
Mozambique In-Country Scholarship Assistance Scheme (ICSAS)

Independent Completion Review

Final Report

10 December 2007

Table of Contents

<i>Abbreviations</i>	<i>and</i>	<i>Acronyms</i>	iii
.....			
<i>Basic</i>	<i>Activity</i>	<i>Data</i>	iv
.....			
<i>Executive</i>		<i>Summary</i>	vi
.....			
1	Method and context		
1.1	<i>Method</i>		1
1.2	<i>Country context</i>		1
2	Relevance		
2.1	<i>Assessment of objectives and programming logic</i>		3
2.2	<i>Aid delivery choices – forms of aid</i>		4
2.3	<i>Appropriateness of management and institutional arrangements</i>		4
3	Effectiveness		
3.1	<i>Achievements</i>		5
3.2	<i>Qualitative management assessment</i>		7
3.2.1	<i>Risk management</i>		7
3.2.2	<i>Procurement</i>		7
3.2.3	<i>Technical assistance</i>		7
3.2.4	<i>Monitoring and Joint Management Committee supervision</i>		8
3.2.5	<i>Coordination</i>		9
3.2.6	<i>Partner government commitments</i>		10
3.2.7	<i>Overall management</i>		10
3.2.8	<i>Recipient/beneficiary participation</i>		10
4	Efficiency		
4.1	<i>Cost effectiveness and least cost solutions</i>		12
4.2	<i>Timeliness of meeting objectives</i>		13
5	Impact and sustainability		
5.1	<i>Impact</i>		14
5.1.1	<i>Overview</i>		14
5.1.2	<i>Institutional impact</i>		15
5.1.3	<i>Gender equality</i>		15
5.1.4	<i>Other impacts</i>		15
5.2	<i>Sustainability</i>		16
.			
6	Overall quality		

6.1	Objectives.....	17
6.2	Results measurement	18
6.3	Management.....	18
6.4	Sustainability.....	18
6.5	Technical quality	19
6.6	Overall quality.....	19
7	Lessons Learned	20
8	Overall conclusions	
8.1	Summary assessment.....	25
8.2	Future options for using in-country scholarship programs	25
8.3	Preferred mechanisms.....	25
 Appendices		
Appendix 1	Terms of reference.....	27
Appendix 2	Program of activities	33
Appendix 3	PCC monitoring	34
Appendix 4	Annual expenditure and scholarship numbers.....	36
	References.....	38

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ADS	Australian Development Scholarships
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
GOA	Government of Australia
GOM	Government of Mozambique
HE	Higher Education
HRD	Human Resource Development
ICSAS	In-Country Scholarship Assistance [Award] Scheme
IHS	Institute of Health Sciences
ICR	Independent Completion Review
ICRT	Independent Completion Review Team
IBE	Instituto de Bolsas de Estudo
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOHEST	Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology
MOEC	Ministry of Education and Culture
MOH	Ministry of Health
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non Government Organisation
NORAD	Norwegian Aid Agency
PCC	Program Coordination Committee
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SWAp	Sector Wide Approach
TA	Technical Assistance
TORs	Terms of Reference
UEM	Universidade Eduardo Mondlane
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UP	Universidade Pedagógica

Basic Activity Data

Map



Location:

Maputo & UP campuses in Beira & Nampula

Implementing Counterpart agencies:

Universidade Eduardo Mondlane (UEM)

Universidade Pedagógica (UP)

Institute of Health Sciences (IHS)

Designated Executing Authorities:

Government of Mozambique:

Ministry of Education (MOE)

Government of Australia:

Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)

Key dates

Commencement:

1988. Final Phase 1 July 2001

Reviews:

1995 & 2000.

Final phase: None

Phasing:

1. 1988 – 2001 (mainly funded using food aid sale proceeds.)
2. Final Phase: Initially 3 years 2001/02 – 2004/05.
3. Exit phase (No new students) 2004/05 – 2005/06.

Completion:

30 June 2006

Costs:

Approved cost final phase:

\$1,750,000 (some funds were utilised for previous phase expenditures)

Actual cost:

\$ 1,740,000 (of which \$1,573,000 was utilised for final phase)

Counterpart contributions:

Not costed – in kind

Form of Aid

Bilateral/Training using Scholarships

Executive Summary

1 Overview

The In-Country Scholarship Award Scheme (ICSAS) achieved its stated goal and in its final 5-year phase which ended June 2006 also achieved its component level objectives. It was relevant in terms of the AusAID's Aid Framework for Africa. The management and institutional arrangements were appropriate and cost effective overall.

The program scored 5 on a scale of 1 to 6, defined as a '*good quality initiative*' that could have improved in some areas with minor work. It was assessed as highly efficient and achieved sustainable outcomes and positive impact overall. Because its goal was pitched at the achievement of academic qualifications there was no requirement to monitor post-study outcomes and broader level impact could not therefore be assessed. There is evidence that some of the graduates from one institution have been unable to obtain gainful employment.

Statistical gender targets were largely met, in part by transferring women from the government scholarship scheme. There was strong institutional ownership facilitated by a partnership approach between AusAID and institutional staff. Several graduates from the program have subsequently qualified for post graduate scholarship awards in Australia.

2 Summary table

Initiative title: Moz In-Country Scholarship Award Scheme AidWorks ID: 002L01	
Country/region:	Mozambique/Africa
Date initiative commenced:	1 July 2001 (Final phase)
Date initiative completed:	30 June 2006
Initiative cost to Australia:	\$ 1,573,000 (During 5-year period)
Total initiative cost:	\$ 1,573,000 (During 5-year period)
Delivery organisation:	Mozambique post-secondary education institutions: UP; UEM & IHS
Counterpart organisation:	GOM Ministry of Education
Primary sector of initiative:	Education
Main Country Strategy Objective contributed to:	Increasing the productivity of the poor through education/skills training
Form of aid:	Bilateral / Training
Final initiative quality rating:	5
Economic rate of return or similar, if available:	Not applicable
ICR authors and their organisations:	Kai Detto / Lengano P/L Hubertina van Eys / Progresso Association
Contact AusAID employee(s):	Sally Mackay / Anita Menete

3 Achievements

Goal: To assist academically qualified persons mainly from the provinces and from poor and disadvantaged families of Mozambique to gain university and other relevant post-secondary qualifications in fields of study that are relevant to national development, namely health, agriculture, food security, and English language training.

- The program was able to support a significant number of ICSAS awardees obtain post secondary qualifications, facilitated by high success/graduation rates among awardees
 - however not all graduates from one of the three institutions supported (UEM), have been able to obtain gainful employment
- Awardees were selected both on academic performance and economic need and a significant number came from the provinces
- Fields of study reflected priority areas nominated by the GOM
- Some graduates have subsequently qualified for ADS scholarships for postgraduate study in Australia.

Purpose: To establish a funding mechanism with higher education institutions whereby up to 300 Mozambican nationals receive Australian financial assistance. The funding mechanism will also be used to provide relevant texts to participating institutions on an annual basis, particularly English language training resources.

- The funding mechanism was functioning effectively during the final phase of the program
- Over the 3 years ending June 2004, 300 students were receiving scholarship assistance at any one time and more than 300 students were assisted over that period
- Each institution received funds to purchase library texts covering the priority disciplines being studied by ICSAS students who participated in the selection of books that also benefited the wider student community.

Objective 1:

Ensure that adequate funds are provided to Universities at the commencement of each semester to cover the costs of 300 scholarship holders at any one time throughout each academic year for three (3) years from academic year 2001-02 (commencing in August) until academic years 2003 – 2004.

- From 2001/02 payments were made direct to the Beira and Nampula campuses of the central institution (UP) which helped ensure timely payments to most scholarship holders
- Institutional reporting and acquittal of funds improved progressively over the life of the program which in turn enabled the timely transfer of funds and payment to students of their monthly allowances and other entitlements
 - however while all entitlements were eventually paid some students continued to experience delays in receiving their payments.

Objective 2:

Ensure that comprehensive information on ICSAS (selection criteria and procedure, award conditions, benefits of the award) is made available to all interested award candidates.

- A comprehensive brochure on program entitlements was produced by AusAID which enabled a significant number of students to obtain reliable information on their entitlements
 - however AusAID monitoring and interviews by the ICRT revealed that some students did not receive the brochure given that it was not reissued for the benefit of later entrants to the program

Objective 3:

Ensure awardees are selected in accordance with agreed ICSAS criteria prior to the commencement of the academic year, and that all awardees receive their full benefits for the duration of the award if they maintain their scholarship status.

- AusAID monitoring and ICRT interviews of students confirmed that overall, a highly transparent and fair selection process applied in each institution
- Selection was based on criteria that had been agreed with AusAID and endorsed by the PCC
- Gender targets were set and achieved, although apart from setting and monitoring the achievement of statistical targets, more in-depth analysis might have achieved better gender outcomes overall.

Objective 4:

Achieve cost-effective management and reporting by each participating institution of all aspects of the program, in accordance with Annual Work Plans and Budgets agreed between AusAID, participating education institutions and the Ministry of Education.

- Cost effective management and reporting was achieved during the final phase of the program using a range of good practice techniques:
 - 2002 ICSAS Review recommendations formed the basis of an Action Plan that was owned and accepted by institutions and DOE
 - an effective PCC that monitored progress and also organised a workshop attended by all stakeholders where challenges to achieving good management were identified and solutions agreed
 - a partnership approach with AusAID staff and the provision of technical and other capacity building support to student administration areas
 - the involvement of student beneficiaries in the PCC and cost-effective monitoring by AusAID staff.

4 Assessment

Relevance

The ICRT confirms the appropriateness of the ICSAS objectives as refined in 2000/01 based on AusAID's revised Aid Framework. However, the ICRT concludes that improved targeting at design (in terms of the institutions and fields of study) coupled with some post-study monitoring could have improved the sustainability of the initiative overall taking into account broader country program level objectives. The choice of delivery organisation was entirely appropriate. Partner agencies met their commitments and the management and institutional arrangements utilised for this final phase of the program are assessed as appropriate.

Effectiveness

The activity attained its objectives overall. There was no formal risk management plan but risks were managed appropriately through the effective use and monitoring of an Action Plan and appropriate audit activity. Procurement was managed effectively by the implementing institutions. Monitoring particularly through a joint management committee was effective. Coordination with other donors was lacking and there was no coordination with other AusAID programs. There was some correlation between ICSAS and the government scholarship program. Recipient/beneficiary participation was a particular strength. Management arrangements were effective overall.

Efficiency

The ICRT concludes that in its management and administration the initiative represented the least-cost solution. There was strong beneficiary ownership and key program partners provided counterpart contributions. Serious management and operational shortcomings identified by the 2000 Review were addressed and rectified. AusAID inputs were not needed at the levels specified after the first year of the new program phase. A contracting approach would have been more costly, counterpart contributions would have been more limited and the partner and beneficiary ownership benefits might not have been realised. Overall, a smaller number of scholarships would have been funded and there would have been fewer graduates. Objectives were met on time given subsequent approval and implementation of a 2-year exit phase.

Impact and sustainability

The program achieved its desired training impact. It was not designed to intervene beyond graduation; however the goal statement implies that graduates would ultimately use their qualifications to benefit national development in Mozambique. There was no provision for post-scholarship monitoring and data is not available on how graduates used their qualifications. The ICRT found that some graduates from one institution have been unable to obtain full-time employment but it seems clear that graduates from the other two institutions have obtained gainful employment. At least two thirds of ICSAS beneficiaries can therefore be said to be contributing to national development.

Gender targets were met but gender outcomes could probably have been improved. There was some institutional capacity building with systems developed by the program still in use in one of the three institutions. An unplanned but potentially significant impact is that some ICSAS graduates have qualified for AusAID ADS awards for postgraduate study in Australia.

The activity was genuinely demand driven and targeted appropriate beneficiaries; there were strong incentives for beneficiary involvement and performance; the activity was sensitive to gender issues and it ultimately provided for a 2-year phase out strategy. Activity timeframes were appropriate to promote the desired outcomes enabling more than 300 Mozambican nationals to obtain post-secondary qualifications in the final phase. These factors all contributed to sustainable outcomes within the scheme's narrow design parameters.

It was beyond the scope of the scheme to facilitate employment outcomes of graduates although, given that some are still unemployed, improved targeting at design (in terms of the institutions and fields of study) coupled with some post-study monitoring could have improved the sustainability of the initiative overall taking into account broader country program level objectives.

5 Summary scores (out of a total of 6)

<u>Achievement of objectives and contribution to higher level program strategy objectives:</u>	5
<u>Robustness of system to measure ongoing achievement of objectives and /results:</u>	5
<u>Effectiveness of management and good value for money:</u>	6
<u>Appropriateness of sustainability of initiative outcomes:</u>	5
<u>Highest technical quality based on sound analysis and learning:</u>	5
<u>Overall quality:</u>	5

6 Lessons

Lessons identified by the ICRT address the following issues:

- Reviews need a clear action plan and the resource implications of review recommendations must be managed effectively.
- In-country scholarship programs are well suited to partner implementation facilitated by a team-based approach between staff of the donor and implementing agencies.
- Complementary institutional support can have a significant impact on scholarship program outcomes in terms of ownership, commitment and sustainability.
- The implementation and monitoring of gender targets requires careful analysis beyond the achievement of statistical results.
- To ensure transparency and ownership, direct beneficiary participation in monitoring arrangements could be considered for overseas scholarship programs where these are strongly targeted towards particular agencies or groups of students.
- Incentive-based approaches can be effective at project level in maximising desired outcomes.
- Strong donor identity for such programs can lead to high expectations on the part of beneficiaries of ongoing donor support after the funds have been disbursed.
- An exit strategy helps ensure more sustainable outcomes but should preferably be developed and incorporated into the initial program design.
- Given the current financial reforms in the higher education sector in Mozambique, future in-country donor scholarships may need to be pooled with those of the government and other donors.
- The impact of programs of this kind may easily be overstated when outcomes monitoring is not built into the program design.
- Post-scholarship monitoring, possibly involving reporting by institutions on where graduates are employed is likely to add value by allowing conclusions to be drawn about the proportion of graduates contributing to national development. Designers and implementers of such programs need to give more attention to anticipated post-award scholarship outcomes.
- In-country scholarship programs funded by AusAID should at least acknowledge at design that there may be a future connection with other AusAID scholarship programs and consider whether this should influence any of the design parameters.
- Completion Reviews need to be implemented soon after program completion.

7 Future options for using in-country scholarship programs

Overall, in-country scholarship programs can be an effective form of aid. However, in the current context of Mozambique and perhaps elsewhere, serious consideration needs to be given pooling such support with other scholarship programs consistent with donor harmonisation and financial reforms in the tertiary education sector.

More generally, before launching any future in-country scholarship programs in Africa or elsewhere, serious consideration needs to be given to a more targeted approach. Targeting could take into account possible linkages with other higher level scholarship programs involving study overseas. Targeting should also take into account the employment prospects of scholarship holders and that post-award outcomes should be monitored.

Where pooling of funds is not feasible, implementation should ideally be managed by the beneficiary institutions working in partnership with donor staff. Students should be involved in monitoring and coordination arrangements. Some modest levels of complementary technical assistance should be funded as necessary and other complementary support inputs should be considered. For programs of this kind, commercial contractors may not be cost effective and may be less likely to achieve institutional ownership and sustainability outcomes.

1 Method and context

1.1 Method

The objectives of this independent review of ICSAS were to assess its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability and to draw out lessons. In preparing an Independent Completion Report (ICR), the ICRT followed new Interim Guidelines published by AusAID's Office of Development Effectiveness in May 2007. The Guidelines assume the existence of a separate *Completion Report*. In the absence of a program contractor such a Report had not been prepared.

In accordance with the Review's terms of reference, the assessment process was participatory and involved joint analysis with AusAID local staff previously involved in program monitoring and staff of implementing partners. Terms of reference are at *Appendix 1*.

The team undertook an extensive review of program documentation as detailed in the *References Appendix*. This was followed in-country by discussions with AusAID staff, government agencies and administration and academic staff of each of the three education institutions. The ICRT also met with small groups of student beneficiaries as well as with other major donors providing in-country scholarships.

ICSAS ended more than 12 months ago. However given that new students were not admitted to the program after June 2004 and that some of AusAID's monitoring ended at that time it was not always possible to meet with institutional staff directly involved in program management. The ICRT was unable to access institutional databases to extract student statistics beyond the material in *Appendix 3* taken from AusAID records. There was no post-scholarship monitoring during the life of the program. The ICRT meetings with graduates allow some conclusions to be drawn about subsequent employment outcomes but do not reflect a reliable statistical sample for reasons discussed in this Report.

1.2 Country context

General

Following the end of the internal war, the signing of the peace agreement in Rome in 1992 and the first general elections, held in 1994, Mozambique's general economic and social situation improved dramatically. Nonetheless Mozambique is still one of the poorest countries in the world with about 70% of the population living below the poverty line, declining life expectancy (38.1 years in 2004), reduced access to health facilities (40%) and high illiteracy rates (about 60%).

About 80% of the Mozambican population depends on agriculture for its living. But a persistent lack of infrastructures (roads, irrigation work) and rural financing mechanisms, as well as ongoing natural disasters (floods, droughts and hurricanes) have hindered accelerated economic growth.

To address this situation the GOM promotes foreign investment, particularly in large scale industries (gas, oil, aluminium, minerals) and has simultaneously commenced a decentralization process to promote economic development at district level.

Unemployment is a serious problem, particularly for the young and those less educated. The more educated are also increasingly confronted with limited employment opportunities, especially in the urban areas.

Education in Mozambique

Primary, secondary and technical education in Mozambique are all organised under a National Education System. More than half of the Mozambican population is under 20 years of age and there is enormous pressure on the education system.

Although Mozambique has '*Education for All*' targets, access is limited and drop-out rates continue to be very high, particularly for girls. Education sector strategic plans emphasise increased access, first for primary education, but increasingly also for secondary levels. Yet no more than 3% of any age group completes 12 years of education. Improving the quality of education has been a fundamental goal of education sector strategic plans over the last decade.

A new curriculum for primary schools was introduced in 2002 and for secondary education curriculum reform is under way. Professional education is also in a process of profound change. Reforms aim at making education more practical and better adjusted to local circumstances and to the development needs of the country.

The higher education sector

Following the political and economic transformations that occurred in Mozambique since the end of the 1980s, higher education (HE) faced new demands. There was a growing understanding that the sector had to expand and diversify.

The Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology (MOHEST), established in 2002, developed a 10-year Strategic Plan (PEES). In 2005 the HE component of MOHEST was brought under the Ministry of Education (MOE) which then became the Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC). The PEES is now being implemented by the Directorate of Higher Education at the MOEC.

The new strategy led to a substantial increase in the number of private HE institutions (up to 11 in 2006) and to the establishment of several new, more specialised public HE institutions. Moreover, in 2005, 3 public polytechnics were created.

Although the capital Maputo has still a high concentration of HE institutions, gradually private and public institutions have spread out over the country. For example, the Pedagogic University (UP) already has campuses in seven provinces and will shortly cover all provincial capitals. A new general public university opened in the northern province of Nampula in 2007.

Student numbers have increased rapidly over the last decade; from 4000 in 1990 to more than 22,200 in 2004. But, like in other sectors of the education system, drop-out rates are high and the quality and relevance of some HE courses is questionable.

Financial support for the HE sector is provided by some 20 donor countries and institutions, amongst them the World Bank and the Swedish and Dutch Governments. Donor coordination is growing, for the education sector as a whole as well as HE institutions specifically.

In relation to scholarship programs, the Ministry of Education and Culture has recently (August 2007) created an Institute for Scholarships, IBE (*Instituto de Bolsas de Estudo*). IBE will manage internal and some external scholarship programs for secondary and higher education. Donors will be invited to jointly support IBE activities.

2 Relevance

Relevance is assessed in terms of the appropriateness of the program's objectives in the context of AusAID's Aid Framework for Africa as well as the management and institutional arrangements adopted in implementing the program.

2.1 *Assessment of objectives and programming logic*

This program commenced in 1988 when provision was made under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the GOA and the GOM for a proportion of food aid sales revenue to support post-secondary scholarships. The food aid commitment was renewed in June 1995 incorporating firm commitments of increased ICSAS funding.

A Review in July 1995 examined the ICSAS management arrangements and whether the program was contributing effectively to Mozambique's human resource potential. It reaffirmed that an in-country scholarship program represented an appropriate and cost effective contribution to educational development in Mozambique. It also concluded that its educational objectives overlapped with the main objectives of a concurrent AusAID-funded HRD project managed by the Commonwealth Secretariat. It therefore proposed that after the conclusion of the latter project in June 1997 the two programs should be redesigned to form a single project managed by one managing agent. In the event, the HRD project did not continue, a further ICSAS Review in December 2000 reaffirmed the ongoing priority need for in-country scholarship support as confirmed by all stakeholders. Fields of study were adjusted.

The final phase straddled two Africa program Strategies. AusAID's *Framework for Australian Aid to Africa 1998-2001* was in place when the final phase of the program was developed. The 2000 Review adjusted disciplines of study in keeping with GOM priority sectors while also reflecting targeted sectors for Australian aid to Mozambique as reflected in the Framework. The Framework emphasised education and skills training; increasing the productivity of the poor and the use of scholarships, all issues addressed in the objectives of the ICSAS program. An issue not addressed was the stated 'critical' principle '*... that any assistance is coordinated with other bilateral donors and multilateral agencies to meet recipient government priorities.*' As discussed later in this Report, while co-financing and pooling of funds was considered by the Review, it was not actively pursued and in practice donors are only now giving serious attention to the pooling of funds for introduction in 2009.

AusAID's new Africa Framework covering 2003-07, sought to tighten the overall sectoral focus and move away from stand-alone bilateral projects. Some concerns were expressed within AusAID when a 2-year exit strategy was planned during 2003/04 that the extension could not be justified because ICSAS was a project and not consistent with the then preferred management model (delivery through other multilateral or bilateral donor organisations). However given that 'traditional projects' were merely to be 'phased out' and ICSAS was by no means a traditional project, acknowledging the importance of allowing current awardees to complete their studies, a 2-year extension was approved.

The ICRT confirms the appropriateness of the ICSAS objectives as refined in 2000/01 based on AusAID's revised Aid Framework. However, the ICRT believes that as discussed in *Section 5* below, improved targeting at design (in terms of the institutions and fields of study) coupled with some post-study monitoring could have improved the sustainability of the initiative overall taking into account broader country program level objectives.

2.2 *Aid delivery choices – forms of aid*

Based on the issues described in *Section 2.1*, appropriate aid modality choices were made in 2000/01 at the commencement of the final phase of the program. Co-financing with other

donors and outsourcing using a managing contractor were options considered but as discussed in *Section 3.2* below, proved not to be feasible (co-financing) or were not considered cost effective (outsourcing). The ICRT concludes that the choice of delivery organisation was entirely appropriate (also see *Section 4* below).

2.3 *Appropriateness of management and institutional arrangements*

Following a Review in December 2000 a Supplementary MOU was signed in August 2001 and covering the initial 3 years of the final 5-year phase of ICSAS. This MOU was executed ‘pursuant’ to an earlier May 1999 MOU that covered broad development cooperation activities between the two countries.

Taken together, these documents set out very clearly all of the necessary management and institutional arrangements. Responsibilities at governmental level are clearly specified. The final 2-year extension of this phase was covered by an exchange of letters with the Ministry of Education which chaired the PCC. Supplementing the MOU documentation were exchanges of letters between the High Commission in Pretoria and each of the institutions managing the scholarships they had been allocated. Adjustments to allocations were similarly covered by exchanges of letters. The correspondence sets out clearly the responsibilities of each party, supplemented as to detail by discussions during monitoring visits and attendance at biannual PCC meetings. As discussed in *Section 3.2.6* below, partner agencies met all of their commitments and the management and institutional arrangements utilised for this final phase are assessed as appropriate.

3 Effectiveness

This Section reviews the extent to which the activity has attained its objectives. It considers firstly to what extent its objectives were achieved or are likely to be achieved and then reviews how management impacted on the achievement or non-achievement of outcomes.

3.1 Achievements

This Section tabulates the achievements of the initiative the goal, purpose and objective levels of the Scheme.¹ Any deviations (positive or negative) are explained. The Scheme ended more than 12 months ago with no new students admitted after June 2004. There is no future action required.

ICSAS Program Achievements Summary

Goal and Objectives	Achievements
<p><u>Goal:</u></p> <p><i>To assist academically qualified persons mainly from the provinces and from poor and disadvantaged families of Mozambique to gain university and other relevant post-secondary qualifications in fields of study that are relevant to national development, namely health, agriculture, food security, and English language training.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The program was able to support a significant number of ICSAS awardees obtain post secondary qualifications, facilitated by high success/graduation rates among awardees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ however not all graduates from one of the three institutions supported (UEM), have been able to obtain gainful employment ▪ Awardees were selected both on academic performance and economic need and a significant number came from the provinces ▪ Fields of study reflected priority areas nominated by the GOM ▪ Some graduates have subsequently qualified for ADS scholarships for postgraduate study in Australia.
<p><u>Purpose:</u></p> <p><i>To establish a funding mechanism with higher education institutions whereby up to 300 Mozambican nationals receive Australian financial assistance. The funding mechanism will also be used to provide relevant texts to participating institutions on an annual basis, particularly English language training resources.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The funding mechanism was functioning effectively during the final phase of the program ▪ Over the 3 years ending June 2004, 300 students were receiving scholarship assistance at any one time and more than 300 students were assisted over that period ▪ Each institution received funds to purchase library texts covering the priority disciplines being studied by ICSAS students who participated in the selection of books that also benefited the wider student community.
<p><u>Objective 1:</u></p> <p><i>Ensure that adequate funds are provided to Universities at the commencement of each semester to cover the costs of 300 scholarship holders at any one time throughout each academic year for three (3) years from academic year 2001-02</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From 2001/02 payments were made direct to Beira and Nampula campuses of the central institution (UP) which helped ensure timely payments to most scholarship holders ▪ Institutional reporting and acquittal of fund improved progressively over the life of the program which in turn enabled the timely transfer of funds and payment to students of their monthly allowances and other entitlements

¹ There were no approved performance indicators although they may be broadly deduced from the purpose statements and from the recommendations of the 2000 Review which served as an Action Plan that was regularly monitored. By 2004 they had all been implemented subject to some minor adjustments in response to changing circumstances.

(commencing in August) until academic years 2003 – 2004.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ however while all entitlements were eventually paid some students continued to experience delays in receiving their payments at the start of the academic year.
<p>Objective 2:</p> <p><i>Ensure that comprehensive information on ICSAS (selection criteria and procedure, award conditions, benefits of the award) is made available to all interested award candidates.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A comprehensive brochure on program entitlements was produced by AusAID which enabled a significant number of students to obtain reliable information on their entitlements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ however AusAID monitoring and interviews by the ICRT revealed that some students did not receive the brochure given that it was not reissued for the benefit of later entrants to the program ▪ Apart from the brochure both scholarship applicants and ongoing students confirmed to the ICRT that they were also able to obtain a reasonable amount of information through student services within the institutions.
<p>Objective 3:</p> <p><i>Ensure awardees are selected in accordance with agreed ICSAS criteria prior to the commencement of the academic year, and that all awardees receive their full benefits for the duration of the award if they maintain their scholarship status.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ AusAID monitoring and ICRT interviews of students confirmed that overall, a highly transparent and fair selection process applied in each institution ▪ Selection was based on criteria that had been agreed with AusAID and endorsed by the PCC ▪ Gender targets were set and achieved, although apart from setting and monitoring the achievement of statistical targets, more in-depth analysis might have achieved better gender outcomes overall.
<p>Objective 4:</p> <p><i>Achieve cost-effective management and reporting by each participating institution of all aspects of the program, in accordance with Annual Work Plans and Budgets agreed between AusAID, participating education institutions and the Ministry of Education.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cost effective management and reporting was achieved during the final phase of the program using a range of good practice techniques: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2002 ICSAS Review recommendations formed the basis of an Action Plan that was owned and accepted by institutions and MOE ○ an effective PCC that monitored progress and also organised a workshop attended by all stakeholders where challenges to achieving good management were identified and solutions agreed ○ a partnership approach with AusAID staff and the provision of technical and other capacity building support to student administration areas ○ the involvement of student beneficiaries in the PCC and cost-effective monitoring by AusAID staff.

3.2 Qualitative management assessment

This Section provides a qualitative assessment against a range of factors of how well the initiative was managed and how management impacted (positively or negatively) on achievement of outcomes.

3.2.1 Risk management

The 1995 design did not include a Risk Matrix and a Risk Management Plan was not developed during implementation. This is not to say that risks were ignored.

The December 2000 Review focused on how to manage risks associated with the management and administration shortcomings that ‘*plagued*’ the program. The review TORs highlighted the need to identify measures to improve management and administration, so it can be assumed that these shortcomings were well known. The Review strongly criticised the lack of action following the 1995 Review.² While concerned to identify measures to manage the obvious risks if this state of affairs had been allowed to continue, the Review does not mention ‘*risks*’.

The Review produced a practical set of recommendations attributing responsibilities for implementation between AusAID, the institutions and MOE. A key recommendation was the commissioning of periodic independent audits of the scheme.

Maputo Office staff used this set of its recommendations as its Workplan, shared the plan with partner agencies so that it was jointly owned and proceeded to implement or have implemented all of its 13 recommendations. (This is further discussed in *Section 4* below). A PCC workshop was held and AusAID staff viewed this Workplan as also serving as a Risk Management Plan. (See *Appendix 3*). The ICRT does not disagree with this approach given the nature of the Scheme.

A major audit was completed in June 2002.³ It covered the three institutions including the UP Beira and Nampula campuses. It did not identify major financial shortcomings but for each institution it produced a list of recommendations generally relating to improved bank reconciliations and the need to deposit ICSAS funds in interest earning accounts. These were addressed by the institutions concerned and implementation was monitored by AusAID and discussed in the PCC. Further audits were not commissioned and given the impact and findings of the first audit, the ICRT agrees that this approach was justified on risk management grounds.

3.2.2 Procurement

Procurement was restricted to library books and managed effectively by the institutions subject to AusAID monitoring. Beneficiary students were involved in the selection of appropriate text books that were related to their prescribed courses. The wider student community was able to benefit from this program component.

3.2.3 Technical assistance

The ICSAS design did not provide for technical assistance. However, in implementing the final 5-year phase of the program that also set out to rectify the administration and management shortcomings mentioned in *Section 3.2.1*, some technical assistance was provided by AusAID staff at the Maputo Office resulting in capacity building within the student administration areas of each of the institutions. The impact of this relatively minor but significant technical assistance component is discussed in *Section 5.1* below.

² In its one page Executive Summary the review notes that many of its recommendations mirror those of the earlier review, expresses disappointment that the 1995 recommendations were in the main not implemented, notes that the Report ‘*sat idle*’ and concluded that ‘*both AusAID and MOE must accept responsibility for this situation*’.

³ The audit was conducted by the Maputo Office of Grant Thornton, Chartered Accountants.

3.2.4 Monitoring and Joint Management Committee Supervision

The December 2000 review gave a great deal of attention to program monitoring and produced specific recommendations designed to improve the monitoring of institutional performance that had not been undertaken prior to 2000 despite the 1995 Review recommendations. Using the recommendations of the 2000 review as a workplan, as outlined in *Section 3.2.1* above and further analysed in *Section 4* below, staff at the AusAID Maputo Office undertook extensive and effective monitoring during the final phase of the program.

Such monitoring included periodic meetings with groups of students from the various institutions and participation on a selective basis in institutional selection committee meetings to monitor adherence to agreed selection criteria. Participation in selection meetings improved transparency and AusAID was able to suggest improvements to the process particularly in relation to record keeping and reporting. At one meeting (at UEM) the President of the Students Association is reported to have commended AusAID's participation which had been '*constructive*' adding that '*an external analysis perspective was valuable to the university members of the Committee*'. Participation in these meetings even in an observer capacity and on a selective basis was clearly a useful monitoring device. As to the meetings with students, graduates interviewed by the ICRT commended the opportunity to meet directly with AusAID staff although most lamented that there had not been more of these meetings with many having had no personal contact with AusAID throughout their courses of study.

In the final 2 years of the last phase AusAID monitoring was restricted to reviewing reports and funding acquittals submitted by institutions. AusAID staff had been given other priority aid initiative management tasks. Given that no new students were funded after June 2004 the ICRT considers this to have been an appropriate prioritisation of scarce management resources in a situation where there was no requirement or expectation that post-scholarship outcomes would be monitored.

A review by the ICRT of correspondence exchanged between AusAID staff and institutions and file notes reporting on meetings confirm that appropriate action was taken in response to emerging issues. Institution staff interviewed by the ICRT while commending the support provided by AusAID staff confirmed that AusAID expected strict compliance with agreed procedures but imposed reasonable deadlines.

The Program Management Committee (PCC) played a critical role in monitoring at a broader program level and in addressing higher level policy and performance issues. Following the December 2000 Review its composition was enhanced by including student representatives from each of the institutions as well as staff representatives from the UP Beira and Nampula campuses. This helped to achieve a greater degree of transparency with students at the regional campuses generally '*having been kept in the dark*' about the full extent of their scholarship entitlements. The PCC continued to be chaired by the Ministry of Education even after a Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology was established.⁴

There were no PCC meetings after 2004. A formal decision was taken in October 2004 by the then AusAID Counsellor in Pretoria to '*waiver the customary six monthly PCC meetings for the period of the 2 year extension*' on the grounds that all scholarship management and administration procedures were in place and '*have been functioning smoothly over the past 3 years*'. It was noted that institutions no longer needed ongoing assistance from the AusAID Maputo Office and that monitoring would continue through the review of six-monthly

⁴ The MOEC told the ICRT that this was through a 'Gentlemen's Agreement' between the Ministries because the ICSAS was coming to an end. The new Ministry is cited as a joint Executing Agency with MOE in the Subsidiary MOU but its functions were subsequently absorbed into MOE/MOEC.

institutional reports and annual meetings with students. It had been intended to hold a final PCC before the end of the program to review overall program progress but it appears that this PCC was not held. The ICRT endorses the approach taken but it is unfortunate that it was not possible to hold a final PCC in 2005 or 2006 to review performance at a time when most of the key personnel involved with the program were still available.

The ICRT was able to discuss the operations of the PCC with staff in MOEC, some of the institutions as well as graduates. All commended its operations and those directly involved viewed it as a very successful mechanism for monitoring program implementation. Participation by representatives of all institutions was welcomed and helped in achieving the desired management and operational improvements. Although the ICRT was unable to meet with any graduates that had attended PCC meetings it was generally known that Student Council representatives had been nominated to represent the interests of all students and this was seen as a useful initiative. However generally students saw more value in direct meetings with AusAID staff. A summary of progress as monitored through the PCC mechanism is at *Appendix 3*.

3.2.5 Coordination

There was no coordination with other in-country donor-funded scholarship programs. The December 2000 Review considered the option of pooling ICSAS scholarships with those of the Netherlands through the Nisome program but rejected this approach because its allowances were too high when compared with teacher salary levels and GOM scholarship entitlements. It recommended that AusAID assess the possibility of co-financing with the NORAD program but this was not subsequently pursued following staff changes at the Norwegian embassy.

There was some correlation between the ICSAS and the complementary government scholarship scheme through the lead role played by the Ministry of Education on the PCC. Monthly allowances for both programs were pegged to the minimum government approved basic wage. A proposal during the 1995 Review process to increase ICSAS allowances was not supported by GOM agencies because it would place the government under pressure to increase government scholarship allowances and there was no budget for this. The issue was not raised again.

There was no link with any other GOA financed activities. Linkages that have emerged more recently with ADS as ICSAS graduates qualify for post graduate study awards in Australia were not planned. Interestingly, the Netherlands government initiated its Nisome program in the province of Nampula when it found no local expertise in health, agriculture and basic education for its bilateral programs in that Province. It targeted its scholarship program accordingly and there was a clear linkage with its projects.

Studies by the World Bank and other donors, notably Sweden, have highlighted problems in the education sector where universities have coordinated scholarship and other programs provided by donors each with a different set of requirements. Donor harmonisation in the higher education sector is now being addressed through working groups led by the World Bank, Sweden and the Netherlands to explore future SWAp-type funding arrangements for scholarships in conjunction with the government's new 'Institute for Scholarships'. A new National Scholarships Fund will be associated with broader financial reforms in the higher education sector. Subject to the success of these broader systemic reforms, bilateral donors may be encouraged to roll their individual in-country scholarship programs into the National Fund by around 2009.

The ICRT found that the institutions that benefited from ICSAS experienced no major problems coordinating scholarships – some benefited only from ICSAS and the government program during the period. However all favoured greater donor coordination and seemed supportive of the pending reforms under which they might not in future be required to administer any scholarship programs. UEM which has had problems in the past coordinating the activities of up to 17 donors (not all providing scholarships) mentioned that, assisted by Sweden, it will set up a Donor Coordination Unit. This Unit will administer donor scholarship programs in the event that these are not provided through the new Central Fund in future.

3.2.6 Partner Government commitments

The Subsidiary MOU details the contributions to be made by GOM. These were:

- Chairing the biannual PCC
- Providing advice to AusAID on GOM policy on education policy matters that may impact on ICSAS
- Nominating the student representative for each PCC
- Monitoring the institutions' adherence to the ICSAS gender targets.

MOE chaired the PCC effectively throughout the life of the project, provided advice to AusAID as required and met its obligations as specified in the MOU. However, in practice, AusAID staff were more engaged in working directly with the institutions in monitoring gender targets and the institutions relying on Student Council nominations, arranged student representation at PCC meetings. A representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation attended PCC meetings from May 2002.

The government institutions supported under the program also provided significant counterpart contributions. They attended PCC meetings and workshops and devoted significant resources to their monitoring, financial management and reporting obligations.

3.2.7 Overall management

There was no contracted delivery organisation. The program was managed and administered by the beneficiary institutions with strong and active technical assistance and monitoring support provided by the AusAID Maputo Office.

Following the 2000 Review, AusAID allocated an adequate level of resources to support and monitor the program and to address the significant management and administration shortcomings that had been identified. All of the management and operational shortcomings identified by the December 2000 Review were addressed and by 2003 when an exit strategy was being developed institutional administrative and management processes were assessed as effective. This was achieved in a cost effective manner as discussed in *Section 4*.

3.2.8 Recipient/beneficiary participation

There were two groups of recipients/beneficiaries. The ultimate beneficiaries were the students awarded scholarships and they were significantly involved throughout the second phase in selection and monitoring arrangements. Within each institution, students were members of selection committees which facilitated transparency. To help ensure that students from poor and disadvantaged backgrounds obtained scholarships in line with the goal of the scheme, the selection process was protracted, involved fellow student and teacher participation even prior to the formal application and selection process, and after selections were finalised, the names of those tentatively selected were publicised and other students were given an opportunity to question the selections made. The names of selection committee members were

members were also publicised in at least one institution. Selections for the government scholarship scheme were made at the same time and in a similar manner.

Students from each institution participated in all PCC meetings. Students were also directly involved in the selection of books for institution libraries. This promoted ownership and facilitated transparency as confirmed through interviews of scholarship beneficiaries. AusAID staff met separately with groups of students as part of the monitoring process.

The institutions were not only managers but also beneficiaries. There was some significant capacity building provided to the student administration areas as described in *Section 5.1* below. The successful partnership approach adopted by AusAID Maputo in its dealings with institutions is discussed in the next Section.

A final and important success factor (apart from consistent follow-up by AusAID staff) was that the institutional participants had been carefully selected and came from areas within the institutions responsible for scholarship administration.⁵

⁵ These were for UP the Social Services Department; for UEM the Department of Academic Registry and for IHS the Head of Studies.

4 Efficiency

4.1 Cost effectiveness and least-cost solutions

In assessing efficiency the ICRT considered whether the program used the least costly resources possible in order to achieve its goal level desired results.

The December 2000 Review analysed a range of ICSAS management options. It found only two options ‘worthy of consideration’. One option was to outsource to a contractor such as UNESCO, an NGO or to the private sector. The second was to retain overall management and monitoring responsibilities in the AusAID Maputo Office with back-up from the Pretoria Post if required but with the proviso that the ‘...relevant person in the AusAID Maputo Office should dedicate at least 33% of her time to ICSAS monitoring, with increased contact with awardees and surveillance of institutional commitment/compliance.’

The Review concluded that outsourcing would result in management costs of around 10-13% of program value, leaving less money to support scholarships.⁶ It also noted that the recommended approach had the advantage of providing a counterpart contribution, since UEM, UP and MOE all devoted resources to the management and administration of the scheme.

In the event, the program was not outsourced. AusAID staff, using the recommendations of the 2000 Review as a Work Plan, reviewed implementation arrangements within the institutions in year 1, built on existing systems within these institutions to develop simple but effective templates that ensured effective reporting and acquittals. The Workplan was a shared document and AusAID and institution staff adopted a team-based approach to ensure its implementation. Without such an approach the management and administration shortcomings highlighted by the Review might not have been remedied as quickly and effectively.

All this was achieved by one locally engaged officer at the Maputo AusAID Office devoting around one third of her time to the program for 12 months in year one. In years 2 and 3 this fell to 15% as institutional performance improved. During the final two years when no new students were funded monitoring responsibilities had minor work load implications. Australia-based AusAID staff in Pretoria also provided some inputs by attending PCCs and reviewing/approving funding requests. Where these resources could not be committed by AusAID (in the previous phase), the Scheme, as highlighted by the December 2000 Review, was ‘plagued by significant management and administration shortcomings’.

When interviewed by the ICRT, staff in each of the five institutions commended, unprompted, the professional and helpful approach of AusAID staff. Institutions noted that the requirements that had to be met required a great deal of effort but AusAID staff imposed reasonable deadlines and provided assistance and advice where needed.

The ICRT concludes that in its management and administration the initiative represented the least-cost solution. There was strong beneficiary ownership and key program partners provided counterpart contributions. The serious management and operational shortcomings identified by the 2000 Review were addressed and rectified. AusAID inputs were not needed at the levels specified after the first year of the new program phase. A contracting approach would have been more costly, counterpart contributions would have been more limited and the

⁶ Experience in other AusAID programs has shown that the costs of outsourcing are easily underestimated. There is also the risk of poor contractor performance and AusAID has found that where the administration of scholarships (for study in Australia) is outsourced, Post workloads have at times increased for a period and that in any case the need for ongoing AusAID staff interventions and monitoring may be greater than initially estimated.

partner and beneficiary ownership benefits might not have been realised. Overall, a smaller number of scholarships would have been funded and there would have been fewer graduates.

Given the current financial reforms in the higher education sector in Mozambique including centralised scholarship funding initiatives and a trend towards donor coordination units in key institutions, a similar program implemented today might more appropriately be pooled with the programs of other donors and the GOM. However in that situation some AusAID inputs would still be required as donors undertake joint planning, monitoring and evaluation. Overall, implementation costs could be expected to be lower. This option was not available in 2000 and even now donors are adopting a wait-and-see attitude with a view to considering pooling arrangements from 2009 pending the implementation of governmental sector reforms including a new National Scholarships Fund.

There were no cost overruns as such and some funds remaining when the project ended, were used either to purchase additional books or computers in one institution. Annual expenditures are shown in *Appendix 3*.

4.2 *Timeliness of meeting objectives*

The goal level objectives were achieved on time when taking into account the 2-year exit phase. The commissioning of a new 3-year phase commencing in 2000/01 seemed to overlook the fact that many courses are 5 years and students may take up to 8 years to complete a 5 year course at the universities targeted by the Scheme. It was never feasible on that basis to expect most of the students funded under the program starting in 2000/01 to complete their studies by 2003/04. The 2 year exit phase that ended in 2005/06 helped to remedy this design weakness. Nevertheless, the ICRT met with several ICSAS students (UP-Nampula) who are only now finalising their thesis presentation. While already employed or guaranteed employment as teachers they do not as yet have their formal qualifications.

5 Impact and sustainability

5.1 Impact

5.1.1 Overview

At goal level the program sought ‘to assist [some 300] academically qualified persons mainly from the provinces and from poor and disadvantaged families of Mozambique to gain university and other relevant post-secondary qualifications in fields of study that are relevant to national development, namely health, agriculture, food security, and English language training.’

The program achieved the desired training impact. The program was not designed to intervene beyond graduation; however the goal statement implies that graduates would ultimately use their qualifications to benefit national development in Mozambique. There was no provision for post-scholarship monitoring and data is not available on how graduates used their qualifications.

Some limited conclusions may nevertheless be drawn about broader impact. Around two thirds of the scholarships were allocated to the Pedagogic University which trains teachers and to the Institute of Health Science which trains health workers. The ICRT met with staff and students from each of these institutions and is confident that probably all of the UP and IHS graduates obtained employment either within the government health system or in public education institutions. Indeed, ICSAS scholarship holders were said to have included some of the brightest and hard-working students many of which were selected to remain in the institutions where they had studied. This selection process began in their final years of study where the best students were appointed as class monitors. For example, at the IHS the ICRT met with three former scholarship holders now lecturers at the Institute. They were said to have been the best students and when questioned indicated that they would have preferred to work elsewhere in the public health system but were given no choice. The Ministry gives priority to retaining the best students as trainers and determines where graduates are placed within the system. At least two thirds of ICSAS beneficiaries can be said to be contributing to national development.

The ICRT also met with a group of eleven graduates from the Eduardo Mondlane University that received around one third of the scholarships. All but one had been unemployed since they graduated some two years ago. Several had some part time work. All of those unemployed had studied agriculture. They claimed to have been seeking work actively both in Maputo and in the Provinces (employment prospects in agriculture would clearly be better outside Maputo). The graduates had responded to a newspaper advertisement inviting graduates to meet with the ICRT. When interviewed many said AusAID should have accepted some responsibility for helping them to obtain employment. While not a reliable sample of how UEM ICSAS graduates have used their qualifications, it is clear that some graduates have not applied their qualifications to benefit national development.

An unplanned but potentially significant impact is that at least 3 ICSAS graduates have qualified for ADS postgraduate scholarships. One is currently in Australia and two will commence their studies in 2008.⁷ There may be more – some could have obtained scholarships in other countries. Many graduates interviewed by the ICRT would like to study overseas and some have already considered the ADS program.

⁷ The ICRT interviewed the ADS awardees. Both are employed by a regional polytechnic. One will study Water management in Perth and the other Agricultural Science at Sydney University. They spoke at length about their plans on return and unprompted focussed on how they expect to help their country as lecturers and researchers in the agriculture sector.

5.1.2 Institutional impact

There were no institutional capacity building objectives specified in the design. Around 90% of total funds provided were allocated to benefits directed to the individual students but some funds were directed to institutional capacity building. Institutions benefited through training of key staff in student administration areas and the provision of templates and other forms of support designed to improve and to standardise the management and monitoring of scholarships across the three institutions. The provision of library books relevant to the priority fields of study helped not only the Australian scholarship students but provided a lasting benefit to the institution and broader student community. ICSAS graduates interviewed expressed strong support for this form of complementary assistance. Unspent balances in 2006 were used to buy more books or in one case computers.

The ICRT found that for most institutions the capacity building quite apart from the material support has had some lasting impact. In one case the systems developed are now being used to report on scholarships provided by another donor (Belgium).

5.1.3 Gender equality

The program has generally met its set gender targets. This was helped by a range of initiatives, namely allowing women between the age of 23 and 30 to qualify for scholarships (the government scholarship program has an age limit of 23 for women and men); the annual return home fares, particularly attractive for women returning to their families; and by not forcing women that are pregnant to end their studies (the usual practice for non-scholarship holders). All of the institutions when questioned transferred women from the government scheme to the AusAID scholarships. The government scheme had no gender targets.⁸

An alternative approach would have been to fund some women who met the eligibility criteria but were not above the cut-off point on either the AusAID or the government merit lists was not apparently considered. (Merit lists were published for each scholarship scheme showing successful applicants equal to the number of scholarships available.) While the student ratio was heavily slanted towards males (a ratio of 70/30 male/female was quoted by one institution) the overall number of deserving candidates far exceeded the number of scholarships available. If the switch of female candidates between schemes had been disallowed, a larger number of females overall might have obtained scholarship support – the real intent of the gender targets.⁹

5.1.4 Other impacts

For reasons given earlier in this Section, the ICRT was unable to discern any impact in areas such as *'accelerating economic growth and reducing poverty ... cross-cutting governance issues including corruption and human rights ... partnership and the promotion of regional stability and cooperation ... and ... the long term development of the capacity of ... organisations and the state.'* There was no discernable impact on the environment.

⁸ The MOE in its formal comments on the 2000 Review recommendations noted that *'Gender equity is a fundamental aspect for the Government of Mozambique'* and strongly supported the lifting of the *'age limit established for the access of girls to the scholarship'*.

⁹ This was fundamentally a design issue. Once the targets had been set, staff managing the program could not realistically disallow the strategies adopted by the institutions in response to AusAID's numerical targets.

5.2 Sustainability

The activity was genuinely demand driven and targeted appropriate beneficiaries; there were strong incentives for beneficiary involvement and performance; the activity was sensitive to gender issues; it ultimately provided for an appropriate 2-year phase out strategy to enable some 197 students on award by June 2004, to complete their studies (overlooked at design). Activity timeframes were appropriate to promote the desired outcomes enabling a specified number of Mozambican nationals to obtain post-secondary qualifications. These factors all contributed to sustainable outcomes within the design parameters of the scheme.

At completion, scholarship holders were left with post secondary qualifications. There had been some limited capacity building in the student administration areas of institutions which was an unintended benefit in terms of the original activity design. Some benefits from this component remain either because some individuals have enhanced skills or (in one case) the systems are still being used. Beyond this there are no financial, technical, organisational, institutional or other changes and benefits brought about by the initiative, nor were such benefits assumed or intended in the original design. It was beyond the scope of the scheme to facilitate employment outcomes of graduates although, as already mentioned in *Section 2.1*, given that some are still unemployed, improved targeting at design (in terms of the institutions and fields of study) coupled with some post-study monitoring could have improved the sustainability of the initiative overall taking into account broader country program level objectives.

6 Overall quality

In this Section the ICRT provides ratings on the standard AusAID six-point scale, of the quality of the Scheme.¹⁰ These ratings would normally be compared with ratings made earlier by AusAID at different stages of its cycle.¹¹ The final ratings incorporate some of the issues discussed in the previous Sections such as effectiveness and efficiency and are intended primarily to measure the quality only of initiative delivery. The ratings scale definitions are:

Satisfactory (4, 5 and 6, above the line)

- **6 Very high quality**
- **5 Good quality** initiative; could have improved in some areas with minor work
- **4 Adequate quality** initiative; could have improved with some work

Less than satisfactory (1, 2 and 3, below the line)

- **3 Less than adequate** quality initiative; needed improvements in core areas
- **2 Poor quality** initiative; needed major improvements in core areas
- **1 Very poor quality** initiative; needed a major overhaul

6.1 Objectives

To what degree did the initiative achieve its objectives, and how well did they contribute to higher level objectives in the program strategy?

Rating: 5

Comment:

The initiative at the end of its final phase had achieved all of its objectives as tabulated in *Section 3.1*.

The goal of the program was pitched at the level of assisting academically qualified persons mainly from the provinces and from poor and disadvantaged families to post-secondary qualifications in fields of study that are relevant to national development, namely health, agriculture, food security, and English language training. More than 300 students obtained these qualifications.

As to higher level objectives in the program strategy, AusAID's program strategy for Africa emphasised improvements to the delivery of basic services with a focus on health and food security. Post graduate training is emphasised in equipping service providers and policy makers with skills to improve governance and service delivery. Most graduates obtained employment as teachers/training especially in the health sector. While there was no link with the ADS program, some graduates have qualified for post graduate training in Australia in line

¹⁰ The trial version of new AusGuidelines for ICRs prepared by AusAID's Office of Development Effectiveness and used to prepare this ICR, note that these ratings scales are to be revised or confirmed during 2007.

¹¹ The ICRT has seen an Activity Management Brief prepared in November 2002 where the activity received an overall rating of 'Fully Satisfactory', justified by significant improvements in the quality of program administration and management (since 2000) while noting the need for further improvements in the areas of the timely submission of acquittals and the prompt payment of allowances to students. The ICRT is not aware of any subsequent AusAID ratings although later papers note further substantial improvement in the areas of program management and administration eg the records of the May and November 2003 PCC meetings.

with the strategy. Where graduates are unemployed (some are but the total number is not known) the program is not contributing to higher level strategy objectives.

6.2 Results measurement

How robust was the system to measure ongoing achievement of objectives and results?

Rating: 5

Comment:

Institutions provided reports on academic outcomes. Students that failed left the scholarship program and were replaced by others. While statistics have not been retained and could not be accessed by the ICRT, failure rates were low and most scholarship holders graduated. The reporting system in place during the final phase of the program was adequate in assessing the goal level objective. At the component level, institutional reporting which improved significantly over time was also adequate in enabling AusAID staff and the PCC to monitor the payment of allowances, the application of selection criteria and the achievement of targeted awards.

Systematic post-scholarship monitoring was not a requirement but would have facilitated some measurement of how the program contributed to the higher level program strategy objectives.

6.3 Management

How effectively was the initiative managed? To what degree did it provide good value for money?

Rating: 6

Comment:

As described in *Section 3.2.8* above, following the December 2000 Review, AusAID allocated an adequate level of resources to manage the program and was able to address the significant management and administration shortcomings that had been identified. By 2003 institutional administrative and management processes were assessed as effective. This was achieved with limited AusAID resources and as detailed in *Section 4* above, is considered a good practice and very cost effective approach overall.

6.4 Sustainability

How appropriate is the sustainability of the initiatives outcomes?

Rating: 5

Comment:

Within the design parameters of the scheme – which did not allow for any follow-up activity once scholarship holders had obtained their qualifications – the initiative outcomes were sustainable. The targeted number of students obtained post-secondary qualifications consistent with the scheme's goal, facilitated by a 2-year exit strategy that enabled up to 197 scholarship holders to obtain their qualifications. Some graduates from one institution are currently unemployed. Improved targeting at design (in terms of the institutions and fields of study)

coupled with some post-study monitoring could have improved the sustainability of the initiative overall when taking into account broader country program level objectives.

6.5 Technical quality

Was the initiative of the highest technical quality, based on sound analysis and learning?

Rating: 5

Comment:

A comprehensive review of the ICSAS in 1995 sought to improve the technical quality of the program that began in 1988 as a monetised food aid initiative. However the Post was not resourced to implement the technical improvements recommended. A further review in December 2000 produced a practical workplan that could be implemented and the necessary resources were provided. While the 2000 Review did not specify lessons learned, these do provide a foundation for many of its recommendations. The options considered and the recommendations provided are based on sound analysis. This was not a complex activity and following the refinements recommended in 2000 and successfully implemented over subsequent years, the technical quality was high although minor improvements in several areas discussed in this report would have further improved technical quality.

6.6 Overall quality

Taking the five factors discussed and rated above, into account, what was the overall quality of the initiative?

Rating: 5

Comment:

Based on assessment in Sections 6.1 to 6.5 above, this was a good quality initiative overall that could have been further improved with minor work in several areas. However it should be emphasised that these reflect more weaknesses in the original design. The quality of initiative delivery by AusAID was of a very high standard and delivery by the beneficiary institutions improved significantly over the life of the final 5-year program phase.

7 Lessons learned

Reviews need a clear Action Plan supported by AusAID

A comprehensive review of the ICSAS was completed in 1995. It was led by the then Africa Program Manager in Canberra and produced a basic design document including a logframe with verifiable indicators and means of verification and four program components and 11 outputs. There were 32 recommendations. Not included was a plan of action that attributed responsibility for addressing any of the recommendations and there were no target dates. While a quality document overall, it seems that a final document was never produced given the occasional gaps in the text.

The December 2000 Review led by AusAID's then Education and Training Adviser, sought to assess how each of the 1995 recommendations had been implemented. It found that some had indeed been fully or partially implemented, others had been ignored or poorly implemented and in some cases the Review Team was unable to confirm the implementation status of recommendations. Fundamental weaknesses in management and administration problems had not been addressed essentially because the Maputo Office was not resourced to deal with the implementation of many of the 1995 Review recommendations. Unlike the 1995 Review, the 2000 Review produced a manageable number of 13 recommendations and for each recommendation attributed implementation responsibility to various stakeholders. AusAID resourced the Maputo Office and the 2002 Review recommendations served as a practical Workplan throughout the final phase of the ICSAS.

The lessons to be drawn are that AusAID must be prepared to resource the implementation of review recommendations it commissions and leads; such reviews need to develop a manageable number of recommendations; implementation responsibility should be clearly defined such that the review recommendations may serve as an action plan and there is a need to track the implementation of all review recommendations and to document which recommendations have been accepted for implementation.

Partner implementation versus contractor implementation

Based on the efficiency analysis in Section 4 a fundamental lesson may be drawn:

The overall success of this Scheme highlights that internal scholarship programs of this kind are well suited to partner implementation. An outsourcing approach using contractors would not have been cost effective, would probably not have achieved the same degree of capacity building within institutions nor the same degree of partner institution ownership. However, AusAID needs to commit staff resources to manage some elements of these types of programs including participation on a selective basis in selection and contact with beneficiaries. Some resources are required for monitoring with limited technical assistance at the start and effective coordination utilising PCC-type arrangements preferably including beneficiary participation.

A supplementary lesson to be drawn is that a team-based approach between AusAID as the funding agency and the institutions as the implementing agencies encourages ownership, and facilitates sustainable outcomes.

Complementary institutional support

Institutions benefited through training of key staff in student administration areas and the provision of templates and other forms of support designed to improve and to standardise the management and monitoring of scholarships across the three institutions. In developing templates and procedures, existing institutional systems were utilised as far as practicable.

This helped to develop a sense of ownership and commitment. The provision of library books relevant to the priority fields of study helped not only the Australian scholarship students but provided a lasting benefit to the institution and broader student community. The ICRT found that for most institutions the capacity building quite apart from the material support has had some lasting impact.

The lesson to be drawn is that even a modest level of complementary institutional support can have a significant beneficial impact on scholarship program outcomes in terms of ownership, commitment and sustainability.

Analysis of gender impact and gender targets

The program has generally met its set gender targets facilitated by a range of initiatives described in *Section 5.1*. However, all of the institutions transferred women from the government scheme to the AusAID scholarships to help meet the specified gender targets. As discussed in *Section 5.1*, alternative approaches were not considered.

A lesson to be drawn is that the setting and implementation of gender targets requires careful analysis beyond monitoring of statistical results. Gender analysis needs to be undertaken in line with AusAID's Activity Quality Standards (AusGuideline 6.5)

Transparency and ownership through beneficiary participation

Not only was each recipient institution represented on the PCC, the ultimate scholarship beneficiaries, the students, from each institution participated in all PCC meetings. Students were also directly involved in the selection of books for institution libraries. This promoted ownership and facilitated transparency as confirmed through interviews of scholarship beneficiaries.

While it would generally be impracticable to adopt a similar approach for AusAID development scholarship programs, there may be situations where such programs are in whole or part strongly targeted towards particular agencies or groups of students and more direct beneficiary participation in monitoring arrangements could be considered in the interests of strengthened ownership and transparency.

Importance of incentive-based approaches

The program, while broadly aligned to the GOM scholarship scheme, included cost effective incentives (eg annual return home fare entitlements for scholarship holders who achieved a 100% pass rate and unique entitlements for female candidates) that had a significant beneficial impact on student academic performance, reducing failure rates and enhancing employment prospects. The brightest Australian scholarship holders were offered teaching positions at the UP and IHS upon graduation.

Quite apart from special incentives, Australian scholarships were keenly sought and students worked hard to meet the specified performance requirements so as to retain their overall scholarship entitlement.

Providing incentives for and rewarding improved performance is a 'cornerstone' of the 2006 White Paper on Australia's Overseas Aid Program. While pitched primarily at the country program level, a lesson that may be drawn is that this incentive approach can be effective at all levels of aid activity.

Australian identity

Students interviewed, especially those unemployed, expressed disappointment that AusAID took no interest in them after they graduated. While a few students acknowledged that there

had been occasional monitoring meetings with AusAID Maputo staff during implementation, many had no direct contact with AusAID staff. Some graduates went so far as to suggest that AusAID – and scholarship providers in general – had a moral obligation to help them obtain employment.

A lesson to be drawn is that programs of this kind, where the identity of the donor is highlighted during implementation carry with them the risk of high expectations on the part of beneficiaries as to the ongoing role of the donor after the funds have been disbursed. Scholarship programs for study overseas tend to address this through alumni activities.

Need for an exit strategy

The final phase of the program was approved to cover the 3-year period July 2001 to June 2004. Towards the end of 2003 under the new Africa Development Co-operation Framework for 2003-07, following discussions within the PCC, an exit strategy was developed. This covered the 2-year period to June 2006 and was designed to enhance the positive impact achieved by the program to that point. It provided ongoing scholarship support for all remaining beneficiary students still to complete their courses. Most students completed their studies on schedule (although some students are only now completing their final thesis).

Without such an exit strategy many students would have been left without financial support in the middle of their studies. The exit strategy helped to ensure a more sustainable outcome for the program as confirmed by all of the institutions and the graduates interviewed by the ICRT. However a supplementary lesson is that ideally such an exit strategy should have been developed and incorporated into the initial design of the final phase.

Importance of donor coordination

As discussed in Section 3.2.6 above, there was no coordination with the activities of other donors providing scholarship support to the same institutions throughout the life of the program including its earlier phases. Donor harmonisation in the higher education sector is now being addressed through working groups led by the World Bank, Sweden and the Netherlands to explore future SWAp-type funding arrangements for scholarships in conjunction with broader financial reforms in the higher education sector. Subject to the success of these broader systemic reforms, bilateral donors may be encouraged to roll their individual national scholarship programs into a new National Fund by around 2009.

Given the current financial reforms in the higher education sector in Mozambique including centralised scholarship funding initiatives and a trend towards donor coordination units in key institutions, future bilateral scholarship programs in Mozambique can be expected to require operational harmonisation, with joint planning, monitoring and evaluation and common disbursement rules. The pooling of funds under a centralised system is likely to emerge in the very near future.

Post-scholarship outcomes monitoring

The basic rationale for the program was expressed in terms of providing support to disadvantaged and gifted students who might not otherwise be able to undertake tertiary studies. The ICRT found when interviewing students that most would have somehow completed their studies even without access to the AusAID scholarship. There would have been hardship and academic results would have suffered given the need to find part time work with less time for study. Overall, of the forty graduates interviewed only five stated that they would not have been able to attend university without the AusAID scholarship. However, all

expressed strong support for the scholarships provided and credited this support with improved academic results and less hardship.

The goal of the program was pitched at enabling awardees to obtain qualifications in fields of study relevant to national development. There was not therefore an in-built requirement to monitor post-scholarship outcomes. However, both institutions and awardees when interviewed by the ICRT expressed the view that such monitoring would have added value. While other donors have similarly not undertaken post-scholarship follow-up, the value of such an approach has been recognised and the World Bank representative at the donors meeting with the ICRT mentioned that the Bank had decided to commission a graduate Tracer Study to assess employment outcomes. Institutions would have been prepared to undertake some monitoring and one University suggested that such monitoring could have been the subject of a Masters study.

Post award monitoring for programs of this kind would be consistent with AusAID's general approach to the provision of scholarships in recent years where the measurement of post-award scholarship outcomes is now undertaken by most programs as a matter of course. It would also enable conclusions to be drawn about the contributions programs of this kind make to broader level program strategy objectives.¹²

The nature of the institutions selected was such that graduates from two of the three institutions had a virtual guarantee of employment either within the education system as teachers at UP or at IHS or elsewhere within the government health system. No such guarantees applied to graduates of the UEM and all the unemployed graduates met by the ICRT came from that institution and had qualifications in agriculture.

A low-cost solution to post award monitoring developed during implementation (eg some reporting by institutions where graduates are employed and some post award interviewing of a significant and representative number of graduates) could have added value, allowing firm conclusions to be drawn firstly about the achievement of the basic program rationale and the proportion of graduates in some way contributing to national development.

A fundamental lesson to be drawn is that the designers and implementers of in-country scholarship programs need to give more attention to anticipated post-award scholarship outcomes. When outcomes monitoring is not built into the design conclusions can't ultimately be drawn about specific program impact in areas such as '... accelerating economic growth and reducing poverty ... cross-cutting governance issues including corruption and human rights ... partnership and the promotion of regional stability and cooperation ... and ... the long term development of the capacity of ... organisations and the state...', all areas where AusAID seeks to collect performance data.

While not suggesting that employment guarantees should be built into these types of programs, designs should also give more attention to issues that impact on employment such as the appropriateness of the institutions being supported and the fields of study.

Progression to other scholarship programs

When interviewed all graduates expressed an interest in further study, especially overseas and facilitated by more advanced scholarship programs. Several recent graduates had seriously

¹² It should be noted that the 1995 Review (page 6) stated that 'in future it will be important to monitor labour market absorption of candidates in order to ensure that no over-supply emerges in particular sectors'. This significant statement was not however picked up in the Review's 32 recommendations and seemingly missed by the 2000 Review team or not considered worth pursuing.

considered applying for the ADS program but saw major obstacles either in terms of poor English language skills or in one case because the graduate, head of a University teaching department, did not wish to move from his current field of expertise which did not match specified ADS priority study areas. One former scholarship holder is currently in Australia on an ADS scholarship and the ICRT interviewed two graduates recently selected for ADS awards commencing in 2008. This connection between the two scholarship programs is purely coincidental and given that AusAID has not until recently interviewed ADS applicants other former ICSAS graduates may have studied in Australia under the ADS program.

A lesson that may be drawn is that in-country scholarship programs funded by AusAID should at least acknowledge at design that there may be a future connection with other AusAID scholarship programs and consider whether this should influence any of the design parameters. For example, a match between sectoral priorities might be considered appropriate or language training could be included.¹³

Need for timely Completion Reviews

The program ended June 2006 however, the final 2 year period was a transition phase with no new scholarships and limited monitoring. In effect, the main program activities were finalised June 2004. The ICRT was not always able to meet with institution staff actively involved in program implementation and with Ministry staff actively involved in program monitoring through the PCC.

This highlights the need to commission Completion Reviews in a timely manner.¹⁴

¹³ The AusAID development cooperation program in Laos funds 2-year scholarships at the National University of Laos targeted at provincial school leavers who have qualified for university admission. They undertake a 'Foundation Studies' course as well as English language training and it is expected that they may then qualify for overseas (undergraduate) scholarships. Over an 8-year period, of around 230 graduates, 27% obtained overseas scholarships including 6 students who studied under the ADS program which seeks to encourage provincial applicants.

¹⁴ The ICRT does not believe that its conclusions would necessarily have been different if it had been able to meet with a wider range of individuals directly involved in ICSAS implementation and monitoring although more supporting evidence and data could have been obtained. It was fortunate that locally engaged AusAID staff responsible for the program at the time were either still based in the AusAID Maputo Office or where now based in Pretoria, were able to provide supporting information and to participate in the analysis of program activities.

8 Overall conclusions

8.1 Summary assessment

The scheme achieved its stated goal and in its final 5-year phase also achieved its component level objectives. It was relevant in terms of the AusAID's Aid Framework for Africa. The management and institutional arrangements were appropriate and cost effective overall.

The ICRT assessed the program against most indicators as highly effective and efficient. It achieved sustainable outcomes and positive impact overall. There was no requirement to monitor post-study outcomes and broader level impact could not be assessed. While statistics are not available, there is evidence that some of the graduates from one institution have been unable to obtain gainful employment since graduation.

Statistical gender targets were largely met but gender outcomes could have been improved. There was strong institutional ownership facilitated by a partnership approach between AusAID and institutional staff. Several graduates from the program have subsequently qualified for post graduate scholarship awards in Australia.

The ICRT was able to draw out a numbers of lessons (*Section 7*), some of which may be of wider interest to other AusAID programs. Some of these lessons are not new and merely serve to reemphasise fundamental issues of excellence in aid delivery described in AusAID's AusGuide '*Activity Quality Standards*'.

8.2 Future options for using in-country scholarship programs

Overall, the ICRT finds that in-country scholarship programs of this kind are an effective form of aid. However, in the current context of Mozambique and perhaps elsewhere, serious consideration would need to be given to pooling future support with the government's scholarship programs and the programs of other donors providing similar forms of aid. This reflects strong moves towards donor harmonisation in the tertiary education sector in Mozambique associated with broader financial reforms assisted by the World Bank and other major donors.

More generally, before launching any future in-country scholarship programs in Africa or elsewhere, a more targeted approach should be considered. The ICSAS fundamentally provided budget support in the tertiary education sector. A program of equivalent size could only ever hope to assist a very small number of deserving students. A similar AusAID program in Laos is targeted towards a particular group of students that might subsequently qualify for overseas scholarships and has been successful. ICSAS has also achieved some modest impact in this area although this was not a stated objective and outcomes have not been monitored.

Where such funding mechanisms are used in future, targeting adopted at the design stage should preferably take into account the employment prospects of scholarship holders (by reference to fields of study) and that post-award outcomes should be monitored.

8.3 Preferred mechanisms

Where pooling funds is not feasible implementation should be managed by the beneficiary institutions working in partnership with AusAID. Students should be involved in monitoring and coordination arrangements. Some modest levels of complementary TA should be funded and the provision of books also benefiting the wider student community should be considered. The use of commercial contractors should generally be avoided on cost effectiveness grounds and to maximise institutional ownership and sustainability.

Appendix 1: Terms of reference

1 Background and rationale

- 1.1 The goal of Australia's In-Country Scholarship Assistance Scheme (ICSAS) was to assist academically qualified persons mainly from the provinces and from poor and disadvantaged families of Mozambique to gain university and other relevant post-secondary qualifications in fields of study that are relevant to national development, namely health, agriculture, food security, and English language training.
- 1.2 The purpose of ICSAS was to establish a funding mechanism with higher education institutions whereby up to 300 Mozambican nationals received Australian financial assistance. The funding mechanism was also used to provide relevant texts to participating institutions on an annual basis, particularly English language training resources.
- 1.3 ICSAS was first implemented in 1988. Provision was made under the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the two governments to use a proportion of the revenue from the sale of bilateral development food aid to support the award of post-secondary scholarships. From 1990 to 1999, up to 10 per cent of the monetised wheat shipments from Australia supported some 300 scholarships at the two public universities in Maputo and the provinces.
- 1.4 With the cessation of food aid to Mozambique in 1998-99, the Government of Mozambique was advised by the Australian High Commissioner in Harare that Australia was keen to continue supporting some 300 scholarships a year, and would examine mechanisms for doing so. Funds for the scholarships remaining from the food aid program were sufficient to fund ICSAS, with some supplementary funding, to December 2000.
- 1.5 In November 2000 AusAID conducted a review of ICSAS, which recommended continued support for the scheme and made detailed recommendations to improve the management and administration of the scheme, including establishment of gender targets and re-distribution of the scholarships targets to: 100 for UEM; 50 for UP Maputo; 50 for UP Beira; 50 for UP Nampula and 50 for Institute of Health Sciences.
- 1.6 In August 2001, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed with the Government of Mozambique, for a three-year extension of ICSAS from July 2001 to June 2004. The Ministry of Education continued to chair the Project Coordination Committee (PCC). The PCC met annually and participants included representatives of Mozambique's Ministry of Foreign Affairs and of the scholarship awardees from the participant institutions.
- 1.7 A two year extension of the ICSAS program was approved from July 2004 to June 2006 to allow 98 beneficiary students to complete their five year study courses. In total, from 2000 to 2006, A\$1.6 million was spent on ICSAS.
- 1.8 The AusAID Maputo office monitored the implementation process through annual field visits and participation in the selection of the scholarship awardees. AusAID also developed improved monitoring procedures and trained the beneficiary institutions in the management and administration of the program, particularly financial management and reporting.
- 1.9 Participant institutions established an ICSAS databases and submitted annual budgets for each year (including a list of selected students) according to the agreed criteria covering

student stipends and annual trip home and including a contribution for library books and training of staff managing ICSAS activities. Each participant institution signed a funding agreement with AusAID. Annual payments were made to each institution's ICSAS dedicated bank account, following acceptance and approval of the annual plans, reports and acquittals.

- 1.10 With the completion of the program in June 2006, and in line with AusAID guidelines, an independent assessment of the ICSAS needs to be undertaken and an Independent Completion Report (ICR) compiled.

2 Rationale of the ICR

- 2.1 AusAID has decided to undertake an independent review of ICSAS although it was below the usual threshold for ICRs in Africa. ICSAS was perceived as an innovative and successful project (both by the Government of Mozambique and AusAID post staff) that was run in-country with minimal operational and administrative costs, and which remains consistent with and complementary to AusAID's current framework of international assistance in terms of scholarships.
- 2.2 AusAID provides Australian Development Scholarships to Mozambique but there is a gap in support available in-country at graduate level. ICSAS provided niche support to allow disadvantaged Mozambicans, particularly from provincial level, to complete their graduate studies. Over one year after ICSAS funding ended, the ICR will serve as virtually an ex-post evaluation in allowing AusAID to assess the usefulness and relevance of this support, both during implementation and today, whilst also drawing broader lessons that may be of interest to other AusAID programs.

3 Objectives

- 3.1 To assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of ICSAS, in order to compile an Independent Completion Report (ICR) in accordance with AusGuidelines.
- 3.2 To validate the outcomes and impacts of ICSAS as reported in program documentation from participant institutions, PCC meetings, and field monitoring visits
- 3.3 To draw out lessons that may be of wider interest to other AusAID programs in Africa and more broadly.
- 3.4 To identify whether in-country scholarships schemes such as ICSAS (or parts thereof) are an effective form of aid, both in the current context in Mozambique and more generally, that AusAID could consider utilising further in Africa and identify options for doing so.

4 Scope of Services

- 4.1 The contractor will conduct a review of ICSAS in order to prepare the Independent Completion Report for the program. The contractor will report to AusAID on the outcomes of the process taking into account the AusGuidelines, and the ICR objectives outlined above. The review should also assess the usefulness and impact of ICSAS in the context of AusAID's framework of assistance to Africa 2003-7.
- 4.2 The review should specifically identify lessons to be drawn from the program which are relevant to AusAID's programs in Africa and more broadly.

- 4.3 The review should also examine the relative effectiveness (given AusAID's stated framework of assistance), both within the current context in Mozambique and more generally in Africa, of supporting in-country scholarships; outline options for utilising and implementing such programs; and recommend to AusAID a preferred mechanism for managing such programs. For comparative purposes, the ICR should consider alternate models for supporting graduate level scholarships offered by other international agencies in-country.
- 4.4 During the fieldwork, the Consultant will be accompanied by a locally contracted expert on the Mozambican education system. An AusAID staff member may also accompany the review.
- 4.5 While the ICR report will be the full responsibility of the Consultants, it is expected that the assessment process will be participatory and involve joint analysis of program activities with both the local implementing partners and AusAID. The contractor will be required to produce an aide memoire for distribution to these partners.

5 Duration and phasing:

5.1 Anticipated time required for the ICR process is 15 days for the team leader as follows:

- days desk review of existing documentation
- days/nights in Maputo
- 1 day/night in Beira
- 1 day in Nampula
- ½ day debriefing in AusAID Canberra
- 5½ days to write the aide memoir and draft ICR
- 1 day to finalise the ICR

5.2 Note that the local consultant will be expected to provide up to 10 days working on the review as follows:

- 3 days desk review of existing documentation & preparation in setting up the program of meetings for the review
- 3 days/nights in Maputo
- 1 day/night in Beira
- 1 day in Nampula
- 2 days providing comments and input to the draft aid memoire and ICR

5.3 Preparation: This phase will formally commence with the provision of the ICSAS program documentation to the consultant. It is envisaged that the documentation will be made available by AusAID to the consultant by 19 October 2007.

5.4 In-country investigation will take 5 days from 5 November to 9 November 2007, including debriefing AusAID (staff from Pretoria may travel to Maputo to participate).

5.5 Report writing may commence during the in-country investigation and will be completed when the final ICR has been submitted to AusAID Pretoria. The draft ICR is to be provided to AusAID Pretoria by no later than 23 November 2007.

6 Inputs

6.1 Preparatory Phase

6.1.1 Activities to be undertaken during this phase will include the following:

- (a) Review of relevant ICSAS documentation including:
 - the 2000 ICSAS Review report;
 - approved participant institutions annual proposals, reports, budgets and funding agreements;
 - PCC meeting reports;
 - AusAID field visit reports; and
 - other documents found to be relevant.
- (b) Discuss and agree with AusAID a schedule for the in-country assessment and specific issues to be addressed with partner implementing agencies during the process of the ICR.

6.2 In-country review

6.2.1 Activities to be undertaken during this phase will include meetings and interviews with the following:

- (a) AusAID staff responsible for management of the ICSAS program (in Maputo);
- (b) Representatives from Mozambican Government institutions responsible for the management of the partnership with AusAID, including:
 - Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Cooperation
 - Ministry of Education & Culture
- (c) Key informants from participant institutions being:
 - Eduardo Mondlane University
 - Pedagogic University in Maputo, Beira and Nampula
 - Institute of Health Sciences

Some meetings will take place at the institutions and it is also hoped to organise a joint meeting of staff from all the Maputo institutions that were previously involved in implementing ICSAS.

- (d) ICSAS beneficiaries – it is expected that some beneficiaries may be met during visits to institutions and AusAID will also convene a separate meeting with beneficiaries to be invited by placing an announcement in the local newspaper.
- (e) Other relevant stakeholders and donor agencies involved in similar activities such as the Dutch and Swedish governments and the Ford Foundation. Consideration is also being given to holding a joint meeting with these agencies.
- (f) Discuss initial feedback and recommendations with AusAID staff

7. Outputs

7.1 Report writing

7.1.1 Activities to be undertaken during this phase will include the following:

- (a) Compile a draft ICR in accordance with Section 5.1 “Preparing Completion Reports” of the AusGuidelines, to be submitted no later than 23 November 2007, bearing in mind that no ACR has previously been prepared for ICSAS;
- (b) Prepare a brief version of the ICR which may be distributed to Government of Mozambique partners in the form of an aide memoire; and
- (c) Complete a final ICR incorporating AusAID’s comments, within two weeks of receipt of those comments.

8. Specifications of the Consultants

8.1 Both members of the team must have relevant tertiary level qualifications and a significant amount of relevant experience of the tertiary education sector in developing countries, preferably in southern Africa. They must have knowledge of the particular difficulties facing universities in low income countries. In addition, they should have experience of capacity building programs (ideally including scholarship programs) and delivery mechanisms for those programs; assessment of contributions to project purpose and expected outcomes using participatory consultative approaches.

8.2 The Mozambican team member will be fluent in both English and Portuguese and will be willing to assist the team leader in translating some meetings.

9 Team Members’ Roles & Responsibilities

9.2 Team leader

In accordance with the Terms of Reference, the team leader will

- Lead the mission into Mozambique and the debriefing of AusAID both in-country and in Canberra, on return.
- Lead discussions with representatives from the Government of Mozambique and all other parties that are approached as part of the review.
- Provide advice on AusAID’s reporting requirements and policy priorities, in consultation with the AusAID desk in Canberra and Post in Pretoria, as necessary.
- Take responsibility for completion of the report of the mission and a brief aide memoire for distribution to Government of Mozambique partners.
- Be responsible for the overall direction of the mission and allocation of tasks among team members.

9.3 Local consultant

In accordance with the terms of reference and under the direction of the team leader, the local consultant will:

- Undertake a support role, together with the AusAID Maputo office, in setting up meetings, scheduling the program and in locating/contacting ICSAS beneficiaries.
- Participate as a member of the review team during the Mozambique leg of the mission.

- Attend all meetings during the review and translate for the team leader where necessary.
- Participate in team discussions on findings of the review, some of which may take place outside of normal working hours.
- Based on knowledge of Mozambican Government structures and the tertiary education system, provide up to date contextual information to the review;
- Assess the satisfaction of the Mozambican Government departments with ICSAS.
- Provide input to the ICR and brief aide memoire which will be distributed to Government of Mozambique partners.
- Assist the team leader, as required.

Appendix 2: Program of activities

Date	Meeting / Activity
Maputo	
5 November (Monday)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ AusAID Maputo and AusAID Pretoria staff briefing and discussions ▪ Meeting with Deputy Director of Planning and Cooperation, Ministry of Education and Culture ▪ Discussions with staff of Eduardo Mondlane University (UEM) including the Coordinator of Project Finance and the Director of Academic Registration ▪ Meeting with UEM Academic Vice Rector
6 November (Tuesday)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussions with AusAID Maputo and AusAID Pretoria staff ▪ Discussions with staff of Pedagogic University (UP) and a group of 8 Australian scholarship beneficiaries ▪ Meeting with the Director for Asia and Oceania and the Head of South East Asia Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation ▪ Discussions with staff of Institute of Health Sciences (IHS) including the Pedagogic Director and a group of 3 Australian scholarship beneficiaries now teachers at the Institute ▪ Meeting with a group of 13 Australian scholarship beneficiaries from UEM and UP Maputo
Beira	
7 November (Wednesday)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting with staff of Pedagogic University (UP) Beira campus ▪ Discussions with a group of 9 Australian scholarship beneficiaries ▪ Team workshop
Nampula	
8 November (Thursday)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussions with a group of 7 Australian scholarship beneficiaries ▪ Meeting with staff of Pedagogic University (UP) Nampula campus including former Head of Academic Registration ▪ Working lunch with former manager of Netherlands-funded Nisome In-Country Provincial Scholarships Program ▪ Meeting with Director of UP Nampula campus ▪ Team workshop
Maputo	
9 November (Friday)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussions with 2 Australian in-country scholarship beneficiaries selected for 2008 academic year ADS post graduate awards ▪ Joint in-country scholarships donors meeting covering World Bank; Netherlands; Portugal and Belgium ▪ Debriefing meeting with AusAID Maputo and AusAID Pretoria staff to discuss findings and lessons learned.

Appendix 3: PCC monitoring

As discussed in Sections 3.2.1, 3.2.4 and 3.2.9, the PCC played a critical role in monitoring at a broader program level, in managing risks and in facilitating direct beneficiary participation in monitoring and in addressing higher level performance issues. The brief extracts below from key PCC meeting records indicate the overall effectiveness of this process.

The October 2001 PCC Workshop

A major success factor was a PCC Workshop held in October 2001 attended by all stakeholders. It exemplifies the partnership approach and is viewed by the ICRT as a good practice example of how to foster commitment on the part of a group of beneficiaries who had in effect been blamed for a range of administrative and management shortcomings that had ‘plagued’ (to quote the 2000 Review) the Scheme for many years. The workshop approach was recommended by the 2000 Review.

The Workshop had a clear set of objectives covering the creation of databases; identifying any difficulties in creating such databases; identifying priority areas of the ICSAS implementation process and the development of a joint AusAID and institutional workplan based on the 2000 Review recommendations.

Participants were encouraged to express their expectations from the workshop. For the institutions and MOE which played an active role in the proceedings, these were: harmonising program implementation methods and procedures; sharing information on other institutions’ experience to improve institutional management; evaluating performance in the management of scholarships; familiarisation with the new ICSAS environment; increasing knowledge in the scholarships area; obtaining information about ICSAS and the dynamics of its implementation and finally to be clear about donor interests and objectives.

Group discussion focused on the challenges faced by institutions in managing scholarship programs. AusAID’s specific management and reporting requirements were not tabled at the meeting but translated and distributed later. However all participants had seen the recommendations of the 2000 Review. This approach helped ensure that the discussion did not get bogged down in administrative detail. The challenges were tabulated and reviewed in terms firstly of what the institutions could do themselves and how to deal with internal administrative constraints and secondly where support was needed. In response AusAID agreed to: fund computer training for relevant staff; to participate in follow up workshops at each institution to explain the operations of ICSAS in more detail; and to provide some technical assistance to establish information systems to facilitate program management and monitoring.

The Workshop concluded with the preparation of a detailed Action Plan that tabulated against each of eight priority areas agreed action by the institutions and by AusAID.

May 2002 PCC meeting

The May 2002 Minutes show early positive impact from implementation of the Review recommendations. Students had received a program brochure and displayed a good awareness of conditions. Gender issues have been addressed. The institutions had established student databases using agreed templates. Relevant institutional staff had received IT training. All of the institutions were said to be working cooperatively with AusAID. Information flows had improved.

November 2002 PCC meeting

The November 2002 PCC Minutes reported further progress but also showed that there were some continuing problems with timely institutional acquittals which had delayed payments to some students. (Statistical) gender targets had been achieved – above those recommended by the 2000 Review. Student representatives reported improvements in the quality of services provided by institutions.

There is a reference to a clear workplan focusing on standardised management and reporting procedures that was being updated prior to each PCC and that served all stakeholders as a useful monitoring tool.

May 2003 PCC meeting

The May 2003 PCC was informed that all institutions had submitted their financial reports within the agreed deadline. Some conclusions about overall program progress were recorded and the need for an exit strategy was raised.

During the last two years the program was said to have registered substantial improvement of its administrative and management processes following the recommendations of the 2000 Review. However, as the project was about to enter its final year of implementation commencing July 2003, the institutional staff and beneficiary students had expressed concerns that some of the students might not be able to continue their studies if the ICSAS project is not continued.

November 2003 PCC meeting

This PCC meeting concluded with *‘an evaluation of the impact of the project on the institutions capacity to manage the ICSAS scholarships and on the beneficiaries’* in the following terms:

‘Both the institutions staff and the beneficiary students pointed out the positive aspects of the ICSAS project such as the provision of institutional book grants and the increase of their capacity of responding to the demand of scholarships by students from the provinces. Others included the training of institutions’ staff responsible for the management of the project in computer use, basic accounts and English language. The students also noted that the annual home leave has been an important element of the ICSAS scholarship project as it provides them with the opportunity to visit their families at end of each academic year. They also appreciated the fact that the ICSAS project provides them with support to prepare their thesis.’

There was discussion about the future of the ICSAS program. AusAID had formally informed MOE in October 2003 that the continuation of ICSAS was unlikely in the context of AusAID’s new Africa Program Framework 2003. The PCC discussed the expected negative impact on beneficiary students who will not have finished their course by June 2004.

The PCC meeting concluded by recommending *‘that a final two year extension of the ICSAS project be authorised under the new Africa Development Co-operation Framework for 2003-07 to allow for an exit strategy that would enhance the positive impact that the project has up to now achieved by continuing to support the beneficiary students who are still to complete their courses’*.

These views were reinforced at a final PCC meeting in May 2004 and in June 2004 AusAID formally approved a 2-year program extension covering ongoing students.

Appendix 4: Annual expenditure and scholarship numbers

Table 1: Annual Expenditure by institution (\$A'000)

Year	UP Maputo	UP Beira	UP Nampula	UP Total	UEM	IHS	Total
2001/02	100	69	37	206	222	41	469#
2002/03	64	57	65	186	124	47	357
2003/04	71	53	51	175	117	52	344
2004/05	34	49	47	130	98	30	258
2005/06	26	28	31	85	60	0	145
Total	295	256	231	782	621	170	1,573

Includes delayed payments for some scholarships from 2000/01, primarily from UEM. These scholarships from the previous phase of the program are not reflected in Table 2.

Table 2: Number of scholarships funded each year by institution ##

Year	UP Maputo	UP Beira	UP Nampula	UP Total	UEM	IHS	Total
2001/02	73	50	27	150	120	30	300
2002/03	50	50	50	150	100	50	300
2003/04	50	50	50	150	100	50	300
2004/05	26	37	36	99	75	23	197
2005/06	16	24	19	59	39	0	98
Total	215	211	182	608	434	153	1,195

Scholarship numbers in this table do not accurately reflect the number of students that benefited from program. This is because students that did not meet the set academic performance standards or withdrew for other reasons, were replaced by other students. However, in the first three years of the new phase, 300 scholarships were maintained at any one time in line with the program goal.

References

AusAID (2005), *Review of the Mozambique Australia In-country Scholarship Award Scheme, Mission Report*, July 10-14

AusAID (1998), *Framework for Australian Aid to Africa, 1998-2001*

AusAID (2000), *Australia-Mozambique Development Cooperation Program, In-country Scholarship Award Scheme, Report of a Joint review Mission*, December 2000

AusAID – ACNielsen (2003), *Laos ADS Impact Assessment: Final Report on Qualitative Research and Final Summary*, 23 October

AusAID (2003), *Australia and Africa: Facing the Challenges as Partners, 2003-07*

AusAID (2005), *Laos Australia Development Cooperation Program. Australian Development Scholarships Review, Final Report*. 22 August

AusAID (2006), *Australian Aid: Promoting Growth and Stability. A White Paper on the Australian Government's Overseas Aid Program*, May

AusAID, *AusGUIDE & AusGUIDELines*

AusAID (2007), *Preparing Completion reports for AusAID – Interim Guidelines*, Office of Development Effectiveness, 28 May

OECD (2001), *DAC Principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance*

Mozambique (2003) *The Mozambican Experience: Initiating and Sustaining Tertiary Education Reform*, Lúcia Brito, Minister for Higher Education, Science and Technology: A Case Study prepared for a Regional Training Conference on Improving Tertiary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: *Things That Work!* Accra, September 23-25

Mozambique (2003) *Higher Education in Mozambique - A Case Study. Partnership for Higher Education in Africa*, 20 May

Sweden (2003), *Support to the University Eduardo Mondlane, Mozambique, Evaluation 03/35: Sida Department for Research Co-operation*, April

World Bank (2002), *Project Appraisal Document on a Proposed Credit in the Amount of \$US60 million to the Republic Of Mozambique for a Higher Education Project*, Report No: 22962-MOZ, 4 February

World Bank (2005), *An Independent Review of World Bank Support for Capacity Building in Africa: The Case of Mozambique*. Corporate Evaluation and Methods Operations Evaluation Department, 6 April

Other papers:

Records of PCC Meetings covering the final phase of ICSAS

Program MOUs & Funding and Institutional Funding & Supplementary Funding Agreements

AusAID Activity Monitoring Brief January 2003

FMA Regulation 13 Funding Approvals 2002-2005

AusAID AIDWORKS 2007 and Excel Expenditure 2002/03 – 2004/05 printouts

AusAID Monitoring File Notes on meetings with institution staff and students

AusAID File Note on meeting with staff of Nisome project, October 2000

AusAID File Notes on participation in Scholarship Selection Committee meetings

AusAID ICSAS Briefing Notes 2001-2005

MOE comments on 2001 Review Report, 2001

Record of PCC ICSAS Workshop, October 2001

ICSAS Program Brochure, July 2001

ICSAS Workplan 2001-2004

AusAID Projects Brief: Mozambique 2006

ICSAS Audit Reports for HIS; UEM; UP Maputo; UP Beira; UP Nampula, Grant Thornton Chartered Accountants, June 2002

Laos National University AusAID Provincial Scholarships – Briefing Note (2005)