% of total mobility funding; the goal of 150 student exchanges per annum was exceeded by 55% in 2006–08; the goal of 100 teacher exchanges per annum has consistently been achieved; the goal of 15 intensive courses arranged per annum has not always been achieved on an annual basis, but overall the anticipated number has been exceeded by over 100%.	The selection criteria are compatible with the objectives of the N-S-S Programme. They have been applied in an effective manner and have resulted in the formation/development of relevant networks. In terms of activities, the programme has generally met or exceeded the planned activities in the PD.	R 2 Plans should express objectives and expectations of Northern and Southern partners.
- The programme is presently applied through 34 networks in 24 countries. Some 15 thematic areas are represented by the networks.	Geographical coverage is broad, with the highest concentration in Finland's long-term development partner countries. The range of thematic areas is also wide; the majority of networks cover more traditional areas of development. In terms of use of the limited programme resources the emphasis on traditional partners and traditional themes is relevant, but the "non-traditional" network themes and partners also make significant contributions to programme success.	R 18 Geographical and thematic coverage to be network decisions.
<b>Impact</b>		
- Information on impact has not been systematically collated under the programme; information has mainly been derived from interviews and questionnaires: networks are increasingly well institutionalised; impact on curricula and teaching methodology and skills in the South varies greatly between networks, but high impact cannot be expected at the present levels of funding; both teachers and students from the North and South generally feel they have improved their skills and knowledge. - Career plans of the students in the South and North have been impacted as a result of participation in the exchanges.	The N-S-S has had positive impact on both Southern and Northern institutions, but to greatly varying degrees. Present levels of funding and activity would preclude major institutional impact but serve to introduce new ideas and approaches and develop the critical mass necessary for change to happen in the HEIs. In combination with other funding instruments, impact could be greater. Accreditation of exchanges works better for the Finnish than the Southern students, but this is not seen as an obstacle by the Southern students. Accreditation should be viewed as a long-term goal of the N-S-S Programme.	R 16 Mutual accreditation to be handled as a long-term network goal. R 17 Use learning plans to improve effectiveness of student exchanges.

<p>- Regional (S-S) networking has been definitely enhanced by the programme.</p> <p>- At least in the case study countries, there has been clear improvement of networking between national organisations S-S networks.</p> <p>- Networks are developing from individual contact-based to more institutional-based, but this is a process requiring time and resources to be fully implemented.</p>	<p>S-S cooperation and networking has been increased (often initiated) through the N-S-S Programme activities and the opportunities for regional level discussion and collaboration are highly appreciated in the South.</p> <p>The N-S-S programme has created and/or supported long-term partnerships between the institutions, and continues to do so. This is a process requiring time and commitment, and would benefit from more stable funding.</p>	<p>R 8 Apply 3+2 year funding scheme to established networks.</p> <p>R 15 Use best practices to pilot S-S networking managed by a Southern HEI.</p>
<b>Sustainability</b>		
<p>There are a number of other funding mechanisms in Finland, (e.g. Academy of Finland, MoE, NGO, Private sector, MFA's HEI ICI) which may be used to replace or support N-S-S funding. There are generally few funding sources in the South that could be applied to a programme of this nature.</p>	<p>At least in the medium-term, other funding modalities should be seen as complementing the N-S-S funding, rather than replacing it. Sustainability should not only be measured in terms of funding availability, but also in terms of the high level of commitment shown by the HEIs to the networks.</p>	<p>R 6 Use of N-S-S as complementary funding.</p> <p>R 7 Link N-S-S success to other forms of institutional cooperation such as HEI ICI.</p>
<p>- The prospects for teacher exchanges, student exchanges and intensive courses are quite poor without the N-S-S funding.</p>	<p>Student and staff exchanges out from Finland could probably continue to some extent, but the likelihood of reciprocal exchanges to Finland is low. Some S-S short-term mobility may still be possible, but at a diminished level.</p>	<p>Main Recommendation: The N-S-S Programme is a valuable asset to Finnish development cooperation as well as to the recipient higher education systems in the South and it is worth continuing.</p>
<b>Finnish value-added</b>		
<p>There have been clear development opportunities that would not have arisen without the N-S-S programme.</p>	<p>These opportunities have centred more on an individual level than an institutional one, and have opened doors onto Finnish academic excellence for many Southerners who would not otherwise have had a chance to see outside their own borders.</p>	<p>Main Recommendation: The N-S-S Programme is a valuable asset to Finnish development cooperation as well as to the recipient higher education systems in the South and it is worth continuing.</p>
<b>Thematic &amp; cross-cutting issues</b>		
<p>- Thematic areas are spread quite evenly across the geographical boundaries, and there is no evidence of particular focus (the number of networks is too small to expect any visible trends in thematic areas). The main developmental cross-cutting issues (gender, governance, human rights, HIV/Aids, environmental issues, etc.) are covered or addressed in one or more of the networks.</p>	<p>Overall gender balance in exchanges out from Finland is fairly good, though more female students than males have been on exchanges. For inward exchanges to Finland, staff exchanges are male biased, but this may be a reflection of staffing situations. Student exchanges show little gender bias, except where there is a clear existing gender bias in the study area (e.g. nursing). In terms</p>	<p>R 18 Geographical and thematic coverage to be network decisions.</p>

<p>- Geographical coverage is broad, with the highest concentration in Finland's long-term development partner countries. The range of thematic areas is also wide; the majority of networks covering more traditional areas of development.</p>	<p>of use of the limited programme resources the emphasis on traditional partners and traditional themes is relevant, but the "non-traditional" network themes and partners also make significant contributions to programme success.</p>	
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

The North-South-South Higher Education Institution Network Programme (N-S-S Programme) has been implemented during 2007–2009. It is a continuation of a pilot phase (North-South Programme) that was launched in March 2004. The main purpose of this evaluation is to produce useful information, which will form the basis for the recommendations for development of the N-S-S Programme.

## 1.2 Objectives of the Evaluation

The main objective of the evaluation is to assess the usefulness and utilization of the recommendations of the 2006 pilot phase evaluation. Thus, this evaluation will assess the development results of a Programme that has been implemented for five years (including the pilot phase) in the following categories:

The programme concept, planning, and implementation modalities, and the programme governance and transparency;

Thematic distribution of the various networks within the Programme;

Crosscutting issues, e.g. equality (gender, different types of HEIs, geographical dimension etc.); and

Links with the Finnish and Global Development Policy as expressed in Millennium Development Goals.

## 1.3 Scope and Main Issues addressed

The Programme Document (PD) for the North-South-South Higher Education Institution Network Programme (Mikkola & Snellman 2006a) provides an overall framework for planning the various institutional level network projects. The PD was prepared as the result of the evaluation of the pilot phase. Thus, this evaluation will use the Programme Document (PD; Mikkola & Snellman 2006b) as an overall guideline in assessing the Programme achievements through focusing on individual networks.

The evaluation will aim at drawing general conclusions for the entire Programme from findings on individual projects. In addition, the support and coordination mechanisms will be assessed (i.e., Centre for International Mobility, CIMO, Advisory Group and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, MFA) in terms of their efficiency and effectiveness in the processes.

The evaluation team has identified and summarized the following as the main issues from

the Terms of Reference (TOR; Annex 1) of the evaluation:

- Are the current Programme instruments producing results that are conducive to attainment of the Finnish development policy (Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2007), and to the institution level priorities?
- Is the high number of eligible countries in proper balance with the demands on efficiency, effectiveness and development results?
- What criteria should be used in determining the thematic distribution of the projects? Should Finnish expertise areas be used as priorities in the selection - process?
- How to promote financial sustainability of the networks after the N-S-S funding?
- What are the comparative advantages between the different instruments; teacher and students exchanges vs. intensive courses in attaining the objectives in various networks?
- How to ensure that equality is promoted through the Programme?
- How are the cross-cutting issues integrated into the Programme?
- What are the measures that are critical to good governance and transparency at every stage of the Programme implementation and at every level of organizational structure (CIMO, Institutions, MFA)?
- Are there major risks involved in implementing the networks and how are they overcome?
- What are the main development results at Programme level? Are there common denominators in attaining the results among various network projects? Are there common features in the non-attainment of the development results?

## 1.4 Methodology and Data Collection

### Approach

- *Team work*; the Evaluation team has worked closely together in planning the methodology, preparing the field visits and interviews, analyzing the findings and drawing conclusions. Team work in our view also promotes reliability of the evaluation results;
- *Participatory*; the evaluation has been conducted through a consultative process in the participating institutions in Finland, Nepal and Uganda. Other stakeholders were consulted during the field visits to Nepal and Uganda, e.g. the Ministry of Education, University management and Board members of the institutions and local beneficiaries particularly in the field visits to the case developing countries. The purpose was to put this N-S-S Higher Education Institution Network Programme into national policy context.

## Data Collection

Data was collected as extensively as the tight timeframe of the evaluation allowed. One limiting factor was that the evaluation (from mid June 2009 to end of September 2009) was undertaken during the school holiday season in Finland. Hence, the interviews in Finland could not start before mid-August when the semester starts. It was also somewhat difficult to prepare the field missions to Nepal and Uganda, because the network coordinators in Finland were all on holiday. Nevertheless, we managed to undertake the missions to Uganda during the first-second week of August and to Nepal during the second-third week of August. This left approximately two weeks in August and September to undertake the network interviews in Finland. However, the TOR deadline of 30 September was met in submission of the draft report.

Methodology is summarised below:

- *Desk study of documents* in Finland including programme plans, progress reports, final and pilot reports, evaluation report, financial reports, policy documents etc.
- *Interviews* with MFA officials, Advisory Group (AG), CIMO staff and University Student Union (Suomen Ylioppilaskuntien Liitto, SYL) for situation analysis and briefing.
- *Visits to participating Universities and Universities of Applied Science (UASs) in Finland* – conducting interviews of the academic and administrative coordinators, round table discussions with the teachers and students who have participated in the programme, interviews of the top management of the institutions (e.g. principals, deans etc).
- *Survey through e-mail* has been undertaken in Finland and some Southern institutions to cover those networks that could not be visited. Questionnaires were prepared for academic and administrative coordinators, teachers and students who have participated in the programme. This was intended to provide a broader coverage of the evaluation in the given tight timeframe.
- *Field missions to Nepal and Uganda* to interview the University academic and administrative coordinators, participants in mobility and intensive courses (lecturers and students) as well as top management. Coordination and cooperation with similar networks with other countries was also examined. Interviews with other development partners and the Ministries of Education (MoE).
- *Field visits in Uganda* to discuss with the beneficiaries (district and village level) the contributions of the Finnish N-S-S students and teachers at the community level.

- *Regular team meetings* in connection with every critical phase of the evaluation (data collection, field visits, analysis etc.). The findings and conclusions were discussed before drafting. Recommendations were jointly agreed.
- *Summary of the volume of collected data:*
  - (1) 23 out of 34 networks were interviewed;
  - (2) 15 persons from MFA and CIMO/AG were interviewed;
  - (3) 149 persons working directly with networks were interviewed;
  - (4) 2 network coordinators (1 academic and 1 administrative) who were not interviewed returned the questionnaires;
  - (5) 8 exchange students from Finland to South returned the questionnaires;
  - (6) 6 exchange students from the South to Finland returned the questionnaires;
  - (7) Missions to Nepal covered two networks, including participation in an Intensive Course (IC), and to Uganda four networks;
  - (8) Field visit to Mpigi District in Uganda covered a District Health Centre/ in-patient ward and the primary and secondary school with school health and nutrition programme initiated by the Health Africa project.

## 1.5 Evaluation Indicators and Analysis

The indicator matrix below (Table 1) aims to link the Programme implementation phases/modalities with the OECD /DAC evaluation criteria (OECD/DAC 2006) and specific thematic areas (Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2007). It has to be noted that the indicators at the Programme level are different from those at the individual network level. The evaluation concentrates on assessing the attainment of the objectives at the Programme level.

**Table 1** Indicator matrix.

Criteria	Dimensions of evaluation	Evaluative question	Indicators
Relevance	Policy compatibility	<p>1 In which area is the N-S-S aligned with the Finnish development policy &amp; MDG's?</p> <p>2 Is the N-S-S compatible with the policies &amp; priorities in South?</p> <p>3 How does the N-S-S correspond with the internationalization strategies of the universities in Finland and in developing countries?</p>	<p>- Alignment with Poverty Reduction, MDG Goals</p> <p>- Alignment with Policy Goals of the South, HEI Strategies etc.</p>



Criteria	Dimensions of evaluation	Evaluative question	Indicators
Efficiency	Selection process, planning, implementation, financial management, reporting, governance and transparency	<p>1 How was the N-S-S planned, and managed in terms of advertising, application and selections of the N-S-S networks?</p> <p>2 How cost-efficient was utilization of funds for activities?</p> <p>3 Do the financial management &amp; reporting systems support smooth implementation of the N-S-S?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level of governance and transparency</li> <li>- Cost-efficiency in the system planning and management</li> <li>- Administrative guidelines in place</li> <li>- Monitoring system in place</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	Selection criteria, Country & thematic coverage, Aid modalities	<p>1 Are the selection criteria compatible with the objectives of the N-S-S?</p> <p>2 What is the relationship between the number of countries and coverage thematic areas &amp; sectors with the expected results?</p> <p>3 Are the aid instruments appropriate for achieving the results?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Selection criteria vs. selection outcomes</li> <li>- 60% of funds allocated to student mobility</li> <li>- 150 student exchanges per annum</li> <li>- 100 teacher exchanges per annum</li> <li>- 15 intensive courses arranged each year</li> <li>- No. of countries</li> <li>- No. of themes and sectors</li> </ul>
Impact	<p>Development results of the N-S-S HEI Network Programme on the Institutions in the South and in the North</p> <p>South-South Network development as a result of this programme</p>	<p>1 In which way has the N-S-S influenced the developing country institutions?</p> <p>2 What has been the impact on the Finnish institutions?</p> <p>3 Has the S-S cooperation and networking increased?</p> <p>4 Has the N-S-S created long-term partnerships between the institutions?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No. of networks institutionalised</li> <li>- New curricula in the South</li> <li>- New teaching methodology in the South</li> <li>- Improved skills and knowledge of the teachers in the South</li> <li>- Improved skills</li> </ul>

Criteria	Dimensions of evaluation	Evaluative question	Indicators
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>and knowledge of the students in the South</li> <li>- Career plans of the students in the South and in the North</li> <li>- No. of long-term partnerships between N-S-S</li> <li>- No. of S-S networks</li> </ul>
Sustainability	Continuation of activities after the external funding	<p>1 What are the other funding mechanisms after N-S-S?</p> <p>2 How can the institutions in the South participate after N-S-S funding ?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No. of other funding mechanisms in Finland, e.g. Academy of Finland , MoE, NGO, private sector, ICI, self-financing etc.</li> <li>- Other donors in the South etc.</li> </ul>
Finnish Value added	Value added of this North-South Networking Programme	1 What opportunities for development would not have occurred, if this programme would not have taken place?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prospects for teacher exchanges, student exchanges, intensive courses</li> </ul>

Criteria	Dimensions of evaluation	Evaluative question	Indicators
Thematic and cross cutting issues, distribution of the N-S-S Programme	Sectoral and subsectoral distribution of the N-S-S projects Gender equality Other equality dimensions	1 What is the sectoral distribution of the N-S-S networks projects?  2 What is the balance between female and male participation at the Programme level?  3 Is the volume of the programme in terms of countries, no. of participants and thematic areas in proper relation with available resources?  4 What is the geographical distribution of the projects?	- No of projects in each sector & geographical region

## 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE NORTH-SOUTH-SOUTH PROGRAMME

### 2.1 Background

The N-S-S Programme 2007–2009 (Mikkola & Snellman 2006b) is a smooth continuation of its predecessor, the North-South Higher Education Network Programme that was commenced in 2004 as a pilot programme covering the years 2005–2007. The justification for launching a programme at tertiary level was the great demand for an intervention in higher education. Traditionally, Finland's education sector support to the developing countries has been targeted to primary education aligned with the MDG's target on provision of universal primary education by 2015. As educational opportunities have increased at primary level the demand for education at secondary and tertiary levels has also increased.

The pilot phase included 23 networks receiving support on an annual basis. This prevented a smoothly progressing exchange programme between the HEIs in the North and South. Evaluation of the pilot phase was carried out in 2006 and followed by planning of the new phase. The lessons learnt were taken into account in the new programme to be implemented in 2007–2009 (Mikkola & Snellman 2006a).

## **2.2 Lessons Learned from the Pilot Phase – Highlights of the Evaluation**

The evaluation report of the pilot phase contained of 35 recommendations for the future. These included many detailed recommendations on management and some general, policy level recommendations.

The most important policy level observation was that the development goals for the pilot phase were unrealistic. It was recommended that the new phase should have more realistic objectives, which should still clearly follow the overall development strategies. The evaluation also made note that too many projects were supported in Sub-Saharan Africa and recommended that the Programme should include all long-term partner countries for Finland. It also recommended that more innovative approaches should be encouraged in the networks, complementary to the more traditional development cooperation.

The Programme Document of the new N-S-S Programme takes up the following lessons learned from the Pilot Phase as guidelines for the future (Mikkola & Snellman 2006b):

- The new programme should succeed the pilot phase immediately.
- Components of student and teacher exchanges as well as administration should be included.
- The call for new projects should be open and inclusive of all HEIs and sectors in Finland.
- Developing country HEI eligibility should be expanded.
- Financial factors of the Programme should be re-visited both from the budgetary and monitoring angle.
- Sound preparation for the management and administration of the programme is necessary.

## **2.3 Objectives and Components of the N-S-S Programme**

The objective of the N-S-S is:

- To enhance human capacity to ensure that people in all participating countries may better contribute to the cultural, socio-economic and political development of their communities.

The broad objective is narrowed down into the Programme purpose:

- The N-S-S aims at providing an operational framework for building capacity through interaction and mobility between Finnish and cooperating country higher education institutions.

The activities that are meant to realize the purpose are grouped under three components:

- 1 **Mobility** to enhance human capacity through student and teacher exchanges.
- 2 **Intensive courses** to generate and disseminate knowledge.
- 3 **Management and organization** to create sustainable partnerships between HEIs in Finland and in partner countries through networking, programme website and administrative arrangements.

## 2.4 Stakeholders

- The MFA and MoE of Finland as the funding agencies and for policy guidance;
- CIMO providing overall coordination and management; and
- Universities and universities of applied sciences in Finland and in partner countries as implementers of the Programme.

Beneficiary groups/stakeholders in the institutions

- Students and teachers participating in the mobility;
- Students and teachers participating in the intensive courses;
- Academic and administrative coordinators;
- International relations departments;
- Concerned faculties; and
- Senior management.

## 2.5 Implementation of the Activities

Implementing the programme takes place at central and at institutional levels. CIMO is in charge of the processes of application, selection, monitoring and overall reporting. An Advisory Group (AG) with representation from relevant stakeholders at central level (MFA, MoE, Universities, UASs and student unions) has been established to oversee and guide the processes at central level.

### 2.5.1 Activities at Central Level

#### Application

CIMO organizes the application process through an open call for all Finnish HEIs once a year in November and the first selection takes place in March the following year. The mobility component then commences in August. The AG approves the application package, and recommends adjustments to individual network plans in line with final budget levels – to date, all plans have had to be reduced because of over-subscription from the HEIs. The maximum number of years of funding is five for each project.

This comprises one year pre-project for preparatory activities and 2+2 years of implementing the project. The preparatory year is optional and is intended for new applicants who did not participate in the pilot phase.

### **Selection**

Principles for selection criteria are presented in the Programme Document, but they can be revised and complemented by the AG. The criteria include criteria for eligibility and quality aspects for pre-projects and ongoing projects. These are summarized as follows:

**Eligibility** consists e.g. of requirements on appointment of the coordinating Finnish HEI within the network, eligible partner countries selected (list provided), project proposal that promote development under the MDG's, clear commitment from all participating institutions endorsed by a letter including an accreditation plan for exchange students

**Quality** requirements emphasise preference to Finnish long-term partner countries (list provided), potential for South-South cooperation, balanced selection of partner countries, innovative approaches, realistic objectives, gender balance, exchanges balanced between all participating institutions, foreseen funding prospects from sources other than the N-S-S Programme, promotion of sustainability.

### **Orientation**

CIMO organizes an orientation programme of 1–2 days duration for Finnish students and teachers who are participating in the exchanges.

### **Information Service**

CIMO has developed central information material about the N-S-S Programme which is distributed to the eligible Finnish HEIs through CIMO's normal channels, the Rectors' Council and the Network of International Relations Managers.

CIMO has also established a Programme website for exchanging relevant information among all N-S-S Programme participants and CIMO. The website is accessible at different levels: administrator privileges are given to Finnish network coordinators who can access and revise information, for example in their proposals; reader privileges are given to Finnish network academic and administration coordinators, who may share these privileges and access to reports etc. with their southern counterparts if they so wish; public access is restricted to basic information about the programme and links to other sites on Finnish education, culture, etc.

National coordination meetings are held regularly under CIMO auspices to discuss common issues and share experiences of all participating HEIs.

### **Monitoring**

CIMO regularly visits HEIs in Finland to monitor the progress and supervise the projects in relevant areas, like financial management and reporting etc. Some monitoring by CIMO has also been carried out in the South.

## **2.5.2 Activities at Institutional Level**

### **Component 1 Mobility**

The coordinating HEIs organize the exchanges by selecting students and teachers, preparing annual plans for mobility and reporting annually on the progress to CIMO. The HEIs are expected to define their selection criteria in the project plans

### **Component 2 Intensive Courses**

Intensive courses provide a mechanism for enhancing creative ways to organize teaching jointly within the network. Innovative approaches are encouraged. They can be arranged as campus-based short courses in one partner institution and made available to students from all partners in the network. On-line modality can also be utilized.

The intensive courses are always organised in the Southern institutions (on a rotating basis between partners) and are an avenue for enhancement of South-South interaction within the network and also an opportunity for joint curriculum development, sharing of experience and transferring knowledge. Innovative teaching methodologies are encouraged.

### **Component 3 Management and Organization**

Coordination of projects is provided under component 3. While all mobility and Intensive Course activities take place within the networks, this component is divided between CIMO and the networks. Institutionalization of the networks beyond the N-S-S duration is the ultimate goal. The support provided for networking can include financial support for facilitating contacts of the HEIs in Finland and in partner countries for establishment of the network cooperation. Annual network meetings are financed by the N-S-S Programme for joint planning of activities. Networking meetings provide an opportunity for agreeing on roles and responsibilities between the partners of the North and South. Programme management related activities facilitate the planning, implementing and monitoring of the activities.

## **3 KEY FINDINGS**

### **3.1 Overall Progress of the Project Implementation**

#### **3.1.1 Programme Concept and Scope**

The PD defines the N-S-S Programme as an umbrella programme that aims at capacity building and enhancing human capacity to ensure their contributions to development of their communities. This is done through interaction and mobility between Finnish and cooperating partner institutions in the South. Thus the primary scope of the Programme is on capacity building of individuals. Institutional capacity development is another deve-

development area that is expected from the N-S-S Programme through curriculum development, staff exchanges and intensive courses.

Considering the rather small financial allocations to each network the focus on individual capacity development is valid in the programme concept. With the current level of funding, contributions to institutional capacity development remain rather minimal in most cases.

Since N-S-S is financed from the development cooperation funds, it is understandable that the programme document emphasizes the benefits for the South. However, the mobility programme and the intensive courses are also beneficial to the partners in the North. This came out as a result in the interviews in Finland. Internationalization strategies of the Finnish HEIs (Opetusministeriö 2009) are also an integral part of the programme concept and strategies, even though not stated explicitly in the PD. Many of the interviewed academic coordinators emphasised the important role of the N-S-S Programme in their institutional strategies, and stressed that the programme makes a greater contribution to their internationalization processes than might be expected from the small scale of the programme.

The evaluation team considers the programme concept and scope still valid, even though the small volume of each network project limits the impact of the activities. In addition, the team emphasizes the need to acknowledge the reciprocity of the benefits to the HEIs in the North and in the South. Objectives of the projects should be defined for both Northern and Southern partners.

### **3.1.2 Programme Planning**

The N-S-S Programme is implemented through separate projects in which Finnish HEIs and HEIs in the South establish cooperation networks. Initiatives for the networks have in most, but not all, cases come from Finland. Earlier personal contacts have been instrumental in network formulation. In many cases an already functioning cooperation network (e.g. research cooperation through other funding sources, work practice cooperation, NGO involvement) has joined the N-S-S Programme. Some of the existing projects are continuations from the pilot phase which had already established cooperation mechanisms. The new networks were able to apply for one year pre-project funding for the planning and preparation.

The team would caution the idea presented to the team to open the N-S-S Programme application process to the HEIs in the South. This would inevitably lead to time delays and inefficiencies in programme planning and management. With one exception, this was also the view of the southern partners in Uganda and Nepal in addition to the interviewed networks in Finland. However, the HEIs in the South should be encouraged to initiate network cooperation with the HEIs in the North even though the actual application and financial management is done in Finland. At present, the bureaucratic management sys-



tems in the HEIs in the South would not be conducive to efficient implementation of the projects. Some Southern HEIs would certainly have the capacity to take responsibility for management of at least parts of the networks, and such a level of participation would help to create sustainability. It would be useful to pilot such a management intervention with some HEIs identified through the networks.

The Finnish coordinating HEIs have prepared the project applications usually in consultation with their Southern partner institutions. Guidelines for applications were provided by CIMO. These guidelines are quite simple and hence, user-friendly. However, it is problematic to advise the applicants to identify the project objectives directly from the United Nations (UN) MDG's. As a result, many applications define broad international goals like poverty reduction as the network objective and define student and teacher exchanges as activities directly leading to attainment of these goals. This has led to unrealistic objective setting which was also commented in the evaluation of the pilot phase. The objectives of the projects should be derived from the priorities of the HEIs in the South and in the North. In fact, the interviews in both the South and North revealed that this had often been the case, e.g. in defining the contents of the intensive courses.. The student and teacher exchanges and intensive courses are worthwhile activities and are linked to the programme objectives in the overall PD.

The applications as project plans rarely state any objectives for the HEIs in Finland, which is a gap that should be filled.

### **3.1.3 Implementation and Management of the Activities**

#### **Observations at general Level**

Absorption capacity varies greatly between HEIs. Some Southern HEIs have so many development and network partners and programmes that the small resources of the N-S-S Programme have little strategic importance, though that does not necessarily diminish their academic importance. For the majority of partners from the South, the N-S-S Programme seems to be the only opportunity they have to participate as an equal partner in a network. Probably the main absorption capacity issue lies with the Finnish HEIs, some of which are having difficulty in finding students who want to take up N-S-S Programme exchanges. This seems to be mainly a problem of some UASs and is most likely linked to the more course-bound nature of the studies. A second issue relates to the availability of staff time for exchanges and intensive courses. As there is no cost recovery system to pay locum lecturers at Finnish institutions, inputs need to be kept within relatively narrow limits. At present, there are no procedures whereby exchanges could be arranged simultaneously to permit "job-swapping", so faculty exchanges to the South tend to be short (2–4 weeks), except where they can be linked to longer-term field research work, for example.

#### **Mobility and Intensive Courses**

The activities have been implemented efficiently by the coordinating HEIs. They have

organized the student and teacher selections, both sending and receiving quite well. Preparation for the leaving students has been arranged somewhat variably. All interviewees praised the Orientation programme organized by CIMO as being very useful and high quality.

In some cases the network management in the partner country institutions has not been satisfactory. Difficulties have been encountered particularly when the network has been newly established without a long history of cooperation. Sometimes the Finnish students did not receive necessary orientation and tutoring in selecting study courses, finding accommodation, support for getting visa was not provided by the host university. In some cases doubts on the true commitment and ownership of the N-S-S Programme arose, even though these were minority cases in the Programme.

Nevertheless, most of the interviewed Finnish students and those who responded to the questionnaires were satisfied with their study/work practice periods and the logistical arrangements. All students, except one or two from the South, who were interviewed or responded to the questionnaire, expressed great satisfaction with their studies in Finland, both academically and with tutoring and logistical arrangements. The only big problem for the students coming from the South was the cumbersome procedure of getting a visa to Finland, particularly when the country does not have an Embassy of Finland. They had to travel to the country in the region having a Finnish Embassy. This was very expensive and time-consuming as the costs were not covered by N-S-S Programme. MFA should provide advice to the network coordinators in Finland on how the visa can be obtained in these countries using available mechanisms (e.g. Schengen visa). It is important to note that everyone considered the subsequent exchange experience useful despite the visa problems.

Teacher exchanges were also useful and in most cases efficiently implemented. The problem in many cases was their short duration, often two weeks maximum. Capacity development and curriculum development are not possible during very short visits. For example, expectations in Uganda on the teacher exchanges were high, including assistance in preparation of new curriculum modules in school health, occupational health and community health services (Health Africa network) and gap filling of teaching in subjects where competent teachers were not available (e.g. algebra) and development of applied mathematics curricula for industrial mathematics (Technomathematics network).

In some cases the contents of the teacher exchange was not prepared well in advance due to lack of explicit, timely demands on professional expertise from the host country (e.g. in Mozambique, Well-Net and in Zambia, Sustainable Development). However, this has been exception rather than the rule. The utilization of the Finnish teachers' expertise varies greatly. In some cases their role was more administrative rather than academic, but the converse is also true (Kenya Well-Net).

Many Finnish HEIs reported that it is not possible to release teachers from their teaching

duties in the home university for longer periods. In addition, funding for the project was too low to allow for longer periods of exchanges. There are differences among HEIs in this aspect. Longer exchanges like four weeks were possible in some institutions. When the HEI had other sources for funding they were able to increase the durations and number of exchanges.

All interviewed considered intensive courses a successful modality. They were planned jointly between the partners and responded to current needs, they were of high quality and well managed. The problem mentioned most often by interviewees was the heavy workload that the practical arrangements caused for the partner HEI in the South and the lack of funds to cover the administrative costs for them. In some cases the funding ceiling of 15 000 euros was considered too low, particularly when the network partner countries in Africa were far away from each other, e.g. Ghana, Mozambique and South Africa. Travel costs easily become excessive.

### **Reporting**

Reporting of financial activities is rigorously maintained, and every cent is accounted for. However, a serious deficiency of the existing financial reporting systems is that they neither encourage nor, in some instances, permit reporting of anything other than funds coming directly from MFA/CIMO. It is clear that all of the HEIs contribute in some form or another to the resources of the networks, but these inputs are generally not reflected in either network reports to CIMO or (consequently) CIMO's reports to MFA. For example, universities regularly have been able to access their own funds to support network activities (e.g. to extend faculty visits, to supplement student exchange budgets, to provide materials for intensive courses, support to southern HEIs to help with network administration costs). These funds have been accessed from various sources: Rector's discretionary funds, departmental budgets, research grants (see also Section "Network Funding" below).

While guidelines on activity reporting are not as restrictive as those for financial reporting, the electronic format focuses only on activity-based and quantitative reporting. Debriefing report formats for returning exchanges are similarly weak (at least in many southern institutions, returning students are also required to prepare a fuller report of the exchange, including analysis of benefits and impact, but these are usually not shared outside the HEI). The evaluators could find little evidence of results-based monitoring that considers programme or network impact. Interviewees were usually willing and able to discuss their networks in terms of immediate and envisaged longer-term impact, but (in view of high workloads and lack of compensation) had not seen it necessary to go beyond the reporting as required by CIMO. Similarly (and consequentially), CIMO's own reporting focuses on activities, student and faculty exchange flows etc. instead of considering the impact of the activities on the institutions and individuals and on achievement of programme objectives.

## Programme Management

Generally the N-S-S Programme is well-managed. There are clear divisions and lines of responsibility between various parts of the organization. While the management process includes an MFA “veto” possibility in case of widely diverging views, this has never been applied and decision-making is seen to be a consensual process. With certain exceptions that will be addressed below, all Finnish network coordinators expressed their satisfaction with CIMO as the overall managing body. Similarly, MFA officials also expressed their satisfaction with CIMO as a working partner.

The 2006 evaluation of the pilot N-S programme recommended changes to be made to accounting and reporting procedures to ensure full reporting of application of funds. New reporting and accounting systems were put in place, and clearly it is now possible to identify exactly what funds have been used and for what purpose. However, this has happened at the expense of flexibility and has reduced the options for robust cost-management by the HEIs. In addition, although coordinating institutions should theoretically be required only to maintain a separate budget line under their own accounting systems, in practice CIMO has required accounts to be prepared along different lines to simplify its own accounting to MFA. This creates double work at the HEI level, which is even more burdensome considering that HEIs receive no contribution to network administration costs (cf. also below under Network Management). It must be noted that these are not arbitrary requirements by CIMO, and there are valid reasons behind these practices. CIMO experts have also identified these as problem areas and anticipate that the evaluation recommendations will alleviate some of these difficulties.

Similarly, there are very rigid rules on budget management by the HEIs, which create unnecessary work (for both CIMO and the HEIs) and also have resulted at times in higher than necessary costs. For example, once a network is functioning, it should be possible for coordinators to decide whether or not to combine activities such as Intensive Courses with Network Meetings. At present, because of the structure of the budget and components in the PD, this is only possible after an application to and approval from CIMO, and accounts must be kept separately for the two events; some coordinators have resorted to arbitrary allocation of budget items to meet these requirements. An additional burden on the administration of the project is the requirement to resubmit plans for approval on an annual basis. The evaluators understand that this is a way to ensure that funds unused from one year can be rolled over to the next and included in a revised action plan, though this seems to indicate that some activities are finally approved two or even three times before they implemented. The situation is complicated by the fact that MFA/CIMO administration is based on calendar years and HEIs run on academic years. Many coordinators, as well as CIMO, raised this as one of the funding modality issues requiring attention, and the opinion of the evaluators is that these issues could be resolved more efficiently through new reporting and accounting procedures or through new funding modalities, or through a combination of both (cf. Recommendations).

Generally respondents feel the N-S-S Programme should have a longer life span than 1+2+2 years. Except where some form of network partnerships are already in place, es-

establishing a cooperation mechanism for a network takes at least two years and implementing the activities efficiently can only start during the third year. In developing countries bureaucracy and resistance to change hinders fast planning and implementing – even where an institution or department may be geared to fast action, its operating environment may not support this. Many suggestions were received for a 3+2 years funding schedule for continuing networks. The key issue is that some form of guaranteed medium-term funding would permit more effective planning and more efficient use of resources.

### **Network Management**

Visits to the case study countries (Nepal and Uganda) allowed the evaluators to examine in detail six of the networks and to discuss directly with southern institutions. Again, the overall perception (of both the coordinating and the partner HEIs) is that the networks are well-managed and there is good sense of ownership of the networks by all partners. In Nepal it was mentioned that the selection criteria were not originally available in English, which had made it difficult for the non-Finnish institutions to understand how to formulate the network objectives at the planning stage. Indeed this was an issue raised in the 2006 evaluation, and the selection process documents and procedures are now also available in English. The present requirement for a Finnish institution to coordinate each network is generally acceptable to the HEIs, but the evaluators feel that some form of coordination of activities by Southern institutions could help to build capacity and make the Southern networking more sustainable. Possibly this could be trialled as a pilot to encourage regional networking, for example, in Africa.

In some cases, the basis for a network in a particular institution remains a single individual, so if the individual leaves the institution, the interest in the network leaves with the individual. This is also an issue related to governance and is handled in more detail under section 3.2.3 below.

### **Programme Funding**

Generally funds are applied efficiently, with a good balance between the three types of activity. The procedures for disbursement of the funds work very well, and no reports were received of difficulties in receiving funds once they had been allocated. Universities continue to invoice retrospectively, while UASs are able to receive advance funding for activities. With the change of HEI status from the beginning of 2010, all coordinating HEIs will receive funds in advance.

Original estimates of administrative cost recovery for CIMO were set at 1.5 person-years full-time equivalent plus specific expenses defined by CIMO. CIMO's own public reporting of its activities through its annual reports (CIMO 2008a & b) lumps together the N-S-S Programme with three other network programmes (FIRST, North2North and Aasia-verkostoyhteistyö) and other minor activities, of which N-S-S accounts for 69,7% of funding. It is difficult therefore to compare the cost level of the N-S-S Programme activities with that of other activities in CIMO. If working time is directly correlated to funding level in networking programmes, this would put the actual working time allocated

in 2008 to N-S-S Programme at 3.3 person-years out of a total 107,3 p-y of total staff working time. Measured against funding levels of EUR 1 439 000 for N-S-S out of a total of EUR 36 172 000, this would mean the 3,98% N-S-S share of total CIMO funding contrasts against 3,06% of working time. Figures received from CIMO show that working time is recovered as 1.5 person-years full-time equivalent for administration plus 0.35 person-years for maintenance of the website, or only 1.7% of CIMO total working time, indicating a high degree of efficiency of application of working time or the N-S-S Programme.

The proposed N-S-S Programme budget for 2007–2009 includes an average of slightly over 14% for Programme administration (Total budget EUR 4,5 million, of which EUR 658 000 earmarked for administration costs). In 2006 and 2007, cost recovery to CIMO comprised slightly over 10% of total funding (Table 2). In 2008, cost recovery was 8% of total funding, which is comparable with administration costs using private sector organizations (though it is not really possible to make direct comparisons of cost levels between disparate project modalities). CIMO’s cost recovery includes the cost of setting up and maintaining the web-site as well as initial start-up costs for information and project selection, so, over the life of the N-S-S Programme, “pure” administration costs are probably closer to 5% of total funding.

**Table 2** N-S-S financing levels (EUR ‘000) and mobility data (exchanges) in 2006–2008.

Year	Financing of network activities	Cost recovery (CR) to CIMO*	CR as % of total costs	CIMO Non-Salary Cost Recovery**			Student Mobility	
				CIMO Total	N-S-S	%	From Finland	To Finland
2006	899	104	10,4%	5 582	71,8	1,29%	114	117
2007	906	114	11,2%	5 937	62,2	1,05%	114	117
2008	1 258	110	8,0%	6 705	67,7	1,01%	105	128
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3 063</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>9,7%</b>	<b>18 224</b>	<b>201,7</b>	<b>1,09%</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>362</b>

\* data received from CIMO specialists

\*\* data extrapolated from CIMO annual reports 2006–2008

### Network Funding

All participating HEIs contribute their own funds as “counterpart” funding to at least some extent. One of the visited universities (University of Jyväskylä) directly augmented the MFA budget to as much as 24.1% of the total funds applied (Table 3). In addition, all administration costs in terms of working hours of administrative and academic coordinators as well as faculty working hours on intensive courses and exchanges are funded by the participating institutions without reimbursement.



**Table 3** Ministry for Foreign Affairs granted and own funds applied by one university.

Year of activity	MFA funds (EUR)	Own funds applied (EUR)*	Own funds as % of total funds applied
2007/08	120 760	18 822	13,5%
2008/09	102 178	32 496	24,1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>222 938</b>	<b>51 318</b>	<b>18.7%</b>

\* cash only, excluding costs of working time etc.

Obviously, there is nothing intrinsically wrong with institutions contributing their own resources – indeed application of counterpart funds is usually a requirement for funding projects, and is mentioned in the PD as a way for the HEIs to show commitment to the networks. However, the scope and volume of these inputs should be reported and recognized as an indication of the high level of commitment of the institutions to the programme. Presently HEIs do not generally maintain detailed records of working hours applied to the networks but indications are as follows. At both universities and universities of applied sciences, academic coordinators spend about 10–15% of their working time on the N-S-S networks. For administrative coordinators, the figure seems to be at about the same or slightly higher level (estimates between 10% and 40%). Coordinators were generally of the opinion that incoming students (whether to Finland or to southern countries) under the N-S-S Programme are more labour-intensive than, for example students under Erasmus or other EU programs, and require more work in terms of management. This is particularly important in view of the fact that HEIs receive no contribution to administration costs.

In South Africa, for example, not all local partner institutions were able to attend an intensive course because funding does not permit the use of funds for local in-country travel. Thus planned participants from a partner UAS situated over 500 km from the host institution were unable to attend as the UAS was unable to source travel funds for faculty or students. These and other specific “gaps” in funding were raised as serious issues by both Northern and Southern HEIs. In response to this issue, CIMO informed the team that these costs would actually have been reimbursable as a valid cost under Component 2 – the network HEIs had been working with the wrong information, but it was not possible to trace the cause of this specific issue.

Hiccups in information flow notwithstanding, it is essential for the overall programme management to recognize that working in Southern countries generally requires greater resources as well as more flexible approaches than working in the North. While some living expenses may be lower in countries of the South, other costs, such as travel and accommodation are at least on a par with Europe and often more expensive. More flexibility and freedom of choice could be devolved to the coordinating institutions: network plans are of sufficiently high quality and approved by the AG before any activities can begin; budgets are provided in sufficient detail and are related directly to proposed activities;

institutions have shown strong commitment in terms of their own funds and resources to be allowed a stronger voice in network decision-making; and network administrators generally have more experience in dealing with Southern bureaucracies and cultures.

While exchange participants generally responded that the level of grants was sufficient, there were some clear cases where lack of funds had created either extra expenses or hardship for the visitors; for example Helsinki is generally more expensive than other parts of Finland and this should be considered when defining exchange budgets. Finnish students were clearly better able to manage funding problems, perhaps being able to access funds from Finland (opintotuki), but Southern students are clearly more limited in their ability to respond to extra or unanticipated costs. For example, some host institutions have a strong “social safety-net” for visiting Southern students, including mentors, “foster-parent” families, provision of basic furnishings and cooking items, etc., but this is not always the case. This could be an area in which clear guidelines and operational procedures would be beneficial (cf. Recommendations).

Budgets for specific activities tend to be too low. For example, the EUR 15 000 budget for ICs is often insufficient, especially where the network is widespread (e.g., regional travel in Africa is very expensive) and has many partners. The only means for coordinators to manage with such low funds has been either to reduce the length of the IC, or to supplement the budget with external funds. Because the accounting requirements of CIMO do not permit accounts to reflect the extra spending, information on exact amounts of external funding is not easily available. In addition, ICs are always arranged in the Southern institutions, and require a lot of management inputs from the host organization. Programme regulations do not permit the use of funds to pay any administrative costs, which means that either the coordinating HEI finds funds to support partner institution costs or that the coordinating HEI has to try and manage all logistical arrangements for the IC (often from Finland). The situation has had negative consequences on efficient use of working time (making travel arrangements in less developed countries is not something simply done on a remote basis), on efficient use of funds (even where travel or hotel discounts might be available, they are usually only accessible in-country), and even on security of participants (several coordinators told of having to travel with large sums of cash to manage in-country payments).

As mentioned above, even though South-South cooperation is a goal of the project, funds to promote this are either too little or have at least been perceived to be precluded under the regulations in place (e.g., in South Africa, where national policy is to include privileged universities and disadvantaged universities in the same network, it is essential that funds are available to pay for travel between the institutions).

Despite the criticisms levelled above, it is essential to note that individual networks have met the challenges in creative and innovative ways, and have demonstrated strong commitment to the N-S-S Programme. The overwhelming majority of respondents feel the N-S-S Programme is such a worthwhile intervention and such an important contributor



to their activities that they are willing to take on the burden of the extra challenges and expenses. Similarly, the majority of coordinators feel that funding issues are not insurmountable and would not be a reason for withdrawal from the programme.

### **3.1.4 Instruments and Modalities of Implementation**

#### **Teacher and Student Exchanges**

Teacher exchanges have usually consisted of short visits to the Finnish HEIs and to the HEIs in the South. They have been useful in strengthening the cooperation, establishment of good relations, planning annually the exchange programme and intensive courses. To some extent it has also been possible to undertake academic work, like teaching and research cooperation. The Finnish teachers have not had many opportunities to participate in the actual development of the institutions (e.g. staff training, curriculum development) due to the short periods, lack of demand or poor planning. The teacher mobility from the South is also of short duration and their role in teaching has been small. The teachers from the South felt that they benefited from the visits through familiarising with the Finnish systems of education and their respective sectors (e.g. health systems).

However, the participants and their host institutions in the North and South have expressed satisfaction on the exchange programme even within the limited funds. The focus of the activities has been adapted to the available funds. Institutional capacity development in the South would require a financially stronger instrument. The new Institutional Cooperation Instrument for Higher Education Institutions (HEI ICI) introduced by the MFA in 2009 will provide a viable tool for strengthening institutional development. It specifically aims at creating a mechanism to undertake institutional reforms in the south. Its main aim is to promote strengthening of developing country HEIs' administrative, methodological and pedagogical capacity and support their development plans. This instrument has a financial volume between EUR 50000–500 000 for a maximum of three years.

Student exchanges have been of longer duration, usually of three months. Students have participated in study programmes relevant to their field of studies in their home countries, collected data for the master's thesis, some students from the South even progressed to doctoral (PhD) studies in Finland. Academic support and library and other facilities of the Finnish Universities were praised during the interviews and in the questionnaires. Many Finnish students from the UASs were able to undertake field studies and do their work practice during their exchanges. Also students from the South have been able to participate in practical work particularly in the health and social sectors. The academic usefulness of the studies varied among the Finnish students. For example, a Finnish student who studied Human Rights issues in South Africa, Centre for Human Rights, University of Pretoria, benefited academically and has continued to PhD studies in Finland at Åbo Akademi. Many considered the exposure to a different culture in the third world country a valuable experience, even if the academic value remained limited.

Accreditation is an issue with all networks. The N-S-S Programme requires that all student

exchanges should be accreditable in home institutions. Generally, this is relatively easy to ensure for the Finnish students, but generally not so for the Southern students. Accreditation seems to work best where students are required to prepare an advance learning plan which is approved by both the host and home institutions as a “learning contract”, and where studies include optional courses. Often host courses differ widely from what is on offer at the home institution, and some southern institutions, especially those whose studies are particularly course-bound, or time-bound such as Bachelor programmes, are not able (or willing?) to consider the comparability of external courses. This is also true of networks involving studies for professional degrees (such as nursing), where decisions on curriculum comparison and accreditation may not even be the remit of the institution but of a national curriculum body (as is the case in Nepal). For most students from the South who were asked to comment on this issue, the practical benefits of an exchange period in Finland far outweigh the disadvantages of not being credited partially or wholly for the time abroad. In light of these facts, it seems that mutual accreditation should not be seen as an obstacle to an exchange programme, but rather as a long-term goal of the network.

### **Intensive Courses**

Intensive courses have been a successful modality and more expectations seem to be generated towards them. They were expected in the future to become more continuous processes linked to study programmes in the universities that could be offered as joint modules in the regions, as mechanisms for curriculum development. One clear benefit from the intensive courses has been the networking of the Southern partners. Usually, an intensive course was the first time that teachers and students from the network HEIs in the region met, and the opportunity to get to know each other and share experience and knowledge was welcomed with enthusiasm. Intensive course work has in some cases led towards real curriculum development (for example the establishment of a musicology degree programme in Botswana with assistance from a South African university is being supported through the N-S-S Programme (intensive courses under The Role of Music in Strengthening Cultural Identity in Southern Africa network). The problem for continuing the S-S cooperation is non-availability of funds in the developing countries to continue on their own. The N-S-S Programme does not finance this outside the intensive course modality. The N-S-S Programme could make a valuable contribution by financing the S-S networking for a couple of years to get it off the ground.

## **3.2 General Issues**

### **3.2.1 Thematic and Geographical Distribution**

#### **Geographical Coverage**

According to the CIMO documentation 34 networks were operational in 2009. Their geographical coverage has a strong focus on Africa (32) with two networks in Asia (Nepal and Vietnam) and two in Latin America (Peru). This division is compatible with the focal

country selection of Finnish Development Cooperation that has a long-standing relationship with Africa. The countries in Africa participating in the networks currently are Botswana, Burundi, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, Swaziland, Tanzania, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Uganda and Zambia, altogether 20 countries.

South Africa participates in 15, Tanzania in 14, Kenya in 8, Namibia in 7 and Ethiopia in 6 networks. These countries are Finland's long-standing partners in development cooperation and thus it is understandable that contacts already exist or are easily made. Zambia, with 4 networks and Mozambique, with 5 networks are also priority countries in bilateral development.

The country selection criteria from the PD are well met in the country selection, since Finland's major partner countries for development cooperation are well represented in the Programme. Also Nepal is one of this group of countries and Peru used to be earlier. The benefit for the Programme is also the existence of the Embassy of Finland in these countries, which makes the visa applications simpler for the exchanges to Finland and the support to the Finnish teachers and particularly to the students if/when practical problems are encountered. The interviewed students appreciated the support particularly from the Embassy in Mozambique, since the biggest dissatisfaction on the programme arrangements in terms of contents and logistics came from those teachers and students.

Nonetheless, wider country selection is an asset to the Programme, because it broadens the Finnish experience to other cultural, social and economic contexts and gives an opportunity for a broader spectrum of HEIs to participate in the cooperation.. S-S cooperation can be also promoted, particularly in the neighbouring countries, when more countries are involved (e.g. in addition to Tanzania and Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda can participate in S-S cooperation). For example East Africa Technomathematics II Network has expanded from cooperation with University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, to Kigali Institute of Science and Technology and the National University of Rwanda, to Makerere University, Uganda and Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia. Regional cooperation between Uganda, Tanzania and Rwanda in sharing scarce resources in teaching mathematics is underway. Also Health Africa Network has brought Ugandan and Kenyan colleges of Nursing together in sharing experiences and planning for innovative approaches in school health and community health. Similarly, in Nepal the HOPE network has promoted collaboration between local nursing and social work institutions as well as an NGO (life experience) partner and a partner in Vietnam.

The question of whether this is the proper number of countries and a balanced geographical distribution in the Programme needs to be considered within the context of the Programme objectives in comparison with the available resources. Funding for each network is quite low, allowing a few exchanges per annum and one intensive course. This is clearly too little for institutional capacity development. Hence, the programme supports more capacity development at the individual level than institutional development. It

also gives opportunities for professionals from North and South to share experience and knowledge and familiarize themselves with different cultural environments. The contacts between the North and the South are valuable as such as they promote intercultural understanding and give new ideas on development of e.g. the curricula, teaching/learning methodology, research approaches linked to society's development priorities.

Therefore, it has been also the strength of the N-S-S that it has expanded the cooperation geographically to a wider country selection than just the few main recipients of Finland's development cooperation. It has widened the country selection for the Finnish HEIs and provided seed funding for possible stronger cooperation mechanisms in the future, like ICIs. The interviewed Finnish institutions considered N-S-S a valuable instrument to establish networks with their southern counterparts. It has been practically the only instrument for student and teacher exchanges from the South.

Whether more countries should be included from Asia and Latin America depends on the demand from their side and the Finnish HEIs' existing contacts in Asia and Latin America. Finland has been more active in the African continent and thus contact networks exist. Adding more countries from Asia and Latin America depends largely on the existing contacts between HEIs and particularly individuals in the HEIs and their demands on cooperation. If applications to the N-S-S Programme will increase for HEIs in Asia and Latin America, the country selection will eventually grow. In our view institutionalising the existing networks should be prioritised at the moment. In deciding on which countries to include, the key issue for network planners should be to consider which HEIs would benefit most and would contribute most to the network, regardless of their country of origin. This should be reflected in the proposal as justification for limiting or broadening geographical coverage. In any case, if the decisions on geographical coverage are to be based on need, the decision should come from the network level and not from the programme level.

The N-S-S Programme can be an entry point to deeper and more profound cooperation through other funding mechanisms, e.g. the ICI instrument. The N-S-S Programme has already functioned as a complementary instrument in many cases when other funding has been available, such as HEIs' own budget funds for work practice, research funds from the Academy of Finland etc.

### **Thematic Distribution**

The N-S-S Programme networks cover a wide range of thematic areas and sectors. Social sciences and natural sciences are best represented in the programme, 6 networks for each discipline. Engineering and technology, teacher training and communication and information science are the next most popular, having five networks each. Medical sciences, agricultural sciences and art and design all have 4 networks. The rest with one to three networks cover mathematics, informatics, humanities, geography, geology, business studies and management, and other areas.

The thematic areas cover well the traditional sectors of Finnish development cooperation like forestry, agriculture, health, education and information technology, where Finnish know-how and experience are prominent. Some networks are content-wise aligned with the cross-cutting dimensions like human rights, democracy, economic activity and environmental protection. There are also networks from outside the traditional sectors, e.g. culture and music.

The evaluation team appreciates the selection of the variety of themes in the Programme. They give an opportunity for participation by a wider range of HEIs in Finland and in the South. The combination of various themes is well balanced with the development cooperation aspects and the cultural cooperation aspects. One critical factor in deciding whether a project is worthwhile funding is the expressed commitment from the South and demand-based approach in planning the project proposal. If commitment is lacking, it will become apparent very soon in implementation. This has become evident during the evaluation process as a few networks never really got off the ground due to difficulties in some HEIs in the South.

The priorities of the HEIs in the south, as far as their thematic distribution is concerned, are somewhat difficult to assess. All networks, regardless of their thematic contents, have responded to expressed needs in the South, even if the capacity development has taken place (with a few exceptions) mostly at individual level. Interviews of the universities in the South (Uganda and Nepal) and students and teachers who have participated or are participating in the exchange programmes and intensive courses considered the experience academically and professionally beneficial. Improvement of career opportunities and actual employment has taken place in many cases and they felt that they can promote the development of their countries in their respective sectors (e.g. health, social, journalism, human rights, mathematical applications in world of work, tourism, etc.). The universities in the South also deliberately expressed as a priority when selecting students for the programme to select promising academics to be recruited later in the university staff (e.g. University of Makerere, Lalitpur Nursing Campus).

The thematic priorities of the HEIs may not necessarily be exactly the same as the thematic priorities at national levels. Interviewees from the less traditional disciplines (such as journalism, music, culture, etc.) strongly objected to any idea of restricting themes as they felt their disciplines would be the first to be dropped. Clearly a discipline like health (HOPE, Health Africa, WellNet, etc.) will always be a high priority, at both national and institutional levels, though prioritisation between community health, school health, occupational health, care of the aged, etc. should be decided at local rather than national levels. On the other hand, fields such as community-based radio (JOCID) or internet access (Open Doors) can contribute strongly to community-based development and good governance issues, but may sometimes be seen in a negative light. Disciplines which help to empower the poor can be viewed as detracting from the power and authority of national-level government institutions, and are thus given low priority in some countries. As is the case with geographical distribution, the key issue for HEIs should be to consider which

disciplines would benefit most from networking, in line with the priorities, needs and objectives of the partner institutions. The justification for selecting a particular theme should be reflected in the proposal in terms of its importance to the partners. In any case, decisions on thematic coverage must be based on need, and the best level to identify that need is at the network level and not at the programme level.

### 3.2.2 Equality and Cross-cutting Dimensions

#### Gender Equality

One way of measuring the gender equality in the programme is to study the gender distribution of the teachers and students in the mobility statistics (Table 4).

**Table 4** Gender distribution of the participants 2007–08.

Teachers				Students			
Out		In		Out		In	
Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males
42	39	29	45	70	17	57	60

There is a fairly good balance of Finnish teachers going out to the network HEIs in the South. Females are a bit over-represented. There is a clear difference between female and male teachers coming from the HEIs in the South in the favour of males. There is an overwhelming majority of female students going out from Finland. The female/male ratio of incoming students from the South is quite well balanced. It seems that the Finnish male students are not as interested in this programme as the female students. The clear majority of male teacher participation from the South would be easy to account for as the lower female status in the HEIs in the developing countries, but there might be other reasons for this situation. The overall numbers of participants are quite low during two academic years to allow straightforward interpretations in equality. The networks consist also of disciplines which are gender stereotyped, e.g. nursing vs. engineering. The crucial observation is that the Programme as a whole consists of a multitude of disciplines open to both sexes.

#### Cross-cutting Dimensions

The traditional cross-cutting dimensions in the Finnish Development Cooperation are promoting human rights, democracy, environmental protection, and combating HIV/AIDS in addition to gender equity, which is dealt with above.

One way to assess how these dimensions are taken into account is to identify projects with direct content focus on these aspects.

#### Human Rights

Human Rights issues are covered in the network activities coordinated by Åbo Akademi; Sustainable Development and Human Rights and Globalisation and the Body with the Universities of Addis Ababa, Nairobi, Western Cape and Makerere. Human rights issues are covered in the rights of the disabled.



## **Democracy**

Promotion of Democracy is a strong element in two networks related to journalism. (1) Twinning of Finnish and African Journalism Education Institutions coordinated by the University of Helsinki with the Universities of Namibia, Dar es Salaam, Zambia and Jyväskylä and (2) Diaconia University of Applied Sciences coordinates the Jocid Network II (Journalism for Civic Involvement, Democracy and Development) with partners from Liberia (University of Liberia), Namibia (Polytechnic of Namibia) and from Tanzania (Tumaini University, Iringa University College). The Finnish partner is Helsinki Metropolia University of Applied Sciences.

## **Environmental Protection and Ecological Issues**

Environmental issues are dealt with in many networks in the water, forestry, and agricultural sectors. Some of these networks are still in a preparatory stage. Examples of networks with ecological contents are Tanganyika Aquatic Studies Network coordinated by the University of Jyväskylä, FINPE coordinated by the University of Turku with 30 years of research on the Amazonian region funded by the Academy of Finland, ProEnv2 coordinated by the University of Oulu, also operational in Peru, and Training of Producers for Ecological Broadcasting coordinated by Arcada and operational in Ghana and South Africa. This cross-cutting dimension is quite well taken into account in the networks.

## **HIV/AIDS**

The health sector networks deal with the issues related to HIV/AIDS. The partner countries in Africa are today quite aware of HIV/AIDS and the Governments have taken many actions on prevention, mitigation and treatment of the virus. The Finnish medical and nursing teachers and students in the networks have benefited from the lectures given by their African counterparts. Also Finnish students and teachers have encountered HIV/AIDS in their work in the hospitals and in the field.

### **3.2.3 Good Governance and Transparency**

Good governance cannot be attained without transparency and acceptance of processes and procedures, and so the evaluation considers ownership and transparency as subsumed into governance issues. Governance is considered in terms of both the programme and network levels, and examines not only concrete aspects of good governance such as fairness, clarity and availability of various selection criteria (e.g. for selection of networks to be funded, for selection of students and staff for exchanges), but also the extent to which the components of the project are perceived to be fairly and equitably managed, and the extent to which all partners are involved in the planning and decision-making processes.

At the programme level, the very useful administrator's web-site provides a solid basis for transparency (<https://hakulomake.cimo.fi/nss/admin> requires username and password for access). The English language version is a little difficult to use for newcomers, but contains an enormous amount of detailed data (each network has 43 separate data items). Most institutions have at least limited access to the internet and so this is a reasonable platform for information dissemination. Some general information is available to poten-

tial institutional partners (now in both Finnish and English, so for example lusophone countries may be at a disadvantage) regarding the aims and procedures of the Programme. Similarly, some information on the N-S-S Programme is available on [www.cimo.fi](http://www.cimo.fi) to exchange participants on the opportunities available, though this certainly more easily accessed by Finnish students than the majority of Southern students or faculty, and, apart from listing the eligible countries, refers the reader back to their own institution for further information. Perhaps a list of participating institutions could be added to simplify the process of information gathering. CIMO's web-site contains a wealth of information on studying in Finland and Finland itself.

Networks have generally been able to ensure broad dissemination of information about the programme and its opportunities, though there are some glaring examples of institutions/departments where information is strictly controlled and selection of programme beneficiaries is shrouded in mystery! Most exchange students from the southern institutions were aware that the selection process is usually a competitive one, and had made efforts to ensure they would be selected by actively reacting to the selection criteria. In one visited institution, lecturers told that there were clear increases in study diligence and achievement as students strived to win one of the exchange scholarships. This clearly reflects that students believe the selection procedure will be fairly applied and that hard work will be rewarded: it is a given fact that people will not react positively to competitive situations, however well documented or theoretically fair, if they perceive that actual selection of beneficiaries is based on some other, hidden or biased criteria.

In some cases, the basis for a network in a particular institution remains a single individual, so if the individual leaves the institution, the interest in the network leaves with the individual. A still greater risk is that an individual either manages the partnership poorly (badly organized exchanges, for example in two partner countries were blamed on the simple fact that the sole contact person had not properly informed colleagues of the arrival of a visiting teacher) or exploits the network for own benefit (influence or power within the HEI stems from the kudos of managing the partnership, and people are not always ready to relinquish that). This situation has arisen in small number of institutions, but can quite easily be rectified by requiring partner HEIs to nominate always at least one administrative and one academic coordinator, with all information copied to both, as well as by issuing clear guidelines on exchange beneficiary selection.

## 4 CONCLUSIONS

### 4.1 Relevance

The MDGs, which are designed ultimately to reduce poverty, are a cornerstone of Finnish development policy. From the point of view of the overall programme goals, we



must consider whether the achievements of the programme are relevant to Finland's overall development policy and strategies, and to what extent the programme benefits from Finland's comparative advantages. Alleviation of poverty is an over-riding goal of Finnish development cooperation, and a stated national objective in all of the partner countries. The N-S-S Programme is compatible with the poverty alleviation goals even though it cannot have a direct impact at national level.

The policy relevance also looks at compatibility of the N-S-S with the strategic objectives of the HEIs in the North and South. The internationalisation strategy for the Finnish institutions of Higher Education (Opetusministeriö 2009) defines five objectives out of which two are directly linked to the N-S-S programme: (1) Support to strengthening the multicultural society through e.g. increased intake of foreign exchange students, researchers and teachers; and (2) Promoting global responsibility through research and expertise in solving global problems and strengthening the capacities of the developing countries.

Are the network activities compatible with the internationalization and general development strategies of the HEIs, and, more specifically, are they relevant to the research and teaching programmes of specific faculties or departments? Relevance must also pose the question: is the programme applicable at the individual, institutional, programme and national levels? Relevance must also be seen in terms of an institution's capacity to absorb and utilize the resources delivered through the intervention: in this case, do the network partners have the capacity both to absorb and to deliver the resources?

In the N-S-S Programme, the answers to the above questions are overwhelmingly positive. The nature of the networks and the opportunities for joint planning and ownership ensure that the activities are compatible with the needs and strategies of the institutions. This is further strengthened by the fact that some networks are so well institutionalized that they are supported up to the highest levels of HEI leadership. Some networks, however, are "known" only at departmental level, and attempts must be made to improve their institutionalization.

Interviews in Uganda and Nepal revealed high level relevance of the N-S-S Programme in regard to the strategic plan of the universities. For example, Makerere University Strategic Plan, 2008–2019, defines "provision of innovative teaching, learning, research and services responsive to National and Global needs" as leading principles in the university development (Makerere University 2008). The plan also emphasises three cross-cutting themes (quality assurance, internationalisation, gender mainstreaming) as priorities. The networks with Åbo Akademi (Sustainable Development and Human Rights and Globalization of the Body) are directly linked to university priorities and national development needs. The Technomathematics network is similarly aligned with the university priorities, particularly in regard to innovative teaching, learning and research and also more broadly with the development of the national economy. The same is true of Health Africa Network and the HOPE Network, both of which are directly aligned with the health sector priorities at national and community level. In Nepal, the Open Doors Network relates

directly to several components in Nepal's national ICT strategy that are directly supported by provision of skilled ICT-trained individuals from Purbanchal University.

On an individual level, the impacts of primary and general education on poverty have been demonstrated in various studies, but not all of the causalities and correlations have been identified. One way to ensure impact is to target the poorest or the most disadvantaged in society. However, despite selection of students for exchange visits to Finland having been done mainly on an equal opportunity basis, it is not possible to state that the N-S-S Programme has been able to support specifically the most economically or otherwise disadvantaged students. It has been possible to elicit some information on an individual level from beneficiaries of the N-S-S Programme, and so the evaluators have chosen to rely on the responses of individual beneficiaries of exchanges, garnered from interviews and questionnaires, to give an indication of how participants perceive the future impact of the networks on poverty reduction. Some of the networks do impact directly on poverty issues. For example the participants in the Sustainable Tourism network expect to make a direct impact on poverty by their future involvement in rural income-generating schemes. In fact, some earlier exchange beneficiaries are already working in this sector and feel that their exchange visits have had an important impact on both their career choices and their employability in this sector.

## 4.2 Efficiency

The efficiency of the programme is a function of how well it achieves its goals in relation to available resource utilization, and for the purposes of this evaluation is considered much from a financial aspect, thus mainly from CIMO's perspective. Some of the recommendations of the previous evaluation (of the pilot phase) were to improve the accounting and transparency of the programme as well as to improve communications. Thus, efficiency was also considered from the perspective of efficiency of communication and reporting mechanisms between MFA, CIMO and the coordinating HEIs. Internal efficiency of each network has been considered solely from this perspective, as there has been no time to examine the accounting and audit systems of separate HEIs.

A lot of effort has been put into building a solid, web-based central planning and monitoring system for project activities and budgets, and the results are impressive. A vast amount of data is available, covering all the networks and the funds applied. However, while the data is efficiently collected and managed, there is little room for its effective use as there is little or no analysis of what has been collected. This is due to two reasons. The first relates to the difficulty in applying the quantitative data as a basis for analysis of the N-S-S Programme in terms of poverty reduction, achievement of MDGs, etc. It is simply not possible to analyse any of the data on exchange flows or numbers of ICs or workshop meetings in terms of impact on development objectives, and therefore no attempt has been made to do so. The second is that qualitative data are difficult, though not impossible, to put into a database. If the right questions are asked in the right way, we can use

databases at least to show trends in factors such as stakeholder satisfaction, achievement of specific network objectives etc.

Simply put, the accounts and reports from CIMO show that the networks function at high degree of financial efficiency: all funds are applied directly to activities and there are no overhead costs to the networks. Of course the real situation is different, as the HEIs all bear the overhead costs as well as budget over-runs from their own resources, but are not able or encouraged to report this back to CIMO and MFA. During the period since the previous evaluation in 2006, CIMO has maintained or improved its internal efficiencies in relation to administrative costs (at least as expressed in terms of cost recovery rates from MFA).

For the HEIs, internal efficiency expressed as working time compared with numbers of exchange students is low – N-S-S Programme incoming exchanges are labour intensive. However, those institutions which invest a lot of time and energy in hosting their visitors have a strong impact on effectiveness and sustainability. They have student visitors who are able to concentrate on their studies and benefit to a greater degree from their local contacts, and this often (though certainly not always) seems to be reciprocated to the benefit of Finnish exchange students.

### **4.3 Effectiveness**

As an evaluation criterion, effectiveness should consider the relationship between an institution and its operating environment. In the present evaluation there are two institutional levels: CIMO as the managing institution of the programme and the HEI partners in the individual networks. As there is no realistic opportunity to consider in depth the operating environments of the individual HEIs, this evaluation considers how implementation of the programme at the CIMO level has been able to create and react to changes in the programme environment. Another way to consider effectiveness is in terms of customer or stakeholder satisfaction.

In this evaluation, stakeholder satisfaction is high. Almost without exception, participants of exchanges and ICs have been highly satisfied with both the logistical arrangements of their activities as well as the academic content. Even the few exchange participants who had had logistical or financial problems felt that what they had gained academically and personally from their visits far outweighed any inconveniences they had suffered.

CIMO runs pre-departure briefing workshops for exchange students, which are well appreciated by all who have participated. In addition, specific to the N-S-S Programme, CIMO holds coordinator meetings to discuss current programme issues as well as to disseminate information, etc. All the coordinator respondents highly appreciate these opportunities, though some would like to see less focus on administrative details and more opportunity to establish joint approaches, discuss best practices, etc. CIMO also carries

out inspection visits to monitor selected networks as part of its quality control programme. These activities promote programme effectiveness by ensuring that CIMO remains in close contact with the HEI and are able to be pro-active in identifying problems and helping to find solutions.

#### **4.4 Impact**

The Programme has had a positive impact on students from the South. Many students from the South have been given an opportunity to participate in courses of high quality. This has sometimes changed their career plans and they have returned to Finland to study a full degree with a different funding source (e.g. in public health) and plan to return to their homeland and work in that field. There are students who have got good jobs in their home country because of the studies in Finland (e.g. in tourism). Universities in the South have expressed their intention to recruit the students who have done PhD studies in Finland in their faculties. Some interviewed students expressed their N-S-S Programme experience as integral to their career plans.

The impact on the Finnish students is mixed. Some express willingness to follow a career in development cooperation and changed their study focus when returning to Finland. Some worked at the district and village level and had a positive impact on the community by introducing nutrition, hygiene and health programmes. Many Finnish students appreciated the intercultural learning experience, even if they did not gain academically from their studies. There are exceptions also, particularly among those who attended high quality HEIs e.g. in South Africa, where the students felt they had gained academically from the exchange.

The Finnish teachers' work periods were too short to produce an impact on the institutions they visited. Their teaching work was mostly introducing through lectures new methodologies, ideas on improving the curriculum etc. In future if web-based teaching and joint research can be instituted as a cooperation modality between the network institutions the impact will dramatically increase. This is still in the initial stages in the network activities due to the problems of poor Information Technology (IT)-infrastructure in the South and the demands of the time-consuming development stage.

Impacts on institutional capacity development are still modest. The networks that have long-term relationships and other funding sources are in a better position in this respect. The N-S-S Programme is a complementary as well as an important funding modality in their international cooperation, especially for the Southern institutions. All interviewed Southern academic coordinators stressed that the opportunity for their students and staff to participate in exchanges creates high impact.

Intensive courses are already seen as having impact to some extent, and have a potential for greater impact but they are under-funded for this purpose. S-S networking has been

initiated by the N-S-S Programme, but it should be strengthened and financed. If the funding could be extended to support S-S cooperation at least for a few years its impact on the capacities of the HEIs would be enhanced.

## 4.5 Sustainability

Concepts of impact and sustainability should be considered in relational terms – pilot and small-scale projects must be considered differently from projects or programmes that are full-scale or sector-wide – but sustainability is often seen as a function of financing; will the intervention continue under local financing after international funding ceases? Current thinking is that sustainability is more likely within a Sector Wide Approach programme (SWAp), an approach supported by Finland nevertheless there should always be room for project-based activities. Another indication of sustainability is the extent to which an intervention is continued or expanded within the framework of national HE policies. Given that the present N-S-S Programme focuses on HEIs, as well as the fact that Finland’s long-term development partners are the least developed and most likely to require sustained funding relationships, it is more reasonable to examine sustainability in terms of HEI policies and practices than in terms of only financial self-sufficiency. Thus, here the N-S-S networks are considered as project-based, pilot interventions and sustainability is viewed in terms of commitment shown to the networks by the partner HEIs, as well as the importance of the networks as “seeding” for broader and deeper links in research, post-graduate studies and curriculum development.

The networks are highly relevant to the strategies and needs of the partner institutions. Apart from the fact that almost all respondents indicated this to be so in interviews and written responses, there is substantial funding and resource application by the individual institutions, even though individual networks comprise relatively small parts of overall internationalization programmes, especially of Finnish institutions (Box 1).

### Box 1 A coordinator’s view.

“NSS is an important instrument for us but forms a relatively small amount of total student and staff exchange compared to other academic/HEIs collaboration programmes. In calendar year 2008 there were 502 Student Exchanges, of which 11 (1,8 %) were through the NSS-programme.” During the same period, coordination of the NSS programme required an estimated 4 person weeks of academic and up to 9 person weeks of administrative coordination”.

In terms of financial sustainability, the majority of respondents feel very strongly that external funding to N-S-S is crucial if student exchanges from the South to the North are to continue – a termination of funding for this instrument would almost certainly

mean that no or only very few South to North exchanges would be possible. However, some components of the networks have become sufficiently institutionalized in some of the networks that they could continue without direct MFA funding, though probably in a different form. The key here is the degree to which the network has become part of institutional strategy and activity.

Many of the existing partnerships had existed in some form or another prior to the commencement of the N-S Programme. Two-way exchange and other networking activities have strengthened these links and the large numbers of individuals who have been connected with the networks have created the critical mass necessary for networks to continue operating in some form and with various funding modalities. In addition to returning faculty members, returning master's degree candidates may be well positioned to have a sustainable impact on their respective institutions, in turn supporting the impact and sustainability of the professional development component of the program. However, we must ask whether small groups of returning students and faculty can realistically "cascade" newly acquired knowledge to their colleagues. Probably, the most likely effect will be the creation of the critical mass of exchange beneficiaries in a department. It has become increasingly apparent that the N-S-S Programme has functioned as an incubator for fledgling networks, a few of which would now be ready to leave the nest and continue to fly on their own. The majority of networks will continue to need careful nurturing and feeding before they are truly independent.

## **4.6 Finnish Value-added**

Finnish value-added of the N-S-S is that it has provided possibilities for the teachers and students from the South to come to Finland for studies and teaching. No other programme is funding this type of mobility in the network HEIs in the South. Finnish Higher Education is high quality, even world-class in some of the sectors included in the networks, and has a reputation for innovation and creativity which are highly appreciated by the Southern HEIs.

Finnish development assistance has a good reputation for being based on equality of partnerships and being non-tied (Sack, Cross & Moulton 2004). Interviews revealed that this reputation is enhanced by the N-S-S Programme providing opportunities for all partners to deliberate on planning and implementation issues, and because of the opportunities for both S-S mobility through the intensive courses and two-way mobility for exchanges.

## **4.7 Good Governance and Transparency**

Good governance cannot be attained without transparency and acceptance of processes and procedures, and so the evaluation considers ownership and transparency as subsumed into governance issues. Governance is considered in terms of both the programme and

network levels, and examines not only concrete aspects of good governance such as fairness, clarity and availability of various selection criteria (e.g. for selection of networks to be funded, for selection of students and staff for exchanges), but also the extent to which the components of the project are perceived to be fairly and equitably managed, and the extent to which all partners are involved in the planning and decision-making processes.

As stated above, the resource base for a few institutions remains a single individual, so if the individual leaves the institution, the interest in the network leaves with that individual. This is an issue related to both sustainability and governance. The greater risk is that an individual either manages the partnership poorly (e.g., badly organized exchanges in two partner countries were blamed on the simple fact that the sole contact person had not properly informed colleagues of the arrival of a visiting teacher) or exploits the network for own benefit (influence or power within the HEI stems from the kudos of managing the partnership, and people are not always ready to relinquish that). Though the majority of networks function transparently and fairly, respondents from several southern institutions told that they were not aware of the procedures or criteria for selection of network activity participants, or were not aware of how the network functioned. This situation has arisen in small number of institutions, but can quite easily be rectified by considering the best practices of other networks, such as requiring partner HEIs to nominate always at least one administrative and one academic coordinator, with all information copied to both, as well as by issuing clear guidelines on exchange beneficiary selection.

## **4.8 Cross-cutting Issues**

Gender equality in terms of balanced exchanges is fairly well in place. One network, namely Globalisation and the Body coordinated by Åbo Akademi directly deals with gender issues.

Environmental protection is the thematic area in many networks. Human rights and democracy are also included in some networks.

## **5 RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Main Recommendation**

The N-S-S Programme is a valuable asset to Finnish development cooperation as well as to the recipient higher education systems in the South and it is worth continuing.

A few recommendations are made for its improvement. Below they are grouped under functional headings, and in the Annex they are prioritised as those that should be adopted immediately (Priority 1) and those that should be adopted in any future funding (Priority 2).



## 5.1 Planning the Network Projects

The project plans should be given a more logical and coherent structure. Many projects have emerged from earlier personal contacts of teachers in the Finnish HEI and HEIs in the South; sometimes there is a long-standing cooperation arrangement that has been funded through different sources. This forms a strong basis for the network in N-S-S. However, the mobility sometimes resembles more an ad hoc activity due to the fact that the project has not been planned in a structured manner. Poverty reduction and the MDGs are often expressed as project objectives and the small scale mobility activities directly follow as the means to achieve them. The gap in logic between the objective and the activity is then huge, which makes it difficult to apply result-based monitoring and evaluation processes, and network activities tend to stand in isolation which in turn leads to poor project coherence.

### Recommendation 1

We recommend that the CIMO application guidelines be revised using a log frame approach – though not as strictly as in large-scale projects. The joint planning with the Southern partners should be demand-based, reflecting both the Northern and Southern needs for cooperation. The objectives should respond to the institution level demands and the exchanges and intensive courses as activities should reflect these. The scarcity of resources should be reflected in the objective setting (Priority 1).

### Recommendation 2

Project plans should also reflect the objectives and expectations of the Finnish HEIs for the network cooperation aligned with their Internationalisation strategies. The N-S-S Programme is one in which both parties benefit developmentally, and this should also be expressed in the project plans (Priority 1).

### Recommendation 3

We also recommend training sessions for planning for the Finnish HEIs on using structured and logical approaches to planning (Priority 1).

### Recommendation 4

The project plan which is presented as an application to CIMO should also include a section on Quality Assurance. This would consist of a plan for logistical arrangements e.g. accommodation, start-up package etc., for the students coming to Finland for at least 3 months and how the orientation, tutoring and other support services are arranged. There are models from well functioning projects that could be included in CIMO's guidelines as models. This quality system should be a prerequisite for plan approval. To improve governance, the plan should also include a commitment from all partner institutions to nominate both an administrative and an academic coordinator, preferably named in the application (Priority 1).



### **Recommendation 5**

If possible, applications should give an estimate of staff working time required for the network administration and possible other funding sources, though these should not be used as selection criteria for new networks (Priority 1).

## **5.2 Additional Funding Mechanisms**

### **Institutional Cooperation for Higher Education Institutions**

New funding modalities have been introduced by MFA. The Institutional Cooperation Instrument for Higher Education Institutions (HEI ICI) is meant for capacity building support for HEIs in administrative and pedagogical matters (University of Jyväskylä 2009). The projects should be based on the initiative, demand and identified needs for capacity development in the partner country HEI(s). The programme document defines possible areas of capacity development as curriculum development, development of administrative structures, new forms of service delivery, organisational development, enhancing skills in teaching methodology, networking and internationalisation. Funding can vary between 50 000 and 500 000 euros for a maximum of three years. Personnel are encouraged to work on a long-term basis which is provided by the increased funding level (as compared with the N-S-S Programme). Inclusion of young experts in cooperation is also encouraged. Added value will be produced through multilateral partnerships and inclusion of several stakeholders.

### **Recommendation 6**

The N-S-S Programme could be an additional instrument to HEI ICI. Hence, the team recommends that the well established networks with clear development targets and evidence of achieved results will be selected for also for HEI ICI funding (based on their application of course). The N-S-S Programme mechanism for mobility and intensive courses could continue as a complementary funding, because the student and teacher exchanges are worth continuing and, according to present experience, would support the capacity building process by helping to create the necessary critical mass for institutional change (Priority 2).

### **Recommendation 7**

The N-S-S Programme could be used as an entry to the institutional cooperation and the new applicants should first establish the cooperation mechanism through the N-S-S. Successful application of an N-S-S network would provide opportunities for effective identification of institutional needs, and would also function as evidence of the commitment to cooperation from the HEIs in the South (Priority 2).

### **Recommendation 8**

Many suggestions were received for a 3+2 years funding schedule for continuing networks. The key issue is that some form of guaranteed medium-term funding would permit more effective planning and more efficient use of resources (Priority 2).

### Other Viable Instruments

Many existing N-S-S projects have merged as complementary cooperation modalities for already existing cooperation.

- **Research cooperation** through funding from the Academy of Finland has proved to produce long-lasting cooperation between HEIs in Finland and in the South (e.g. Peru).
- **NGO projects** have also been successful in creating sustainable partnerships, reaching poor communities and villages (Health Africa). Realistic and innovative view on new opportunities and how current activities could be strengthened.
- Funds from the **budgets from the Finnish HEIs** have been used for sending Finnish students abroad for work practice and also for receiving students from the South for further studies (e.g. PhD) and/or research. All these mechanisms are valuable tools for capacity development for the South and North. The N-S-S Programme has strengthened the existing cooperation and also provided an avenue for the development of the cooperation modality.
- Another additional funding mechanism could be the **discretionary funds (Local Cooperation Funds)** managed by the Finnish Embassies. The team recommends that the prerequisites for applications from this funding source are explored. The N-S-S Programme partner HEIs in the south should be informed and encouraged to apply from these funds as complementary funding to N-S-S when there is a clearly identified need for additional activities, e.g. promoting S-S cooperation.

### Recommendation 9

The Team recommends acknowledgment of these other instruments as part of the proposed training in planning and considers it important that they are clearly stated in the applications to the N-S-S Programme, particularly in terms of level of funding and volume of the activities (Priority 1).

## 5.3 Accounting and Management

All the coordinating HEIs are public institutions with approved accounting and audit procedures. Project proposals and budgets are vetted by experts before being approved, so there should be no need for such tight budget control and repeated approval processes for the same activities.

### Recommendation 10

HEI accounts must contain a separate head for funds received and used under the N-S-S, but that should be the limit of their accounting responsibilities. Information sent to CIMO should only be in the format of the HEI's accounting system and should not be required to be reworked to suit the MFA/CIMO accounting systems as this is too time-consuming and inefficient. This problem is linked to the structure of the budget

in the PD. The activities are separated into three components, of which Component three relates to Administrative arrangements, the Mid-term review (MTR), Networking, and N-S-S website/information. This means Component three includes activities at both programme level (web-site implementation and cost recovery) and network level (cost of implementing network meetings). In order to follow these budget lines, the networks are required to report networking activities separately from the other two components, even though there is no cost recovery to the HEIs. The PD budget presently allocated to “Networking” (approximately 9% of the total) should be restructured so that network activities carried out by the HEIs could be covered under two components: (1) mobility and (2) intensive courses and network meetings. Programme management (website, administration, cost recovery etc., which is budgeted at about 13% of the total remaining budget for 2009–2011) should be a separate category (Priority 1).

### **Recommendation 11**

There should be greater flexibility in budget management by the HEIs. For example, Academy of Finland funding permits up to 15% deviation from budgeted amounts by decision of the project director, Erasmus programme funding allows for up to 20% deviation. This flexibility could also be applied to N-S-S Programme funding to permit greater efficiency (especially combined with restructuring of budget Component 3). Thus deviations up to 15% (for example, to transfer money from network meetings to ICs, or where savings can be made by combining teacher exchange with participation in an intensive course) could be authorised by academic coordinators and reported to CIMO, but not requiring approval from CIMO (Priority 1).

### **Recommendation 12**

Similarly, once a 2-year plan of action has been approved it should not require resubmission in year 2, unless proposed activity changes exceed 15% of the approved funding. Annual reports by the HEIs should include estimates of activities and costs to be rolled over from year 1 to 2, as well as justification for the change (Priority 2).

### **Recommendation 13**

HEI coordinators should be mandated to use their own judgement in the payment of minor sums to expedite local administration costs, e.g. for arranging ICs (Priority 1).

### **Recommendation 14**

CIMO’s reporting guidelines should be revised to include:

- estimates of counterpart funds and staff working time contributed by the HEIs to the networks;
- more qualitative data from returning exchange students and lecturers; quantifiable opinions to be collected and recorded (e.g. 4-5 scales with running averages to show trends in stakeholder/beneficiary satisfaction and effectiveness in relation to stated goals); and

- more analysis of impact on network objectives in the annual reporting to CIMO and from CIMO to MFA (Priority 2).

## **5.4 Other**

### **Recommendation 15**

Universities in developing countries are at different capacity levels. Many do not have capacity to undertake research and many offer only lower level degrees with outdated programmes and under-resourced facilities. Some form of coordination of activities by Southern institutions could help to build capacity and make the Southern networking more sustainable. Using some of the best network practices as a model, this should be trialled as a pilot to encourage regional networking, for example, in Africa. High level research institutions also exist, particularly in South Africa, and this recommendation could be implemented by financial support to S-S networking in the networks that have a prominent southern HEI to coordinate the network and provide capacity building (Priority 2).

### **Recommendation 16**

Accreditation should not be seen as an obstacle to an exchange programme, but rather as a long-term goal of the network (Priority 1).

### **Recommendation 17**

Exchange students should be required to prepare a learning plan in advance of the exchange, which should be approved by the academic coordinators of both the home and host institutions, naturally this would be subject to revision once the exchange is under way (Priority 1).

### **Recommendation 18**

Issues of geographical and thematic coverage should be treated as demand-side decisions to be made by the networks, based on identified needs and identification of the most relevant institutions, and presented with justifications in the proposals. Geographical and thematic coverage should not be restricted through decisions at the programme level (Priority 1).

### **Recommendation 19**

The team feels that the first priority recommendations given here could be formalised without rewriting the entire PD. It could happen, for example, through an exchange of letters between MFA and CIMO, outlining the proposed changes and additions to the PD and/or existing practices (Priority 1).

## 6 LESSONS LEARNED

- The N-S-S Programme networks that had existing cooperation arrangements for example in research, in academic cooperation and internship/work practice before N-S-S Programme funding were more effective in producing development results. The N-S-S Programme is an excellent complementary instrument.
- The N-S-S Programme is a good instrument for a new HEI to enter the field of international cooperation in building relationships with the HEIs in the South. Its value lies in its nature of reciprocity as there are very few instruments in Finland or elsewhere that allow mobility from the South.
- The N-S-S Programme strength is that the studies are accredited in the home university and it is not possible to use N-S-S Programme funding to study for aentire degree, which effectively prevents brain drain in either direction.
- Models exist from well functioning systems to receive students and teachers (start-up packages, orientation systems etc) to Finland and how to provide mentoring, tutoring and social support during their stay. There is no need to reinvent the wheel every time a new network starts to function. Packages can be provided by e.g. – University of Oulu, UAS Savonia, University of Joensuu, University of Jyväskylä and University of Kuopio. Dissemination of best practices would have prevented some problems from occurring.
- Though the majority of networks function transparently and fairly, respondents from several Southern institutions told that they were not aware of the procedures or criteria for selection of network activity participants, or were not aware of how the network functioned. This situation has arisen in small number of institutions, but can quite easily be rectified by considering the best practices of other networks, such as requiring partner HEIs to nominate always at least one administrative and one academic coordinator, with all information copied to both, as well as by issuing clear guidelines on exchange beneficiary selection.
- A lot of effort has been put into building a solid, web-based central planning and monitoring system for project activities and budgets. However, simple collation of large amounts of results data serves little purpose unless the data can be analysed in relation to objectives. Reporting guidelines must be careful to pose the right questions in the right way.
- The trend towards focusing assistance on SWAps rather than project-based assistance would tend to preclude a programme like N-S-S, which is exclusively project-based. A relatively small-scale, project-based pilot activity such as the N-S-S Programme is, however, just as relevant and can contribute as much to sustainability as a mainstream project component, particularly where the function of the pilot is seen as “seeding” broader forms of intervention

## 7 RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The main risk to the N-S-S Programme was that there would not be sufficient interest from Finnish HEIs in establishing networks or working with Southern HEIs. This has certainly not proved to be the case. There has been a many-fold oversubscription to the Programme, with high numbers of applications. This in itself has created a different risk – that accepting too many networks into a programme with relatively low funding would reduce budgets to below critical levels and thus dilute the impact of the programme. Provision of funding for preparatory visits has reduced this risk by ensuring that new networks really are feasible. CIMO and the AG have clearly been able to select worthwhile networks and have managed the overall budget effectively. Despite reductions to all the proposed budgets, HEIs have still been able to implement the networks effectively.

It was assumed that Southern institutions would be interested in collaborating with each other as well as Finnish HEIs. The evaluators heard many times that especially the opportunity to meet people working in the same fields in neighbouring countries was highly appreciated, as it was easier then to put each others' issues and problems into a more familiar context.

The PD assumptions include there being enough Finnish students interested in taking up an exchange to a Southern institution, and that their time abroad would be creditable. Generally, this has proved to be a correct assumption, though some networks (particularly with UASs) have had some difficulty in finding enough students. This, on the other hand, has led to wider networking in Finland in order to enlarge the potential exchange student pool, which may have other impacts on UAS networking in Finland (though this evaluation did not take this up as an issue).

The placing of ICs in southern institutions carried several risks due to difficulties of remote coordination to host participants arriving from several southern countries. The risks seem to have been managed well by the HEIs, though this has been quite cumbersome and sometimes quite expensive for the HEIs.

A major risk in the view of the MFA was related to the N-S-S Programme possibly causing brain drain from the southern institutions. By restricting the length of exchanges and by ensuring that credits are applied only in the home institution, this risk has been avoided. Some exchange students have returned later (or plan/hope to return later) for advanced studies on the basis of their experience and performance under an N-S-S Programme exchange, but they have then returned (or plan to return) to their home countries.

A second risk raised by the MFA was related to possible displacement of previously applied funding modalities by the N-S-S Programme – some networks were already functioning before the N-S or the N-S-S programmes began. However, interviewed coordinators were of the strong opinion that N-S-S Programme funding had complemented earlier resources, particularly through permitting South to North exchanges, and had not displaced other funding modalities.

The thorough budget control, accounting and monitoring by CIMO has reduced the risk of fraudulent use of the network funds to zero. However, it would be more efficient to apply the adage – “don’t try to be perfect at the expense of being perfectly good” – and allow greater budget control by the professionals in the HEIs.

While there are some sparse examples of funds being wasted because of poor coordination in host institutions, these have been at a very low level, and could be avoided by providing network coordination guidelines as recommended above. There have been no misdemeanours that would have warranted disciplinary action against any of the networks.

The evaluators have proposed that a log frame approach should be adopted for network planning. Applications would then naturally include a section on risks and assumptions which could be evaluated during selection, and monitored during network implementation. Risk assessments and lessons learned from risk management would be valuable information to be disseminated throughout the programme.

Finally, the biggest risk linked to any process is that of failure. However, the prime function of a pilot process is to test whether an intervention will succeed or fail. Under the N-S-S Programme, not all networks will necessarily prove to be useful or maintainable – some networks are bound to fail, in the same way that some innovations never become concretised in practice, but that should not be seen as a sign of failure of the N-S-S Programme. Lessons will be learned from both failure and success.

## REFERENCES

- CIMO 2008a *Kansainvälisen Henkilöväihdon Keskus CIMO*. Toimintakertomus 2008.
- CIMO 2008b *North-South-South Higher Education Network Programme (2007–2009)*. Annual Report 2008.
- OECD/DAC 2006 *Quality Standards for Development Evaluation*. The DAC Network on Development Evaluation, Paris, 10 p.
- Makerere University 2008 *Makerere University Strategic Plan 2008/09–2018/19*. Kampala, Uganda, 27 p. <http://www.mak.ac.ug/documents/policy/STRATEGIC%20PLAN%20NEW.pdf>
- Mikkola M & Snellman O 2006a *Evaluation of CIMO North-South-South Higher Education Network Programme*. Evaluation report 2006:2. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Hakapaino Oy, Helsinki, 75 p. ISBN 951-724-548-1.
- Mikkola M & Snellman O 2006b *North-South-South Higher Education Institution Network Programme (North-South-South)*. Programme Document. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, mimeographic document.
- Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2007 *Development Policy Programme: Towards a Sustainable and Just Humanity Policy*. Government Decision-in-Principle. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Development Communication, Erweko Painotuote Oy, 38 p.
- Opetusministeriö [Ministry of Education of Finland] 2009 *Korkeakoulujen kansainvälistymisstrategia 2009–2015*. Opetusministeriön julkaisuja 2009:21. Opetusministeriö, Yliopistopaino, Helsinki, 56 p. [http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Julkaisut/2009/Korkeakoulujen\\_kansainvalistymisstrategia\\_2009\\_2015.html?lang=fi](http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Julkaisut/2009/Korkeakoulujen_kansainvalistymisstrategia_2009_2015.html?lang=fi)
- Sack R, Cross M & Moulton J 2004 *Evaluation of Finnish Education Sector Development Cooperation*. Evaluation report 2004: 1. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Hakapaino Oy, Helsinki, 166 p. ISBN 951-724-440-1.
- University of Jyväskylä 2009 *Programme Document: Capacity Building Support Programme for Higher Education Institutions (an institutional cooperation instrument, HEI ICI)*, FINAL 9.4.2009/<https://www.jyu.fi/hallinto/heiici/en>



## ANNEX 1 TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland

Office of the Under-Secretary of State

Development Evaluation

### Terms of Reference

#### Evaluation of the North-South-South Higher Education Institution Network Programme (89855501)

### 1. Background

#### 1.1 Pilot phase 2004–2006

“*The Higher Education Network Programme’s*” 3-year pilot phase was launched in March 2004 with funding from the development budget of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (Ministry). The objectives of the programme were to contribute towards the goals of the overall Finnish development policy, namely alleviation of widespread poverty, prevention of global environmental threats and promotion of equality, democracy and human rights. Improving the developing country capacities in higher education was considered one valid concept towards the achievement of these goals. The programme also aimed at developing good governance, exchanging best practices, including improving the students’ understanding of democracy, and building capacity among the networking partners.

The *Centre for International Mobility (CIMO)*, established in 1991 under the Ministry of Education of Finland, has hosted the programme since its inception. The pilot phase was evaluated in 2005–2006 at the juncture of planning of the new phase for 2007–2009 (Mikkola & Snellman 2006)<sup>1</sup>. The evaluation was designed so that it drew lessons from the first years of implementation to benefit the planning of the new phase, which in fact was prepared by the evaluators after completion of the evaluation.

The evaluation confirmed that during the pilot phase the administrative arrangements and the actual implementation patterns were still evolving. The higher education institutions involved were universities and polytechnics in Finland and in the southern partner countries. During the pilot phase, projects involving a total of 9 polytechnics and 14 universities in Finland were funded. In the network as such a total of 28 Finnish partners were participating, out of which 13 were polytechnics and the rest were universities. The developing countries eligible to participate in the pilot phase were limited to Sub-Saharan Africa, Peru and Egypt. In the latter two countries, the Higher Education Institutions’

(HEIs) Network Programme was seen in terms of establishing new ways of cooperation in the transition from traditional development aid.

The distribution of funded projects by sectors during the pilot phase was quite extensive: education, humanities and the arts, social sciences, science, engineering, agriculture, health and welfare, and services. The major sectors in terms of financial appropriations were social sciences, health and welfare, and the humanities and arts.

An advisory committee was established at the outset of the programme. It launched the calls for applications and prepared the project selection criteria, which CIMO was expected to use in the selection and approval of the applicant projects.

---

<sup>1)</sup> Mikkola M & Snellman O 2006 Evaluation of CIMO North-South Higher Education Network Programme. Evaluation report 2006:2. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Hakapaino Oy, Helsinki, 75 p. ISBN 951-724-549-1.

## 1.2 Evaluation of the Pilot Phase

The evaluation showed that extensive networks and cooperation between the HEIs in the North and the South already existed prior to the pilot phase of the programme. HEIs from 13 Sub-Saharan countries and from Egypt participated in the Pilot phase. However, there were some difficulties in matching the information dissemination policies of the northern institutions and CIMO itself with the southern partners. This circumstance was concluded to lessen the ownership of the programme by the southern partners. Overall, the evaluation stressed the need to improve the needs assessment dimension of the programme, in order for the individual projects to better respond to the needs of the cooperating institutions. Thus, one of the central components of the new phase was communication strategy and its operationalisation. The evaluation showed that improvement in the reporting and implementation of the programme by CIMO had taken place during the pilot phase, but during the next phase, however, clear guidelines would be needed in reporting and monitoring. The monitoring of the financial transactions was also seen important, although the financial audit carried out simultaneously to the evaluation, showed that no actual mismanagement or fraud had taken place at any level.

## 1.3 Phase 2007–2009

The name of the Programme was changed to “*North-North-South Higher Education Network Programme (North-South-South)*”. The objectives were stated as: “*The North-South-South Programme strives to enhance human capacity to ensure that people in all participating countries may better contribute to the cultural, socio-economic and political development of their communities.*” The Programme purpose was stated as “*The North-South-South Programme aims at providing an operational framework for building capacity through interaction and mobility between Finnish and cooperating country higher education institutions.*”

Accordingly, the activities planned for 2007–2009 were grouped in three categories:

- Enhancing human capacity – *mobility, student and teacher exchange*
- Generating and disseminating knowledge – *intensive courses*
- Establishment of sustainable partnerships between all parties (North-South-South) – *networking, programme web-site, and administrative arrangements*

The Programme activities were divided between the central level and the network level. The duration of support to an individual project has been 1+2+2 years, meaning one-year preparatory work and two consecutive rounds of applications. Each of the applicant institutions is responsible for the coordination of their project at the network level.

The selection criteria of projects in the second phase of the Programme include

- relevance to the development policy objectives of Finland,
- innovativeness of approaches, and
- special expertise areas of Finland.

The new phase was welcomed by the HEIs, and good quality applications have been received.

The total budget for 2007–2009 is 4.5 million Euro (1.3 M€ for 2007; 1.7 M€ for 2008; 1.5 M€ for 2009). Out of the total annual appropriations about 2/3 has been allocated to mobility of teachers and students, about 10% to the intensive courses, and the rest to support the networking and central administration.

In the current phase, eligible institutions in the South include those located in the eight principal cooperating partner countries of Finland (Nepal, Nicaragua, Vietnam, Tanzania, Zambia, Kenya, Ethiopia, and Mozambique), the Sub-Saharan African countries, and Egypt and Peru.

The Advisory Group of the Programme includes representatives from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Education, universities, polytechnics and student organizations. CIMO functions as the preparatory body, secretariat, and chair of the Advisory Group's meetings.

The last year of this phase of the Programme is on-going. It is now evaluated for lessons to benefit the planning of the future and for the sake of accountability on public funding.

## **2 Scope of the Evaluation**

The evaluation shall entail a desk study that will peruse the relevant documentation available in CIMO and in the Ministry. A sample of field visits to Finnish universities and polytechnics, representing a range of different disciplines, shall be organized. Field visit to a sample of cooperating countries shall include Nepal, and in Africa Uganda and Tanzania,

where the cooperating universities and institutions shall be visited and beneficiaries and other stakeholders interviewed.

## 2.1 Optional Planning Assignment for 2010–2012

Because of plans to continue the Programme with another 3-year phase, the compilation of the draft project document may be combined to this evaluation assignment as optional part two to be carried out by Evaluation Team. In this way the accumulated knowledge and vision would best be utilized for the future planning. The possibility of the Evaluation Team to continue to the planning assignment is only flagged here, and shall separately be discussed with the team in the course of the evaluation process if deemed necessary. A separate terms of reference will be prepared for the planning assignment and also a separate budget provided. The timing of the planning assignment would be immediately after the completion of the evaluation which is foreseen to be completed no later than 30 September 2009.

## 4 The Evaluation

The usefulness and utilisation of the recommendations of the 2006 evaluation shall be assessed, particularly, how the recommendations were translated into action. Because the Programme has been going on for five years now, tangible results could be expected to be discernible. Thus, the evaluation is much results-oriented in terms of the accountability dimension.

### 4.1 Major evaluation areas

*Concept:* Are the strategic goals and the programme concept itself still valid?

*Implementation:* Does the programme implementation modalities, theme and country selection respond to the needs derived from the strategic goals and objectives? Are modalities of implementation used conducive to sustainable institutional development at the partnercountry level? Is the development constituency-building in Finland emerging?

*Development results:* Have the activities resulted in tangible development results in institutions?

*Governance:* Are effective measures taken and modalities implemented at the levels of the organization, information dissemination, project selection criteria and procedures, and planning and monitoring?

### 4.2 Evaluation Criteria

At the time of launching the current evaluation, the programme is at its 6<sup>th</sup> year of implementation, which enables a development aid evaluation to be carried out by using largely the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. Thus, the questions of the evaluation should, in addition to looking at the overall functionality and implementation of the programme, also look at the results of the activities, their institutional sustainability aspects, and how

effectively and efficiently they were accomplished in terms of resources available and used and translated into outputs / outcomes / results / impacts. The results may not yet be discernible at the true impact level, but at outcome / results level effects and trends should be observed, for example, as career and personal skills development and benefits drawn therein to the concerned institutions.

In the first evaluation published in 2006, the relevance to the needs of the cooperating institutions in the South was one of the areas which were recommended to receive more attention during the current phase. Relevance in this evaluation should be looked at in terms of the activities being relevant to the advancement of the objectives of the partner institutions in the South, and also in terms of encouraging South-South cooperation, which is outside the eligibility of Finnish funding. Relevance shall also be looked at from the point of view of goals set in Finland to build institutional and human resources constituencies with skills and knowledge of development cooperation. Sustainability of the programme activities in terms of institutional sustainability and in terms of personal skills development shall be one of the focal areas of this evaluation.

The question of value added of this programme concept as a conduit to development is central. Is there particular value added in the involvement of Finnish institutions? Coherence with the current development policy and the policies in the partner countries and institutions shall be looked at. Mechanisms of cooperation and coordination shall be elucidated. Complementarity of Finnish support within the overall context of North-South-South cooperation shall also be looked at. The mechanisms of continuing the exchange and networks after the completion of the 5-year funding of an individual project is of interest, too. The evaluation takes place at an opportune time to look at this aspect as part of the sustainability and development result perspectives and their multiplier effects. The assessment of assumptions and risks is pertinent. Lessons will be directly drawn to the programme document of the next phase.

In the following the evaluation criteria are further elaborated in specific evaluation questions designed around the four evaluation areas defined in section 4.1 above.

### **4.3 Evaluation Questions**

#### ***Programme Concept***

To translate the 2007–2009 programme concept and its objectives (see 1.3 above) into the terms of the Finnish Development Policy, the strategic goal of the programme was to build constituencies in the North and in the South that understand what development is and what the added value is of development cooperation to both the North and the South. The purpose of the programme was to serve as a concrete cooperation platform and channel of funding from MFA to support this cooperation.

The evaluation shall assess:

- The overall magnitude of cooperation and exchange within the framework of the programme.

- Development of cooperation from 2006 evaluation to-date.
- Validity of strategic changes made to the programme instruments since 2006 evaluation, which resulted in the current grouping of activities: human capacity-building; knowledge generation and dissemination; and sustainable partnerships.
- Value added of the programme concept and its validity in terms of development among the beneficiaries which may be identified as “*cultural, socio-economic and political development in their community*”. The evaluators need to devise a representative sample and respective indicators.
- Conduciveness of the programme concept to development results at institutional level.
- The programme concept includes both the universities and the polytechnics on equal terms – is this concept valid or are there any disparities occurring due to the different nature and orientation (theoretic / practical) of these two types of higher education institutions?

### **Implementation**

There are several layers and dimensions that should be looked at:

#### *Scope of Implementation:*

- Currently the number of eligible countries is high. Should restriction or phasing be instituted to alternate annually by theme and/or by region or by some other criterion? Potential gains or losses of such arrangements against the efficiency, effectiveness, and development results of the Programme?
- Thematic distribution is all encompassing – has it been conducive to a coherent implementation of programmes of the participating institutions? Or, has the multitude of themes brought about scattered islands of excellence, reflected as incoherence in the overall programmes of the institutions involved?
- Sustainability of results in the current thematic and geographic scope?
- Compliance of the current thematic distribution to the Development Policy of Finland? How does it express the special areas of expertise Finland possesses and can offer? Gains *versus* losses in case that the thematic scope would become more selective left completely open?

#### *Sustainability of funding*

- Funding is possible for 1+2+2 years only. Has there been any “exit preparation” or “exit instruments” available for the network partners in anticipation to the cessation of external funding? Is there any follow-up planned to the “exited” projects to safeguard sustainability or maturation of such results?
- Should some “*champions*”-concept be developed to have an optional prolongation of funding beyond 5 years? In other words, should a competing quality incentive dimension be introduced?
- A number of network partners are now at the point of exiting from the programme. Assessment of experiences at the threshold of “exit” and modalities devised to maintain the network and cooperation, in other words, sustainability tools devised – if any?

- Any fund-raising guidance offered in the course of implementation for alternative sources?

- Should the duration of support be revisited and revised?

- Are there any tangible results indicating that the mobility programme, or the programme in its entirety, has benefited particularly the partner institutions in the South?

- Has the programme contributed in any way to the building of capacities of the institutions of the South, and at the level of individual students and teachers? Concrete examples?

- Measures or mechanisms to enhance and induce South-South cooperation, which is outside the funding of this programme? Ratio of South-South cooperation projects maturing from the North-South projects? Should tripartite models for a transition period be devised?

#### *Instruments of Implementation*

- Have the current selection of implementation instruments been conducive to the attainment of the strategic goals of the programme? What should the future role of these instruments be? Have these instruments been equally available to all concerned?

- Is there any difference (positive or negative) between the effectiveness of the instruments used in the Pilot phase as compared with those of 2007–2009, in the achievement of the programme goals?

#### *Modalities of Implementation*

- Are the current periods of time of mobility optimal for achieving the purpose of the programme and for the achievement of optimal efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and results? Concrete examples of results of individual exchange periods: a few representative samples from the northern and the southern institutions – mutual efficiency gains, are there any?

- Timing of student and researcher mobility? Has exchange been targeted to an optimal juncture of studies or research programme? Any guidance on the timing issued?

- Duration of the period of mobility: perceptions from students and teachers and their suggestions for future development of mobility instrument?

- Should the periods of time of mobility be equal to all or individually tailor made? or categorized with the theme, group of individuals, or other, with the principle that “one-size-does-not-fit-all”.

- Are there or should there be guidelines instituted on the percentage of the total budget to be allocated to under-graduate students, graduate students, and researchers / teachers? Or, should there be a pattern applied only on the basis of merits of the individual applications?

#### *Equality*

- Are there any quotas to ensure balance between male and female participants to the mobility programme? Equality between age groups? Equality between types of HEIs?

- Equality in access to relevant information? Is there any bias with regard of the availabi-



lity of the programme instruments?

- Stronger involvement of the South in initiative-making? Modalities to accomplish it?
- Marketing of the programme is currently done in the North? Possibilities to do marketing in the South and North or solely in the South?
- Optimal timing of marketing? Optimal timing of submission of applications in the South and in the North?

Programme Themes and the Cross-cutting Dimension

- Mainstreaming of the cross-cutting themes of the Finnish Development Policy – are they included or implemented in any way in the Programme? Are partners in the North and South knowledgeable about these themes?
- Are the cross-cutting themes integrated in the study programmes for example, in health, forestry, rural development, socio-economics or other.
- How is the HIV/AIDS present in the study or exchange programmes?
- Multidimensionality of programme themes?

*Good Governance and Transparency*

- Are there any measures to safeguard good governance in the preparation of the applications and in their handling?
- What is the relevance of the funded themes to the host institution's study or research programmes? Is the origin of proposals certified in the applications? Is the concordance of the applications with the southern institutions development goals clearly stated or to those of the northern institutions?
- What is the relevance of the funded themes to the host institution's study or research programmes?
- Reporting and accountability procedures are they clearly understood by all concerned? Are reports mutually prepared between the cooperating institutions?

*Risks and Assumptions*

- Has there been any advance consideration of risks linked to the implementation of the Programme, and its three instruments?
  - Risks of the mobility programme? Examples of unexpected events and how they were settled?
- Should there be a risk assessment criterion applied in the evaluation of the applications?
- Any fraud prevention measures in the management of funds at the central level, in the network institutions in Finland and in the South? Measures to detect corrupt behaviour? Disciplinary actions taken? If any, what kind and why?
  - Is there any individual exchange-based monitoring or feed-back reporting practiced, which would give immediate feed-back at individual and/or institutional levels.

**Development Results**

- Aspects of institutional development: are there any tangible development results discernible in the institutions of the network? If yes, what sort of development, and potentially how sustainable these results are? Are there any secondary impacts in the society beyond



primary beneficiaries? If no results discernible, why is it so?

- Does the Programme as it is now fulfil some of the unmet needs with the southern partners? Have benefits been concrete? To whom? Sustainability and multiplier effects are they discernible?

- Assessment of skills and knowledge development at individual level and at institutional level? Measures built-in in the programme to safeguard and further develop sustainability of these gains?

- Should there be limitations instituted as for the timing of student's mobility to link the mobility to the optimum period of time to contribute to the study results of the students?

- Has exchangeable accreditation of studies been achieved between the institutions? What are the mechanisms devised to synchronize the study programmes or make them compatible? Obstacles experienced and how these were overcome? Problems remaining? Considerations for the future?

- Is there any particular "Finnish value added" in this modality of cooperation between North-South institutions? Does "Finnish value added" extend to the consecutive South-South cooperation? If yes, how?

### **Governance of the Programme**

The administration and governance of the programme takes place at two levels, that of CIMO (the central level) and that of the participating network institutions in the North and in the South. Administration of the CIMO Programme in the Ministry is an additional dimension of the entire governance.

The evaluation shall assess:

- Have the recommendations of the earlier (2006) evaluation in regard of administration at both the central and the network institutions' levels been taken into account?

- Any coordination or cooperation or exchange of information mechanisms with other similar arrangements elsewhere.

- Has any complementarity surveys been done? Who else is doing similar programmes to this one? Mechanisms to ensure that complementarity takes place?

#### *Administration at Central Level (CIMO)*

- organization of governance at CIMO?

- modalities of cooperation with institutions in Finland and with institutions in the South?

- administrative procedures, accountability lines, guidelines for administering development funds, financial management, systems of archiving, monitoring, and statistical information?

- Advisory mechanisms / board, and its usefulness?

- Efficiency and effectiveness of administration in terms of human and other resources as compared with the overall outputs and results of the programme?

- The selection process of projects: how is it organized? Is it transparent throughout? Who decides on the criteria of selection? What is the organizational setup of selection?

What happens to those applications that are rejected?

- Advertising for applications: electronic means and other supplementary means; only by electronic means? Does the information reach all eligible?

#### *Administration at the Networking Institutions` Level*

- Are proper processes and procedures established which correspond to good governance modalities, i.e. guidelines, manuals, disaggregation of duties in financial management, statistical monitoring, qualitative and quantitative monitoring and reporting, cooperation platforms, advisory boards or other mechanisms?

- Organization and models of cooperation with the Institutions in the South?

- How is guidance on proper procedures and administrative rules and guidelines delivered to the cooperating organizations? Who is in charge?

- Annual audits – are they extended to the cooperating institutions` level or only to the central level?

- Problem solving mechanisms?

- Financial management practices at the country level institutions? How has the accountability-trail been ensured? Are the financial management duties disaggregated?

- Administrative costs in the North and South parts of the network regarding individual projects?

#### *The Ministry for Foreign Affairs*

- Role of MFA in giving guidance to the programme?

- Contact platforms, and frequency of contacts?

- Mechanisms to monitor and follow-up progress?

- Efficiency in terms of human resources *versus* outputs?

## **5 Methodology**

The evaluation should use multiple methods to arrive at a common conclusion. It is necessary to peruse relevant documentation and also use different ways of interviews, individual, groups, institution-based etc. The methodology will be specified in the inception report of the evaluation team in full details. For the sake of logical process, it is advisable that the team composes matrix-formatted tables in which the evaluation questions and sources of verifications and indicators can be identified. Such matrix should be an annex in the inception report and can be appended also to the final evaluation report.

## **6 Work Plan and Time Table**

The evaluation team will need to compose a work-plan, called inception report, which is detailed and gives a firm basis to this evaluation. It will describe the approach and methodologies used and the sources and modalities of verification. It will also highlight the critical issues or dimensions to be looked at. The distribution of tasks between the team members will be specified. Travel plans are included and time-tables for each phase of the work.

The work can be divided to phases. Work carried out in Finland will include perusal of relevant documentation, as well as contacts and interviews, possible e-mail surveys etc. at the central administrative level (MFA and CIMO) as well as at the higher education institutions. Institutions or polytechnics to be visited in Finland should be specified.

There evaluation assessments done at the field level in Nepal, Uganda, and Tanzania. The work-plan should already identify the institutions and confirmed availability of relevant people in the network institutions in these countries.

Because the evaluation will immediately be followed by the Project Document compilation process, which needs to be ready early enough for decision-making towards the end of 2009, the time table of the evaluation is quite tight. The final report of the evaluation must be ready not later than mid-September 2009.

## 7 Expertise Required

The Evaluation task renders itself **to senior experts** with significant experience from education-related development cooperation, exchange programmes or similar. Familiarity with the countries concerned. A good constellation of carrying out of this evaluation assignment would be that local senior experts are identified in each of the countries of field assessments (Nepal, Uganda and Tanzania, the latter two can be combined). It is necessary for the **Team Leader** to have significant team leadership experience in evaluations, including evaluation of education sector, and ability to steer a complex process involving many stakeholders and levels of activity. Also the **Team Members** must be senior experts and have experience in development related missions, including evaluation tasks.

The detailed qualifications of the experts shall be contained in the **Instructions to Tendered** document which constitutes Annex A to the Invitation to Tender, in which this Terms of Reference is Annex B.

## 8 Reporting

In the reporting, the evaluation team is encouraged to consult the *Evaluation Guidelines: Between Past and Future (2007)* of the Ministry. These guidelines contain suggested outlines for the list of contents of the evaluation reports. The ministry will separately issue Instructions to Authors, which must be followed scrupulously, so that the final report is ready-to-print and copy-edited. Should language checking be necessary, the consultant is advised to use a native speaker professional. The evaluation report shall address all the issues raised in this ToR. Should the experts consider necessary to address some additional points, they should do so.

The evaluation team will issue the following reports:

- Inception Report: as described above in item 6. above. It shall be ready not later than two weeks from the start-up of the evaluation. The Ministry will facilitate the acquisition of relevant archived materials to the extent available in the Ministry.
- Draft Final Report: The semi-final report will be in the format of the Final report and be subjected to a round of comments with important parties to the programme. A two-week commenting period is allowed. Collated comments are delivered to the evaluation team by the Ministry, which shall consider the comments and take them into account to the extent they deem appropriate and necessary. Any actual errors need to be corrected. The Draft Final Report already includes also the separate contributions from the field and the basic analyses done on the entire portfolio of findings.
- Final Report: The Final Report must be written in a clear and concise manner by using language that opens up also to non-native English speakers and non-specialists to the topic of the evaluation. The findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation must appear clearly in separate chapters. Recommendations are kept to those necessary, and feasible in view of the continuation of the programme. The number of pages should not exceed 30, annexes excluded. Annex no. 1 is the ToR, Annex no. 2 is the list of people interviewed, other annexes can be added if need arises. The Final Report must be ready not later than the end of the first week of September 2009.

The Final Report shall be clear and concise written with language that is easily comprehensible by ordinary readers. The body-text should not exceed 30 pages, the Abstracts (Finnish, Swedish and English) and summary (Finnish, Swedish and English) and the summarising table excluded from this number of pages. Annex 1 of the report is the Terms of Reference, Annex 2 People interviewed and other annexes can be used as need arises.

The OECD/DAC Development Evaluation Quality Standards should be observed in the compilation of the contents of the report. The Evaluation Team is requested to reflect the report against a matrix based on these standards. The matrix is submitted together with the report to the Ministry. The Quality of the report is assessed against the EU Evaluation quality matrix. Both documents can be obtained from the Ministry at the time of commencement of the Contract, or to be downloaded from the respective web-pages.

The evaluation reports are published in the name of the authors of the report, which should be an incentive for a good quality and well finished product. Separate Instructions to Authors of the Evaluation reports shall be provided to the Evaluation Team.

The report is submitted in the electronic form as Word and PDF-files. In addition, the final report shall be forwarded to the Ministry with a covering letter of the consultant, as one original and three paper copies of the final report.

Oral Presentation of the results of the evaluation is organized after completion of the evaluation and submission of the Final Report by the consultants. The team leader should be prepared to give a power point presentation -supported oral presentation of the main findings. The event of presentation is usually open to everyone interested in the topic.

## **9 Time Schedule**

The timing of carrying out this evaluation is not optional due to summer months. However, it is foreseen that the desk-phase and at least part of the interviews in Finland can be performed during May-early June 2009. In the option that the partner country studies were done by locally hired experts, these experts could do their respective studies simultaneously. The analysis and synthesis phase of the evaluation would then have the time of July to mid-August 2009. The Final Report must be finished by the end of the first week of September 2009.

## **10 Budget**

The budget of this evaluation is a maximum of 70.000 euro, VAT excluded.

## **11 Mandate**

The evaluators are expected to contact and consult necessary stakeholders, individuals and institutions to perform this evaluation task. However, they are not allowed to make any commitments on behalf of the Government of Finland or any of the institutions involved.

Helsinki, 27 March 2009

Aira Päivöke  
Director



- REPORT 2006:2 Evaluation of CIMO North-South Higher Education Network Programme  
ISBN: 951-724-549-1, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2006:1 Evaluation of Environmental Management in Finland's Development Cooperation  
ISBN: 951-724-546-7, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2005:6 Evaluation of Support Allocated to International Non-Governmental Organisations (INGO)  
ISBN: 951-724-531-9, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2005:5 Evaluation of the Service Centre for Development Cooperation in Finland (KEPA)  
ISBN: 951-724-523-8, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2005:4 Gender Baseline Study for Finnish Development Cooperation  
ISBN: 951-724-521-1, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2005:3 Evaluation of Finnish Health Sector Development Cooperation 1994–2003  
ISBN: 951-724-493-2, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2005:2 Evaluation of Finnish Humanitarian Assistance 1996–2004  
ISBN: 951-724-491-6, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2005:1 Ex-Ante Evaluation of Finnish Development Cooperation in the Mekong Region  
ISBN: 955-742-478-9, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2004:4 Refocusing Finland's Cooperation with Namibia  
ISBN: 955-724-477-0, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2004:3 Evaluation of the Development Cooperation Activities of Finnish NGOs and Local Cooperation Funds in Tanzania  
ISBN: 951-724-449-5, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2004:2 Evaluation of Finland's Development Cooperation with Bosnia and Herzegovina  
ISBN: 951-724-446-0, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2004:1 Evaluation of Finnish Education Sector Development Cooperation  
ISBN: 951-724-440-1, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2003:3 Label Us Able – A Pro-active Evaluation of Finnish Development co-operation from the disability perspective  
ISBN 951-724-425-8, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2003:2 Evaluation of Finnish Forest Sector Development Co-operation  
PART 2  
ISBN 951-724-416-9 ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2003:2 Evaluation of Finnish Forest Sector Development Co-operation  
PART 1  
ISBN 951-724-407-X, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2003:1 Evaluation of the Finnish Concessional Credit Scheme  
ISBN 951-724-400-2, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2002:9 Evaluation of the Development Cooperation Activities of Finnish NGOs in Kenya  
ISBN 951-724-392-8, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2002:8 Synthesis Study of Eight Country Programme Evaluations  
ISBN 951-724-386-3, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2002:7 Review of Finnish Training in Chemical Weapons Verification  
ISBN 951-724-378-2, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2002:6 Kansalaisjärjestöjen Kehyssopimusjärjestelmän arviointi  
ISBN 951-724-376-6, ISSN 1235-7618
- REPORT 2002:5 Evaluation of the Bilateral Development Co-operation Programme between Kenya and Finland  
ISBN 951-724-373-1, ISSN 1235-7618

Evaluation report 2009:7  
ISBN 978-951-724-790-0 (printed)  
ISBN 978-951-724-791-7 (pdf)  
ISSN 1235-7618

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland



## ANNEX 2 PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

NON-EDITED

### Ministry for Foreign Affairs

Aira Päivöke	Head of Evaluation Unit
Kirsi Pulkkinen	Programme Officer, Department for Dev. Policy
Kari Leppänen	Counsellor (Development, Embassy of Finland, <b>Nepal</b> )
Joshi Chudamani	Programme Coordinator, Embassy of Finland, <b>Nepal</b>
Jussi Karakoski	Education advisor

### Centre for International Mobility / N-S-S Advisory Board

Riitta Oksanen	Head of Unit, Development Policy and Planning, Member of Advisory Board
Juha Ketolainen	Chairman of Advisory Board
Kaija Pajala	Specialist (responsible for N-S-S)
Marianne Rönkä	Programme Coordinator
Mervi Kankkunen	Specialist
Eeva Simonen	Assistant
Henna Juusonen	SAMOK
Liisa Savunen	Secretary General, Council of University Rectors
Elena Gorschkow-Salonranta	SYL/Separate interview, 14.08.2009

### Diaconia University of Applied Sciences

#### HOPE Network

Anne Meretmaa	Lecturer, International Coordinator. NSS Acad. coord.
Riikka Hälikkä	Administrative Coordinator
Rebecca Sinha	Campus Chief, Lalitpur Nursing Campus, Nepal
Radha Devi Bangdel	Deputy Campus Chief
Fr. Anthonyany	Principal, St. Xavier's College, Nepal
Himal Gautam	Academic coordinator
Dipti Sherchan	Returned exchange student
?	Returned exchange student
?	Returned exchange student
SP Kalaunee	Director, Human Dev. & Comm. Services, NGO, Nepal
Pauli Saksa	Returned exchange student
Anu Karjalainen	Returned exchange student
Oskari Karlsson	Returned exchange student

### Journalism for Civic Involvement, Democracy and Development (Jocid Network II)

Susanna Pyörre	Academic Coordinator
----------------	----------------------

### University of Joensuu

#### OPEN DOORS Network

Ramawatar Yadav	Vice Chancellor, Purbanchal University, Nepal
Manohar Bhattarai	Vice Chairman, High Level Commission for Information Technology, Govt. of Nepal
Erkki Sutinen	Professor, Academic Coordinator, Joensuu Univ.
Ilkka Jormanainen	Univ. of Joensuu, NSS Assistant Acad. Coordinator
Pawan Kumar Jha	University of Purbanchal, IC lecturer
Nitin Bhagat	Teaching Assistant, Purbanchal Univ.
Tirtharaj Sapkola	Lecturer, Purbanchal Univ.
Outi Savolainen	Administrative Coordinator, Joensuu University
Raj Kumar Thakur	University of Purbanchal, faculty exchange
Clint Rogers	Univ. of Joensuu, IC lecturer
Matti Tedre	Associate Professor, Iringa Univ. College, Tanzania
Marcu Duveskog	Returned Faculty exchangee
Andrew Mollel	PhD student, Dean of Faculty, Tumaini University
Mikko Vesisenaho	Ex-Assistant Academic Coordinator
Barun Kharai	Returned exchange student (Tanzania)

Sade Lind	Returned exchange student (Tanzania)
Rahul Agrowal	Student participant in IC course, Biratnagar, Nepali
Sanni Bomberg	Student participant in IC course, Biratnagar, Finnish
Sharika Khadka	Student participant in IC course, Biratnagar, Nepali
Komal Mandal	Student participant in IC course, Biratnagar, Nepali
Kwangu Masalu	Student participant in IC course, Biratnagar, Tanzanian
Heavenlight Mshana	Student participant in IC course, Biratnagar, Tanzanian
Dharti Raj Sha	Student participant in IC course, Biratnagar, Nepali
Joonas Toivanen	Student participant in IC course, Biratnagar, Finnish
Rajeer Kumar Ray	Lecturer
Teemu Laine	Returned Faculty exchangee
Miriam Munezero	IC participant, Tanzania
Fadhili George N'gunda	Tanzanian exchange student

### **University of Oulu**

Kimmo Kuorti	Director of International Relations
Anja Mäläskä	Deputy Director of International Relations, NSS admin. coordinator

### **ProENV2**

Prof. Riitta Keiski	Vice Rector Oulu University, Coordinator
Reeta Ylönen	Lecturer

### **Triangular Cooperation in Library and Information Services between Finland, Namibia and the Republic of South Africa**

Maija-Leena Huotari	Professor, Academic Coordinator
Catherine Benkes-Amiss	Exchange faculty, Univ. of Namibia

### **Quality Teacher Education as Cornerstone for Sustainable Development**

Riitta-Liisa Korkeamäki	Professor, Academic Coordinator
Rauni Räsänen	Professor, Retired Ac. Coordinator (from 01.09.09)
Gordon Roberts	Senior Lecturer
Hanna Alasuutari	Researcher
Jani Haapakoski	Ed. Faculty Intl. Coordinator
Ebby Mbanga	University of Zambia Exchange student
Magda Karjalainen	University of Oulu Exchange student

### **Tourism for Development**

Alli Tynjälä	University of Oulu Exchange student
Fredriika Jakola	University of Oulu Exchange student

### **North Carelia University of Applied Science**

#### **Omusati II**

Katriina Korhonen	Administrative coordinator, North Carelia UAS
Pirjo Saramäki	Academic Coordinator
Janne Ihanus	Returned exchange student (Botswana)
Osmo Koponen	Returned exchange student (Namibia)
Heikki Kukkonen	Returned exchange student (Namibia)
Jaakko Tuominen	Returned exchange student (Namibia)
Emily Ndongo	Exchange student (Namibia)
Tretias Haimbala	Exchange student (Namibia)

### **Bobiri Project**

Ari Pappinen	Academic coordinator
--------------	----------------------

### **University of Jyväskylä**

Tuija Koponen	Administrative Coordinator
---------------	----------------------------

### **The Role of Music in Strengthening Cultural Identity in Southern Africa 2009–2011**

Jukka Louhivuori	Professor, Academic Coordinator
------------------	---------------------------------

## **Research-based Knowledge for Integrated Sustainable Development**

Bidemi Coker Junior Lecture, returned faculty exch. Zambia  
Lisa Jokivirta Junior lecturer, Chair of network meeting, Zambia

### **Health Africa**

Helli Kitinoja Administrative coordinator, Seinäjoki UAS  
Raija Tolonen SEAMK, Exchange faculty to Kenya  
Merja Seppälä Academic coordinator, Kokkola UAS  
Helena Kuvaja Exchange student to Uganda, Seinäjoki UAS  
Asta Saikkonen Exchange student to Uganda, Seinäjoki UAS  
Essi Korkeakoski Financial management, Seinäjoki UAS  
Raija Tolonen Exchange student to Kenya, Seinäjoki UAS  
Sirpa Nygård Exchange faculty to Kenya and Uganda, Seinäjoki UAS,  
*Interviews in Uganda*  
Ms. Christine Alura Principal, Public Health Nurses' College, University of Makerere, Academic Coordinator  
Ms. Irene M. Ndazizale Secretary, Public Health Nurses' College, University of Makerere  
Dr. John Jumlee Director of Mpigi Health Center  
Dr. Godfrey Onyango Principal Dental Officer, Mulago Hospital, Governing Board Member, Nursing College  
Ms. Consolata Iyogil Faculty Exchange to Finland, Public Health Nurses' College  
Ms. Beatrice Akiiki Faculty Exchange to Finland, Public Health Nurses' College  
Ms. Joanina J. Ococi Faculty Exchange to Finland, Public Health Nurses' College  
Ms. Alice Grace Alanyo Exchange Student to Finland, Public Health Nurses' College  
Ms. Priscilla Twinomugisha Faculty Exchange to Finland, Public Health Nurses' College  
Ms. Harriet ? Exchange Student to Finland, Public Health Nurses' College  
Eng. Henry Francis Okinyal Ministry of Education and Sports, Director of Industrial Training, previous Commissioner

### **Sustainable Development and Human Rights**

Elina Pirjatanniemi Academic Coordinator, Åbo Akademi  
Kati Frostell Administrative Coordinator, Åbo Akademi  
Taimi Sitari Faculty Exchange to Tanzania, University of Turku, Department of Geography  
Leena-Maija Lauren Faculty Exchange, Intensive course in Zansibar, Turku School of Economics, Institute of Future Research  
Paavo Kotiaho Exchange Student to South Africa, Åbo Akademi  
Ms. Mercy Njoroge Exchange Student, University of Pretoria, Centre for Human Rights to Åbo Akademi  
*Interviews in Uganda*  
Dr. Edward Wamala University of Makerere, Faculty of Arts, Dept. of Philosophy  
Dr. S.A. Mwanahewa University of Makerere, Faculty of Arts, Dept. of Philosophy  
Mr. Edson Ngirabakunzi PhD-Student, University of Makerere, Faculty of Arts, Dept. of Philosophy, future exchange student to Finland, participated in disability conference through funding from FIDIDA  
Mr. Birungi Deogratias Exchange Student - Intensive course in Zanzibar, University of Makerere, Faculty of Arts, Dept. of Philosophy,  
Mr. Robert Kakuru Exchange Student to Finland, University of Makerere, Faculty of Arts, Dept. of Philosophy  
Mr. Fred Mabonga Exchange Student-Intensive course participant in

Zanzibar, University of Makerere, Faculty of Arts, Dept. of Philosophy

### **Globalisation and the Body**

Dr. Consolata Kabonesa      University of Makerere, Head of Women&Gender Studies, Academic Coordinator

### **East Africa Technomathematics II**

Matti Heiliö      Academic Coordinator, Lappeenranta University of Technology  
Anna Makkonen      Administrative Coordinator, Lappeenranta University of Technology  
Mr. Philibert Mugabo      Exchange Student to Finland, National University of Rwanda  
Ms. Nampala Hasifa      Exchange Student to Finland, University of Dar-es-Salaam, Ugandan national  
Mr. Innocent Rusagara      Exchange Student to Finland, Kigali Institute of Science and Technology, Rwanda

### *Interviews in Uganda*

Dr. John Mango Magero      Academic Coordinator, University of Makerere, Department of Mathematics  
Dr. Vincent A. Ssembatya      Dean, Faculty of Science, University of Makerere  
Dr. George William Nasinyama      Deputy Director (Research), School of Graduate Studies, University of Makerere

### **FINPE**

Ilari Sääksjärvi      Academic Coordinator, University of Turku, Faculty of Science  
Pia le Grand      Administrative Coordinator, University of Turku, Faculty of Science  
Liisa Puhakka      Exchange Student to Peru, University of Turku, Faculty of Science

### **Finnish-South-African-GAME- the Foresight Game as a tool for generating future scenarios**

Olli Hietanen      Administrative Coordinator, Turku School of Economics and Business Administration, Centre for Future Research

### **COHSE- Community and environment**

Sanna Merisalo      Administrative Coordinator, Turku UAS  
Kyösti Voima      Academic Coordinator, DIAK, Coordinator of International Affairs  
Sakari Kainulainen      Faculty Exchange to Swaziland, DIAK, Director of Research

### **Journalism Network, Twining Finnish and African Journalism Education Institutions**

Ulla-Maija Kivikuru      Academic Coordinator, University of Helsinki

### **FANM (Finnish-African Exchange Network for Higher Education in Music)**

Tuovi Martinsen      Academic Coordinator, Sibelius Academy, Office of International Affairs  
Leena Veijonsuo      Administrative Coordinator, Sibelius Academy, Office of International Affairs  
Jari Perkiömäki      Vice-Principal, Sibelius Academy  
Tapani Länsiö      Faculty Exchange to Ghana, Sibelius Academy  
Tiina Mäkelä      Exchange Student to Ghana, Sibelius Academy

### **Well-Net Avenue**

Leena Tikka      Academic Coordinator, Savonia UAS,  
Marja Lappalainen      Administrative Coordinator, Savonia UAS, Head of

Riitta Vehviläinen	Research and Development
Teija Rantala	Financial Secretary, Savonia UAS
	Faculty Exchange to Mozambique, Project engineer, Savonia UAS
Hilkka Tapola	Faculty Exchange to Mozambique, Savonia UAS
Elisa Lahtinen	Exchange Student to Mozambique, Savonia UAS

### **PHEN-N-S-S Public Health Higher Education Network**

Jussi Kauhanen	Academic Coordinator, Professor, University of Kuopio, Faculty of Medicine, School of Public Health and Clinical Nutrition
Paola Kontro	Administrative Coordinator, University of Kuopio, School of Public Health and Clinical Nutrition
Juhani Miettola	Faculty Exchange-Intensive course in Tanzania, University of Kuopio, School of Public Health and Clinical Nutrition
Marjo Jantunen	Exchange Student to Kenya, University of Kuopio, School of Public Health and Clinical Nutrition
Laura Kauhanen	Assistant in Public Health, Intensive Course in Kenya
Mr. Asenath Nyantika	Faculty exchange (2006), Student Exchange (post-graduate, 2009) from Nigeria, University of Kuopio, School of Public Health and Clinical Nutrition
Mr. Olawale Omoniyi	Exchange Student from Kenya, University of Kuopio, School of Public Health and Clinical Nutrition

### **INDEHELA-Education**

Mikko Korpela	Academic Coordinator, University of Kuopio, HIS Research and Development Unit, Adjunct Professor
Tuija Tiihonen	Faculty Exchange to Nigeria, University of Kuopio, HIS Research and Development Unit, Researcher

### **Ethiopia-Sudan-Finland Higher Education Network in Forest Sciences**

Eshetu Yirdaw	Academic&administrative Coordinator, University of Helsinki, Department of Forestry
---------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

15 interviewees from Programme level

149 interviewees from network level

## ANNEX 3 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Airas-Hyödynmaa M & Balme L (eds.) 2009 *Accross the Borders – Internationalisation of Finnish Higher Education*. CIMO, Libris 1000, 430 p. ISBN 978-951-805-272-5.

CIMO *Advisory Group Meetings´ Minutes*.

CIMO *Applications, Project Plans and Qualitative Reports of the N-S-S Network*.  
<http://cimo.fi/nss/admin>

CIMO 2009 *Report on the Pilot Phase of the North-South Programme*.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2007 *Evaluation Guidelines – Between past and future*. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Hakapaino Oy, Helsinki, 92 p. ISBN 978-951-724-624-8.