



# Building, Nurturing & Retention of the Next Generation of African Academics Project

---

Second Reference Group Meeting at Hotel Royale, Kampala-  
Uganda, February 9th, 2012

## Contents

1.0	Attendance.....	2
2.0	Introduction .....	3
3.0	Welcome Remarks by the Ag. Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic Affairs), Makerere .....	3
4.0	Remarks by Professor Omotade Akin Aina .....	4
5.0	Updates on NGAA Projects and Discussions.....	5
5.1	University of Cape Town .....	5
5.1	University of Witwatersrand.....	6
5.2	Makerere University .....	9
6.0	Modalities for mutual learning across participating Universities.....	11
7.0	Presentation / Comments on 1 <sup>st</sup> Mid-Term Evaluation by Dr. K. Namuddu, Consultant .....	12
8.0	Way Forward.....	17
9.0	Preparedness for the successor project .....	19
10.	Closing Remarks.....	19

**BUILDING, NURTURING AND RETENTION OF THE NEXT GENERATION OF  
AFRICAN ACADEMICS PROJECT**

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECOND REFERENCE GROUP MEETING HELD AT HOTEL  
ROYALE, KAMPALA-UGANDA ON FEBRUARY 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2012**

**1.0 Attendance**

<b>1</b>	Prof. Omotade Akin Aina	Carnegie Program Director, Higher Education & Libraries in Africa, International Program
<b>2</b>	Prof. Max Rodney Price	Vice Chancellor, University of Cape Town
<b>3</b>	Prof. Loyiso Nongxa	Vice Chancellor & Principal, University of Witwatersrand, South Africa
<b>4</b>	Dr. Katherine Namuddu	Consultant, Midterm Evaluation
<b>5</b>	Prof. Daniel Petrus Visser	Deputy Vice-Chancellor, University of Cape Town
<b>6</b>	Dr. Aletta Marilet Sienaert	Director, Research office, University of Cape Town
<b>7</b>	Prof. Yosuf Veriava	Chief Specialist; School of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Witwatersrand
<b>8</b>	Mr. Tembile Kulati	Strategic Research Projects Director, University of Witwatersrand
<b>9</b>	Prof. Lillian Tibatemwa-Ekirikubinza	Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, Makerere University
<b>10</b>	Prof. Eli Katunguka-Rwakishaya	Director, Research & Graduate Training, Makerere University
<b>11</b>	Assoc Prof. George Nasinyama	Deputy Director, Research & Graduate Training, Makerere University
<b>12</b>	Dr. Elizabeth Kaase Bwanga	Ag. Director, Planning & Development Department, Makerere University
<b>13</b>	Ms. Catherine Kanabahita	Director, Gender Mainstreaming, Makerere University
<b>14</b>	Dr. Maria Nassuna-Musoke	Desk Officer, NGAA, Makerere University
<b>15</b>	Mr. Agaba Issa Mugabo	Brand & Marketing Manager, Makerere University
<b>16</b>	Ms. Susan Mbabazi	Secretariat, Makerere University

17	Mr. Nestor Mugabe	Secretariat, Makerere University
18	Ms. Carolyn Mirembe	Secretariat, Makerere University

---

### Absent with Apology

1	Prof. Venansius Baryamureeba	Vice Chancellor, Makerere University
2	Prof Yaa Ntiamoah-Baidu	Director, University of Ghana Carnegie NGAA Project
3	Prof Kwado Ofori	Dean School of Graduate studies, University of Ghana

## 2.0 Introduction

The second reference Group Meeting was held at Imperial Resort Hotel, Kampala on 9<sup>th</sup> February 2012 to further discuss what was started in the first meeting.

The specific objectives of the meeting were to:

- (1). Share progress of ongoing projects across the four universities
- (2). Discuss modalities for mutual learning across participating Universities
  - Documentation and dissemination of effective practices
  - Assess modes and parameters for regular interaction and meetings
  - Use of the Web-Portal
- (3). Propose and agree on any other set of activities and support that the four universities envisage as a group that requires negotiation and carrying forward.
- (4). Explore more opportunities for collaboration and interaction among the four universities for the successor project

## 3.0 Welcome Remarks by Ag. Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic Affairs), Makerere University, Prof. Lillian Tibatemwa-Ekirikubinza,

Prof. Tibatemwa-Ekirikubinza welcomed the delegates from the various universities to Uganda and extended apologies from Prof. Venansius Baryamureeba, Ag. Vice Chancellor, Makerere University who was attending a University Council meeting that morning and would join the meeting later in the day. Apologies from the delegates from the University of Ghana were registered. Their flight was cancelled at the last minute due to bad weather.

The meeting was a follow up on the November 2010 meeting that was held in Nairobi. The inaugural meeting of the Inter-University Reference Working Group implementing the Carnegie supported project on Building, Nurturing and retention of the next Generation of African Academics was held at Crown Plaza Hotel on November 17, 2010. All the four participating universities and Carnegie Corporation of New York were represented.

The purpose of the second meeting was to share progress of implementing the ongoing projects, assess modes of operation, interact and explore more networking opportunities. The specific objectives of the meeting were to:

- Share progress of ongoing projects across the four universities
- Discuss modalities for mutual learning across participating Universities
  - Documentation and dissemination of effective practices
  - Assess modes and parameters for regular interaction and meetings
  - Use of the Web-Portal
- Propose and agree on any other set of activities and support that the four universities envisage as a group that requires negotiation and carrying forward.
- Explore more opportunities for collaboration and interaction among the four universities for the successor project

Prof. Tibatemwa-Ekirikubinza extended her gratitude to the Carnegie Corporation of New York for the continued support to Makerere University for many years. She in particular thanked Prof. Omotade for his support in the current project.

#### **4.0 Remarks by the Carnegie Program Director, Higher Education and Libraries in Africa, International Program, Professor Omotade Akin Aina**

Prof. Omotade thanked the delegates for attending the second reference group meeting and extended greetings from the Corporation in New York.

He stressed the importance of doctoral and post doctoral research training in African countries as prerequisites for development. He urged participants to go beyond Carnegie support and to constitute a corpus of what can be called the 'African University', share knowledge, practices and see what it is to become a research university in the context of Africa. For example, the University of Ghana was a very dynamic institution that was reaching out to other universities.

Prof. Omotade called upon participants to continue networking and to be open so that the collaboration among the universities transcends Carnegie. Carnegie was playing a facilitation role but the universities had the capacity, the history and excellence to maintain the network.

He informed participants that the Corporation had engaged KPMG firm to audit all projects in preparation for grant renewal.

## 5.0 Updates on NGAA Projects and Discussions

### 5.1 University of Cape Town

Dr. Aletta Marilet Sienaert, Director, Research Office, UCT gave an overview of the University of Cape Town Project. From her presentation it was noted that:

- The Project focused on three thematic areas namely Infectious Diseases, Civil Engineering and Economics.
- Activities include mentorship (differentiated from supervision), workshops; feed-back seminars; and support groups.
- The project awarded 40 PhD and 7 postdoctoral grants. The plan was 38 PhDs and 7 Postdoctoral grants.
- The UCT Project Implementation Committee (PIC) is comprised of representatives from the Research Office, Postgraduate Funding Office, Finance Manager and other relevant departmental/sector heads. PIC oversees and monitors the project
- The Research Office is responsible for the day to day management of the project
- Mid- and year-end academic progress reports are recorded for each student
- The major challenges encountered include:
  - ❖ Recruitment took longer than anticipated

- ❖ One PhD award was not taken up and was replaced by one postdoc
  - ❖ One candidate withdrew from the scheme
  - ❖ Accommodating adjustments to training model
  - ❖ Running a four-year degree(s) within project's two-year time-frame
  - ❖ Managing the project across decentralized system
- Major insights so far include:
    - ❖ The project has created a pool of peer groups who hold feedback sessions to share experiences
    - ❖ Drawing on top scholars to meet with and motivate students
    - ❖ Hosting day of presentations by 'Carnegie fellows' to assist with student progress
    - ❖ One-on-one mentorship sessions
    - ❖ Peer and supervisor support
    - ❖ Celebratory 'fellows' dinner – with motivational talk by top scholar

## Discussion

During the discussion, the following key issues were highlighted:

- (i) The project span vis a vis PhD duration cuts across the 4 projects and participants were not sure of what would happen to the students after the December 2012. In response, Prof. Omotade suggested that Universities should consider supporting some of the students during Phase 2 to enable them complete their studies.
- (ii) Makerere University has a lot to learn from the UCT mentoring component. It was agreed that UCT should share the details of the mentoring model.
- (iii) Members also requested UCT for more information about the project management tool that enabled them manage decentralized selection and monitoring processes of beneficiaries. UCT promised to share the tool which comprised of service level agreements, activities and timelines, TOR of PIC members and flow charts.

## 5.1 University of Witwatersrand

The presentation was made by Mr. Tembile Kulati, Strategic Research Projects Director

The Carnegie Fellowship Training Programme at University of Witwatersrand had 2 major components namely:

***(a) Programme 1: Clinician Scientists Program***

**Programme Objectives:**

- Establish a Division for Academic Medicine as a vehicle for bringing African clinical practitioners into a scholarly research environment
- Increase the number of clinician scientists who complete a PhD and are qualified to teach and supervise research in an academic setting
- Support the clinician scientists' training by providing courses in research methodology, and in personal development

***Programme setup and progress to date:***

A Carnegie PhD Committee (Academic Medicine) has been established, chaired by the Assistant Dean (Research). Membership consists of the Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences and selected senior professors in the faculty

Professor John Pettifor, an A-rated clinical scientist, has been appointed as the Programme Director

***Under this component:***

- 4 fellowships awarded in cardiology, ophthalmology, surgery and rheumatology
- Each of the four fellows has been allocated one or more supervisors who will mentor them
- A programme of training courses for the PhD fellows has been developed on topics such as protocol development, scientific writing, time and stress management, analysis and critical reading of scientific literature
- Agreement has been reached with the (Provincial) Department of Health and Social Development for those in posts within the health service to be given two years of unpaid leave from their clinical positions

***(b) Programme 2: Global Change Studies***

***Programme Objectives:***



- Establish the Global Change and Sustainability Research Institute (GCSRI) as a vehicle for the development of expertise in Global Change and Sustainability. The focus is social sciences
- Recruit and provide training to 21 PhD students and 2 Postdoctoral Fellows in the area of Global Change and Sustainability
- Increase opportunities for Transdisciplinary research in Global Change within Wits and with partner institutions

***Programme setup:***

- Programme is run under the auspices of the Global Change and Sustainability Research Institute (<http://www.wits.ac.za/gcsri>), which was launched on the 8 November 2011
- A steering committee with members from different faculties has been established
- The post of Director has been advertised (Exxaro endowed Chair)

***Progress to date and Challenges:***

- 14 doctoral fellowships awarded (8 in Science, 4 in Engineering and one each Health Sciences and Humanities). Further doctoral awards (mainly in humanities and social sciences) will be made this year
- 2 postdoctoral fellowships awarded, although one has been withdrawn
- The cross-faculty nature of the PhD programme has proven to be administratively challenging

**Discussion**

- (i) The University target of 21 doctoral fellowships under the Global Change Studies was not realized because of a general shortage in the Social Sciences. The University hopes to fill remaining places by placing a call for another round of applicants
- (ii) Just like for UCT, the University of Wits faces a risk of staff brain drain and low completion rate. Members suggested that the selection criteria should be linked to a strategy of ensuring retention in the academia. Focusing on young academics already in the system is one way of ensuring staff retention.
- (iii) All projects should put in place bonding agreements that require beneficiaries to stay in the academia and focus on teaching and research and desist from consultancy work. The beneficiaries can be put under oath.

- (iv) Participants agreed that there is no guarantee that trained staff will stay in the academia given the low pay, like in the case of Makerere University where conditions force staff to look for 'greener pastures' outside Africa.
- (v) Although the need to support non-academic university staff to pursue PhDs as a way of motivating them and advancing their analytical competencies necessary for efficient higher education management was advanced, the focus of the NGAA project was on addressing the challenges of an aging academic staff. Administrators can benefit from other grants that focus on professional managerial competencies.

## 5.2 Makerere University

### 5.2.1 Building and Nurturing the Next Generation of Academic Project

Dr. George W. Nasinyama, Deputy Director (Research and Publications), Directorate of Research and Graduate Training Makerere University presented an overview of the Makerere University Project:

- The goal of the project is to improve the capacity of Makerere University and other public universities in Uganda to build and retain academic staff
- The project has two strategic interventions namely; (a) Human resource development in the thematic area of Food, Nutrition and Value Addition and (b) Foster retention of academics
- The initial target was to train 20 Masters and 20 PhDs students, and 6 post doctoral fellowships
- The project also set out to train junior staff in Research Management, Scholarly Writing, Communication Skills and Personal Development
- The Project is coordinated by the Directorate of Research and Graduate Training
- There is an oversight committee – Project Implementation Committee and a Project Management committee
- The first round attracted 13 Post Doctoral Teams and six (6) were selected and awarded.
- The project experienced a challenge of getting sufficient applicants especially women. After wide consultations with Carnegie and University Management, it was agreed that there should be a shift in focus from full scholarships to small grants (like in ACSR) and open up to other themes for:

Research proposal Development

Data Collection, Analysis and Write up

- (c) Data Analysis and Write up
- (d) Publication
- (e) Travel grant to international conferences to present paper

- The number of PhD and Carnegie grantees as a result of the small grants scheme are as follows :

CATEGORY	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
PhD	27	8	35
Masters	22	6	28

- The mentoring process is ongoing and plans are underway to match mentors and mentees and thereafter roll out the mentoring plan.
- The project also developed an M&E tools, outcome evaluation framework and an internal monitoring plan.
- As a spin off, Makerere was awarded a grant of USD 50,000 by Carnegie Corporation to coordinate the RGM and develop a web portal.
- The web portal is functional but need to be populated with data from the the partnering universities
- The major challenges have been
  - completion of activities in time due to procurement delays
  - low representation of women beneficiaries and
  - delays in securing information for the web portal

### Discussion

- (i) Makerere should think of issues of accountability given the paradigm shift from the original theme of 'Food Nutrition and value Addition'. The goal of the project was to build a pool of experts in the selected field which has not been the case for Makerere.
- (ii) In addition, the idea of small grants would make it difficult for Makerere to measure output given that the project initially set out to support 20 PhDs. The question is, how do the small grants relate to the target of 20 PhDs? Makerere should reflect on this seriously and think of the best way to account to Carnegie.

- (iii) It will be difficult for Makerere to attribute the increased critical mass of young academics solely to the NGAA project since some of them were receiving supplementary funding having benefitted from other funding agencies as well.

### 5.2.2 The NGAA Web portal and Coordination of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Reference Group Meeting (RGM)

#### Discussion

- Some of the members were not aware of the additional grant to support the RGM and what facilitation was envisaged. However, it was clarified that Makerere University volunteered to coordinate the 2<sup>nd</sup> RGM and was facilitated by Carnegie under the Web portal grant.
- Members agreed that:
  - (a) the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase should include a provision to facilitate participation in the Reference Group Meetings
  - (b) Makerere to share the RGM & Webportal Proposal and budget with the other three universities.
  - (c) there was need to improve on the communication channels
  - (d) That the VCs of each partner university should nominate designated contact persons to coordinate the process of information sharing among the four universities.

## 6.0 Modalities for mutual learning across participating Universities

### 6.1 Grant Duration:

The two- year phase was a pilot phase that was used as a learning phase. For example the variance between PhD study duration and programme duration posed a challenge across all universities and each university addressed this differently. Targeting registered students was one way of addressing this. Therefore, the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase should draw lessons from the 1<sup>st</sup> phase and the projects should share their experiences.

### 6.2 PhD Training versus Building and Nurturing the Next Generation of Academics:

The focus of the projects is not PhD training as an end in itself. The Universities should learn from each other the strategies used to build and nurture the next generation of academics. Issues of staff retention, building a critical mass, mentoring, participating in conferences and networking all contribute to building an academic. NGAA should define what it means to be a scholar, issues of emerging trends, new technologies, and plagiarism need to be reflected upon.

The Corporation demands a report that goes beyond number of scholars supported. The report should go beyond to highlight how many people have benefitted in terms of number of students supervised, number of young people mentored, number of publications made etc

### **6.3 Strengthening Communication through the web portal**

The web portal should be used as a tool for disseminating best practices. Supervision and mentoring experiences can also be shared on the web portal

## **7.0 Presentation / Comments on 1<sup>st</sup> Mid-Term Evaluation by Dr. Katherine Namuddu, Consultant**

Dr. Namuddu's presentation raised the following issues:

### **7.1 TORs for the evaluation**

- It is important to hold consultations and agreeing on the TORs for the evaluation as soon as the grant is approved
- The TORs are not primarily for the evaluator. They are primarily for the project implementer. It is the implementer who needs to understand what the evaluation will be looking for and, therefore, be in a position to structure all project activities in such a way as to collect data pertaining to the TORs
- Perceptions that TORs are primarily for the evaluator, is a major flaw in many projects. One can design the most elegant TORs either from the granting institution's point of view or from the proposal. However, if the project collects little useful data that corresponds to the TORs, the project will be flawed. However, an evaluation can be done using the TORs and it will confirm the project's flawed nature.
- It is worth repeating that grantee institutions must be hopeful that there is something, however small that they can learn from an evaluation, instead of entertaining the more common hope of satisfying the funding agency.
- Collection and assembling primary and secondary data (on about 60+ variables / issues) that is needed during the evaluation of Carnegie supported projects must begin on the first day of the project based not only on the proposal but also on an analysis of the TORs for the evaluation.
- A major challenge in doing evaluations is that project implementers appear to be unclear as to who should 'know' what types of data to be collected for the evaluation.
- Another challenge might arise where there is misunderstanding of what are important and unimportant documents. When the evaluator says: "Please provide all relevant

documentation related to the project”, they mean precisely that. The evaluator will decide on the importance or otherwise of a relevant document.

- The consultant provided tools she had developed to guide evaluation (Table 1)

**7.2 Outline of the Areas and Issues to evaluate and what it is they are looking for.**

<i>Areas and Issues To be Explored</i>		<b>Indicators</b>			
		<b>Success (Effectiveness)</b>	<b>Efficiency</b>	<b>Relevance</b>	<b>Impact</b>
1	PROCESS (how project functions)				
2	OUTPUTS(who is benefitting)				
3	OUTCOMES (nature of the benefit and what is changing as a result to the project)				
4	LEVERAGING (extra resources and partnerships with funders, universities and other stakeholders being developed)				
5	INSTITUTIONALIZATION (what plans and thinking are being considered for institutionalizing)				

<i>Assessment of Processes</i>		<b>Primary Data to Be Collected and Assembled by Project</b>	<b>Some Primary Data to Be Collected During Evaluation</b>
1	Venues of Outreach and announcements	X	X
2	Student Access to Announcement		X
3	Student Access to Application forms		X
4	Successful Students' Perception of Application Process		X
5	Unsuccessful Students' Perception of Application Process		X
6	Compilations / Analysis of Profiles of Applicants	X	
7	Shortlisting Processes / Criteria	X	
	Minutes /Notes of Shortlisting Discussion	X	
8	Compilation / Analysis of Shortlisted Applicants	X	
9	Compilation / Analysis of Unsuccessful Applicants	X	
10	Information to Shortlisted	X	
11	Profile of Interview Panels	X	
12	Interview Protocol and Division of Questions Among Panel Members	X	
13	Score Sheet per Interviewee	X	
14	Minutes /Notes of Selection Discussion	X	

Processes		Primary Data to Be Collected and Assembled by Project	Some Primary Data to Be Collected During Evaluation
15	Compilation / Analysis of Successful Applicants	X	
16	Compilation / Analysis of Unsuccessful Applicants	X	
17	Successful Students' Perception of Application Processing (shortlisting and interviewing and information)		X
18	Information and Next Steps to Successful / Unsuccessful Applicants	X	X
19	Compilation of Profiles of Admission, enrollment and completion of degrees	X	
20	Tracking during Fellowship period and Reports by students	X	X
21	Mentoring of students	X	X
22	Students and Staff Skills Enhancement Activities – Announcements, registrations, attendance, schedules and instructors, reports on proceedings and reports of analysis of evaluation by participants and minutes of discussion of feedback	X	X
23	Next generation academic community and cohort-building	X	X
24	Successful Students' perceptions of whole scholarship administration process	X	X
25	Unsuccessful Students' Perception of Application Processing (shortlisting and Interviewing and information)		X
26	Minutes /notes of visits / discussions with funder / funders over grant period	X	

### 7.3 Quality of Data and Documentation for Purposes of Evaluation

The following are some of the most recurrent problems with data provided for evaluations

- Files without a content page with either numbers or markers of some kind
- Incomplete files that have no explanation
- Many copies of the same document without explanation
- Un-dated documents so that one has to read between the lines to figure out when the document was authored

- Duplicate sets of the same data, which do not tally – this is particularly with numbers of applicants, or shortlists or countries or publications.
- Hard copy documents whose electronic versions had different colors but which are now in black and white
- Big tables or matrices in electronic PDF version which cannot fit onto normal computer screens / and read-only documents

#### **7.4 Reducing Dead Time during Site Visits**

- Provide a 1-2 page update on the stage where exactly the project is at the time of evaluation, even if you wrote an interim report only 2 weeks earlier.
- As much as possible provide a complete list of all relevant documentation electronically when evaluator is still at home, and send copies indicating clearly which documents will not be sent electronically.
- Provide remaining documentation on arrival and afford the evaluator time to look at these documents. As far as possible reduce piecemeal provision of documents in order to preserve the time of those who have to look up these documentation from time to time while the evaluator waits.
- Provide a package of general information on the whole university including staff lists, university academic calendars of courses, strategic plans etc. Also make sure that what you think is on the website is actually there and that it can be accessed by those external to the university.
- In setting up any meetings / interviews / visits, keep in mind that the evaluator has five main purposes in mind, namely: (i) to learn new information that is not in the documentation already provided; (ii) to corroborate / challenge and /or validate assumptions and generalizations in the documentation and in informants' narratives; (iii) to gather different perspectives, perceptions and opinions from a variety of those with interest in the project and those that the project has excluded; (iv) to observe actual work of the project in progress and /or inspect work accomplished by the project; and (v) to gain a new or a comparative platform for doing (i) to (iv). Apart from interactions / interviews with participating students, project staff should brief the evaluator on the category of person to be met (e.g. is s/he a post graduate student but not a beneficiary; emerging academic but neither a post graduate nor beneficiary;



senior academic who is / or is not faculty member; mentor who is / is not faculty member and / or senior academic; etc.) and the proposed focus of a meeting beforehand.

### **7.5 Managing Expectations**

Because many look on evaluations as geared more to satisfying funding partners rather than generating learning for the project and the agency, many unspoken expectations ride on the evaluation processes. The following are some expectations and suggestions on how to deal with them:

- Local counterparts – If an evaluator is lucky they will be paired with an experienced scholar, interested in the work of the project and hopefully someone who has done evaluations and is, therefore, well aware of the sensitivity of doing the work, especially in order to achieve the five purposes of the evaluator as listed in (4) above. In all cases however, the local and external evaluator should meet first to learn about each other's style of working on evaluations of this nature and to map out a plan of work. The relationship can be very satisfying but it can also be tenuous.
- The opening briefing meeting – As earlier pointed out, it is best to ensure that the evaluator has had a chance to familiarize him/herself with all provided documentation before the meeting. This will eliminate the need to 'start from the beginning and conduct something of a show and tell'. The briefing should concentrate on the highlight, the newest information and the schedule of work ensuring that there are specific times for the evaluator to talk with the key managers of the project.
- The closing briefing meeting – This is not a meeting in which to expect the evaluator to give his/her findings. Chances are that the evaluator has collected all this data and is only beginning to identify a couple of emerging consistencies and inconsistencies. This briefing should dwell on identifying where information is still inadequate and on agreeing on a plan to rectify that inadequacy within days of her/his return home, and certainly before s/he gets down to writing the draft report.
- Receipt of the draft report by the project implementers – By all means go through the document with a fine-tooth comb and assist the evaluator to be as accurate as possible. If the project implementers paid sufficient attention to all elements outlined in (1) – (4) above, there should be left little room or no room at all for major inaccuracies.
- Receipt of the reviewed draft report by the evaluator – The majority of evaluators are usually willing to continue learning and to correct the inaccuracies that the project

implementers have pointed out in the report. A challenge might surface when project implementers submit new documentation (actually old documentation they had before the evaluation but somehow failed to include in the package!) in order to contest either a perceived inaccuracy or a statement about absence of information made by the evaluator.

### **7.6 Lessons from University of Ghana**

Upon request by members, Dr. Nammuddu shared the progress of the University of Ghana project. It was noted that:

- The top leadership at UG is very supportive of the NGAA Project. The leadership portrayed knowledge of the intricacies of the Project. The project had been situated in the University context.
- It was evident that the Project had leveraged a number of outcomes for example :
  - UG had gone a step further to find support for PhD scholarships for their staff
  - The UG project demonstrated that streamlining postgraduate training was of utmost importance. Beneficiary students signed contracts that obliged them to endeavor to finish on time.
  - Skills enhancement workshops were held for students and staff on areas including research methodology, scholarly writing etc
  - The Project created a platform of research opportunity alerts
  - UG was benchmarking publications in international journals
  - UG was renovating key research infrastructure
  - They have created a strong linkage with academia in the Diaspora

### **8.0 Way Forward:**

- It was unanimously agreed that the RGM was still relevant. The RGM should be used to add value to the NGAA project
- The RGM should have terms of reference detailing expectations, aspirations and obligations.
- The Universities should sign an MOU detailing modes of collaboration and should facilitate interaction on issues of supervision, examination and publication. Issues of accountability, sharing ideas and approaches should be stipulated in the MOU.

- The RGM should ;
  - a. identify collective areas namely (a) mid-term evaluation, (b) important timelines/ milestones and (c) sharing peculiarities and commonalities of what it means to be an academic (d) cross-cutting issues e.g. mentoring, joint student doctoral seminars and training on supervision.
  - b. be a forum for sharing challenges of academia in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century
  
- The collaboration to go beyond Carnegie to look at possibilities sharing aspects of;
  - a. Supervision
  - b. Research training
  - c. Access to library resources
  - d. Networking through seminars and via internet
  - e. Staff retention
  - f. Curriculum and pedagogy
  
- Each university should identify needs and share them with the others
  
- Reiterated the importance of having contact persons who are not Vice Chancellors since the later are too busy.
  
- RGM should identify individual university needs and devise ways of collectively addressing them

**Contact Persons**

UNIV	CONTACT PERSON	DESIGNATION	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
UCT	Dr. Marilet Stenaert	Director, Research office	<a href="mailto:marilet.sienaert@uct.ac.za">marilet.sienaert@uct.ac.za</a>	0027216504402
	Prof. Daniel Visser	Deputy Vice-Chancellor	<a href="mailto:danie.visser@uct.ac.za">danie.visser@uct.ac.za</a>	0027216502173
WITS	Mr. Tembile Kulati	Strategic Research Projects Director	<a href="mailto:tembile.kulati@wits.ac.za">tembile.kulati@wits.ac.za</a>	0027-11-717-1106
	Dr. Helen Laburn		<a href="mailto:helen.laburn@wits.ac.za">helen.laburn@wits.ac.za</a>	0027-11-717-1152
MAK	Prof. Lillian Tibatemwa-Ekirikubinza	Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic Affairs)	<a href="mailto:ltibatemwa@admin.mak.ac.ug">ltibatemwa@admin.mak.ac.ug</a>	

	Dr. George W. Nasinyama	Deputy Director (Research and Publications), Directorate of Research and Graduate Training	<a href="mailto:nasinyama@vetmed.mak.ac.ug">nasinyama@vetmed.mak.ac.ug</a> <a href="mailto:gnasinyama@yahoo.com">gnasinyama@yahoo.com</a>	
UG	Prof Yaa Ntiamo-Baidu	Director, University of Ghana Carnegie NGAA Project	<a href="mailto:ynbaidu@ug.edu.gh">ynbaidu@ug.edu.gh</a>	Land line: +233-302-512835 or 500880; mobile: +233 244
	Ms. Akofa Anyidoho	Project Administrator	<a href="mailto:carnegieNGAA@ug.edu.gh">carnegieNGAA@ug.edu.gh</a> ; <a href="mailto:akofa1@gmail.com">akofa1@gmail.com</a>	Land line +233-302-512835; mobile: +233-267 738328

### 9.0 Preparedness for the successor project

- It was noted that Carnegie would soon engage KPGM to audit the projects. The direction of Phase 2, will depend on; (a) the climate in the universities and (b) The extent to which the project has delivered on what it set out to do. Thereafter, concept notes will be invited.
- The proposals for renewal should answer issues raised in the evaluation reports.
- The themes may change depending on what has been achieved during Phase 1.
- Next Phase should focus on building a critical mass of PhD holders in selected thematic areas
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> grant will be 3-4 years long
- The decision by Carnegie to renew the grant will not depend on the collaboration among the 4 Universities but on a case by case basis

### 10. Closing Remarks

In her closing remarks, Prof. Tibatemwa-Ekirikubinza expressed Makerere University's gratitude for the opportunity of providing the secretariat of the RGM and pledged the University's readiness to continue with the spirit. She wished the delegates an enjoyable stay in Kmapala and wished them a safe trip home, and thereafter declared the meeting closed.