Institutional assessment IUC Call 2022

Mbarara University of Science and Technology

SHARING MINDS, CHANGING LIVES

Draft Report - June 10th, 2020

Joris ELEGEERT – Paul KIBWIKA
C-lever.org

Table of contents

List of abbreviations ***4***

1. Executive summary ***5***

1.1 The institutional assessment process **5**

1.2 Conclusions of the institutional assessment of the university **5**

1.3 The match of the university with the IUC concept **9**

1.4 Relevance and potential of the proposed IUC programme **9**

2. Introduction ***11***

2.1 Brief history of the university in region **11**

2.2 Development context **11**

2.3 Implementation of the institutional assessment **12**

2.3.1 Presentation of the institutional assessment approach 12

2.3.2 Institutional self-assessment process 13

2.3.3 External institutional assessment process 13

3. Institutional assessment of the university ***15***

3.1 Capability to achieve coherence **15**

3.1.1 There is a shared and coherent vision and strategy on university/faculty level 15

3.1.2 Existence of a set of simple principles which govern the university's/faculty's operations 17

3.1.3 University's/faculty's governance/management structures are effective 18

3.2 Capability to deliver on development relevant objectives and commitments **20**

3.2.1 The university provides high quality, development relevant education 20

3.2.2 The university is a multidisciplinary institution that produces major amounts of high-quality research 23

3.2.3 The university is perceived as a real actor and driver of Change 26

3.3 Capability to relate to external stakeholders **29**

3.3.1 The university creates the condition for effective network development and is aware of the importance of formal institutional alliances 29

3.3.2 The university has a vast network which is actively used 31

3.3.3 The university obtains additional project funding 34

3.4 Capability to act and commit **36**

3.4.1 The university is able to make and implement decisions 36

3.4.2 The university has adequate and well managed Human Resources 38

3.4.3 The university has an adequate infrastructure 41

3.4.4 The university has adequate and well managed financial resources 44

3.4.5 The university has effective systems and processes for administration and procurement and logistics 46

3.4.6 The university has effective systems and processes for project management and quality assurance 48

3.5 Capability to adapt and self-renew 49

3.5.1 Effective management in shifting contexts 49

3.5.2 The university is continuously adapting and renewing 50

3.5.3 The university has an adequate knowledge management system 52

4. Assessment of the match of the university with the IUC concept 54

5. Relevance and potential of the proposed IUC programme 57

6. Overall conclusions 58

7. Annexures 59

7.1 Checklist collection of additional data and documentation 59

7.2 Overview of key additional data collected 60

7.3 Overview of internal and external stakeholders met by the external assessment team 61

7.4 Detailed scoring card – maturity levels per domain and aspect 68

7.5 Documents reviewed during the external assessment 73

7.6 Overview of recent external funding 74

List of abbreviations

AfDB	African Development Bank
AIMS	Academic Information Management System
DRGT	Directorate for Research and Graduate Training
DVC	Deputy Vice-Chancellor
FY	Financial Year
GMO	Grants Management Office
HR	Human Resources
IA	Institutional Assessment
IFMS	Integrated Financial Management System
IPSS	Institute for Peace and Strategic Studies
IRO	International Relations Office
IUC	Institutional University Cooperation
KUL	University of Leuven
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MUST	Mbarara University of Science and Technology
NCHE	National Council for Higher Education
NUFFIC	Dutch organization for internationalization in education
PPDA	Public Procurement and Disposal Act
PR	Public Relations
PRO	Public Relations Office
PwC	PricewaterhouseCoopers
SIDA	Swedish development agency
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
UA	University of Antwerp
UG	University of Ghent
USAID	United States development agency
VC	Vice-Chancellor
VLIR-UOS	Flemish Interuniversity Council – University Development Cooperation
VUB	University of Brussels

1. Executive summary

1.1 The institutional assessment process

This institutional assessment report is the product of a two-stage assessment process:

(a) a self-assessment by MUST of its institutional capacity, conducted by a mixed (gender, background) team of university staff members in February 2020

(b) a joint assessment of the university's institutional capacity facilitated by external assessors during a field visited conducted between March 11th and March 20th, 2020.

The institutional assessment framework used, is based on the 5 capabilities model developed by EC-DPM. For the purpose of the institutional assessment, each capability comprises several domains, in turn every domain is characterised by a set of complementary aspects.

1.2 Conclusions of the institutional assessment of the university

1. Capability to achieve coherence		
Domain	*Score*	*Conclusions*
1.1 Vision and strategy	3+	MUST's vision and mission are part of the university's Strategic Plan (2016/17-2025/26). However, in order to align to the National Development Planning (NDP) cycle, MUST adjusted its ten-year Strategic Plan and developed a new 3-year plan for the 2017/18-2019/20 time period. Both strategic plans have the same outline and content, albeit with different timelines. Due to delays in the development of the NDP III, the process of developing the new MUST strategic plan (2020/21 – 2025/26) has not started yet and will probably be delayed. In the existing plan, there is coherence between the mission and vision on the one hand and the strategic goals on the other hand. Unfortunately, the strategic plan is not connected to the annual workplans. Annual workplans are monitored on a quarterly basis; however there is no evidence of strategic-level monitoring & control, linked to MUST's strategic plan.
1.2 Principles	4	The core values of MUSt are mentioned and, to some extent explained, in the Strategic Plan. However, they are not really known within the university and as such probably only influence day-to-day processes in a very limited way. Overall, the major academic, administrative and access policies are in place.
1.3 Governance	4	MUST, as all other public universities in Uganda, is governed by the Universities and other Tertiary Institutions Act. In this Act, the required governance and management structures for public universities are described in detail. Given the limited flexibility to tailor these structures to its real needs, MUST's internal organization is quite heavy given its size. Nonetheless, MUST's Council and management seem to function correctly. MUST has an annual workplan which is developed in a participatory way. The plan itself is only loosely connected to the university's Strategic Plan. Monitoring of its implementation is focussed on budget implementation and not so much on

		outcomes. Despite the clear link between planning and budget, the university doesn't manage to implement its workplan as foreseen.
2. Capability to deliver on development relevant objectives and commitments		
Domain	*Score*	*Conclusions*
2.1 Education	4	MUST seems to comply only partially with the mandatory requirement, from the National Council for Higher Education, to review every curriculum every five years, prior to re-accreditation. Also, there are no indications of continuous adaptation of curricula outside this mandatory review. Feedback mechanisms and quality assurance measure on education exist but there doesn't seem to exist a systematic approach to strengthen pedagogical capacities/practices of lecturers to improve teaching at MUST, connected to existing feedback mechanisms such as student evaluations or the annual appraisal process. There is little quantitative evidence of the labour market relevance of the education provided by MUST. However, given the general appreciation of the quality of education provided at MUST, by key stakeholders such as students and community members, we can consider that the labour market relevance of education is generally rather good.
2.2 Research	3+	MUST is producing sufficient amounts of high-quality research. The university also has experience in multi-disciplinary research. Even though MUST regularly organizes national networking events, these events don't really draw an international audience. MUST staff is insufficiently represented in regional and international conferences.
2.3 Driver of Change	4+	Community engagement through education and research is well developed in MUST. The external assessment found many examples of societal value created by the university's staff and students. MUST is less active in policy making; its influence can mostly be observed at the local level but less at the national or international level.
3. Capability to relate to external stakeholders		
Domain	*Score*	*Conclusions*
3.1 Conditions for networking	3	There is no written strategy guiding communications and nobody at MUST is actively managing the university's brand in a coordinated way. Since January 2020, the Public Relations Office started working on streamlining communication to external stakeholders. Despite these recent efforts, communication is still handled by different parts of the organization in a somewhat disjointed way. Staff members involved in communication could be better supported to increase the overall impact of internal and external communication. MUST doesn't have a real networking strategy either and the overall support and incentives provided by MUST to its staff members in the area of networking are insufficient.
3.2. Network use	4	Despite the relatively weak support provided to its staff members in the area of networking, MUST manages to maintain successful relationships with an important and diverse group of external stakeholders. This potential could be strengthened through well-targeted institutional support in this area.
3.3. Additional funding	4+	MUST seems quite successful in attracting externally funded projects. The presence of an IRO, in charge of supporting

		internationalization, and of a Grants Management Office (GMO) shows a clear understanding of the international funding environment and its requirements. The Grants Management Office (GMO) provides organizational support in proposal writing and is also responsible for management of external funding in MUST. Evidence collected by the IA team suggest that this is done in an adequate way. However, on the former, little capacity strengthening support is provided to individual staff members. Content-wise, monitoring of externally funded projects is done using the normal systems of the university
4. Capability to act and commit		
Domain	*Score*	*Conclusions*
4.1 Effective organisation	3+	Except for academic matters, most decision-making in MUST is done using a cascaded bottom-up approach. Overall, decision making at MUST seems to be done in an adequate and timely manner. However, timeliness of decision making seems to be influenced to some extent by the number of hierarchical layers in the university and the overall collaborative approach to decision making in committees. Suboptimal communication on management decisions also negatively influences staff perception on the appropriateness of certain decisions. The two main systems through which MUST can formally engage and commit are the signing of Memoranda of Understanding and the signing of contracts.
4.2. HR	3	Human resources are a challenge for MUST, especially in quantitative terms. Budgetary constraints don't allow MUST to recruit the required number of academic or non-academic staff members, nor to invest in the professional development of existing staff. Improvements are also needed in other areas of HR management. Although most HR management processes are in place, issues exist with performance management and career development through mobility.
4.3 Infrastructure	3	With the new Kihumuro campus nearing completion, MUST has sufficient space to conduct research and deliver classes. Overall, laboratory infrastructure seems adequate, especially in the new campus. However, in this area, funding for consumables and the presence of skilled technicians are the main challenges. The university has limited technological facilities available for staff and students, mainly because of the poor state of IT infrastructure in the university. This hampers further development of research and education and also has a negative impact on digitalization of other processes in the university.
4.4 Financial management	4+ / 2	The budget provided to MUST is insufficient to fulfil its statutory mandate in an adequate way. However, information obtained during the external assessment shows that overall, the available resources are managed in an adequate way by the university. • *Score 4+ for management of funding* • *Score 2 for level of funding*
4.5 Administration, procurement, logistics	3+	Administration and procurement processes are clearly defined and an adequate system (AIMS) is used for student administration. But administration and procurement suffer from bureaucratic rules, imposed by the legislation, which hamper

		performance in these areas. Also, the implementation of and compliance with established processes need to be improved to enhance performance. Later on, further enhancing the maturity level in these functions would require adopting simple approaches of life cycle costing and value for money procurement.
4.6. Project management and quality assurance	4	Externally funded projects are administratively managed by the Grants Management Office while the content is management at Departmental and Faculty level. While quality assurance processes can be further improved, project implementation and community service delivery seem to be appreciated by the partners and stakeholders involved. Quality standards are, to some extent, in place for research and community engagement while no standards exist for consultancy. We have found no indication that these quality standards were in any way communicated to involved stakeholders nor to the public at large. Nonetheless, from the feedback by different stakeholders, we can conclude that service delivery is generally of good quality.
5. Capability to adapt and self-renew		
Domain	*Score*	*Conclusions*
5.1 Adaptive management	2+	MUST has limited expertise in predicting and managing change, even though the university has undergone a number of important changes in recent years. The university could benefit from incorporating recent thinking on change management, which focusses a lot on change communication to complement work on more traditional aspects of change such as training. The capacity to assess trends and changes to inform and manage changes and adaptation still needs to be strengthened at MUST.
5.2 Continuous improvement	3	At MUST, the focus of management and staff is more on compliance than on organization innovation. Innovation in education and research is to some extent taking place in MUST but innovation of the internal organization is held back by the provisions in the existing legal framework. Nonetheless, within the existing legal framework, MUST could do significantly more to create a real feedback culture that effectively contributes to organizational and individual learning and change. MUST doesn't have a training protocol nor an explicit HR development plan. The general absence of real funding for professional development doesn't encourage learning and exchange.
5.3 Knowledge management	3	MUST currently doesn't have digital systems for knowledge management. Most knowledge management is done in an analogue way, at the level of the Departments and the Faculties. A university-wide systematic approach to organizational learning, starting with systematic feedback collection and dissemination and ending with informed changes in daily practices is currently still lacking at MUST.

The following figures visualise the findings of the self-assessment versus those of the externally facilitated joint institutional assessment exercises.

Self-assessment	***External institutional assessment***

1.3 The match of the university with the IUC concept

Overall, MUST's profile seems a good match with the IUC-concept. The university is already quite active at community level and delivers clear societal value through education and research. MUST has a well-established network with, among its partners, a number of African and Flemish universities. Through its partnerships, the university was able to secure an important amount of external funding. Given the relatively low amount of each externally funded project, the IUC programme would become the biggest intervention in MUST. This would definitely secure a high level of influence in the university without necessarily creating an unhealthy level of dependence, given the high number of other external funders.

The only real area of concerns for the IA team, at the institutional level, are the limited budget of the university and the challenges in terms of internal communication. We also feel that MUST's IUC proposal should be geared more towards the areas of concern flagged in this report (see below). At this moment, the proposal doesn't seem to express a real desire to improve the internal functioning of the university.

For Flemish universities and university colleges, partnering with MUST presents them with the opportunity to contribute directly to community relevant research in Western Uganda. MUST is a university with a rich history and a good reputation, testimony of which are the numerous partnerships with other national and international universities. Especially in the areas of applied science and Medicine, there is an opportunity to contribute to innovative research that could benefit local communities in Uganda and Africa.

1.4 Relevance and potential of the proposed IUC programme

From an analysis of the initial concept note, it would seem that MUST management mainly sees the envisaged IUC programme as a large-scale research programme in 6 research areas. These research areas seem well chosen given the developmental challenges Uganda and its Western region are currently facing. Such a programme would certainly have some positive effects on the current functioning of the university.

However, it would mostly operate from a business-as-usual perspective. The other crucial dimension of an IUC programme, which is to contribute to a change process within the university leading to improved performance in a number of institutional domains, seems to be somewhat underdeveloped and even an afterthought. And this despite clear challenge in areas such as: staff development (only to some extent touched upon in the note), IT (mentioned in the note), internal and external communication, networking and organizational learning.

We believe that, for an IUC programme in MUST to be really successful, a more deliberate approach to capacity development and change management should be developed.

2. Introduction

2.1 Brief history of the university in region

Mbarara University of Science and Technology (MUST) is one of the 9 public universities in Uganda. The university was created in October 1989 after extensive modification of physical facilities of the former School of Midwifery at the Mbarara District hospital. The MUST Statue 1989, as passed by the National Resistance Council, was the enabling law that established the University as a body corporate. At that time Uganda's economy and social infrastructure had collapsed due to civil wars in the 1970s and 1980s. With the government's realization that higher education was a critical asset for nation building, and in particular that science and technology were the most realistic drivers to lead this initiative, MUST was therefore a welcome idea and has to date lived to that expectation.

In collaboration with seven Cuban professors and other expatriates, MUST started the pioneer Faculty of Medicine with the first 43 students admitted to the Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery program. The emphasis from the beginning has been on providing quality and relevant education at National and International levels with particular emphasis on science and technology and its application to community development. Since October 28, 1989, the University has supported many community innovations, which have contributed to the development of Uganda and the Great Lakes region. The University has grown from a single faculty University serving a student population of 43 to six faculties, two institutes and a Centre of Innovations and Technology Transfer with a current student population of 4,722.

2.2 Development context

World over, *demographic challenges* have become a topical issue. And Uganda, with its dramatic increase in population from about 24 million people at the end of the 20th century to over 41 million in 2019 and a projected population of around 120 million by 2050 is no exception to this worldwide trend. The South Western Region, in which MUST is situated, is one of the most densely populated regions in the country. With such demographic changes, existing issues such as limited resources to provide for the population, poor environmental and natural resource management systems and practices, low yields in agriculture sector with inadequate value addition, climate change and inadequate health referral processes will become increasingly challenging. Addressing these challenges will need concerted engagement of all stakeholders including Government of Uganda, Institutions of Higher Learning and the communities which they serve.

Environmental hazards with highly severe impacts have become frequent in Uganda, greatly impacting on people, the economy, the environment, and the long-term development of the country. South Western Uganda, the region where MUST is situated, is a region especially prone to environmental hazards. Landslides are very frequent and in most parts of the region, there is evidence of loss of vegetation cover. As land available for agriculture is limited by various biodiversity conservation avenues, pressure on the remaining land has led to fragmentation of family plots and invasion on the dwindling forests. Additionally, there is encroachment on protected areas as a result of lack of integration of governance in protected area management that has exacerbated poaching of key endemic plants and animal species. The fact that South Western Uganda is commonly referred to as the food basket of the country-

both arable farming and livestock, decreasing agricultural production, through a combination of population growth and environmental hazards, might have a negative impact on the whole of Uganda.

In healthcare, the inefficient community health referral system, combined with poor gender relations at household level constitute a real challenge for *women's health*. Despite reports by the Government of Uganda in the budget strategy 2020/2021 on some strides in reduction of maternal and under-five mortality rates from 435 to 336 and 137 to 64 respectively, this reduction is still below the attainment of the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 3. Health indicators pertaining sexual and reproductive health for Ugandans are worrying. For instance, HIV/AIDS remain prevalent among the youth (15-24 years) with young women disproportionately affected by the epidemic. The fertility rate for Uganda still remains high at 5.7 children per woman. Teenage pregnancy rate is at 25% and adolescents contribute to over 20% of maternal mortality. In addition, fifty-two per cent (52%) of the people living with HIV/AIDS are young people (UDHS, 2016). The unmet need for family planning among married women is higher in rural (30%) than urban (23%) areas.

In *education*, in line with escalating youth unemployment, currently at 60%, and skills gap, there is a considerable number of school drop-outs amidst the implementation of universal education programs for over a decade. Also, there has been a drastic increase in the number of tertiary institutions in Uganda that produce graduates with limited employability skills. Reports show that 87% of the graduates from tertiary Institutions cannot find jobs. Furthermore, there is still unreachable skilling target on the required practical skills and experience in Uganda. Only about 27% of students in institutions of higher learning in Uganda are in science and technology training against the recommended 40%

2.3 Implementation of the institutional assessment

2.3.1 Presentation of the institutional assessment approach

The institutional assessment consists of two stages: (a) a self-assessment by the university of its institutional capacity and (b) a joint assessment of the university's institutional capacity facilitated by external assessors. The same institutional assessment framework is used for both stages of the institutional assessment. The institutional assessment framework is based on the 5 capabilities model developed by ECDPM. For the purpose of the institutional assessment, each capability comprises several domains, in turn every domain is characterised by a set of complementary aspects.

The institutional assessment implies discussing, assessing and documenting every domain, including the identification and justification of its current maturity level, appreciated on a scale from 1 (absent or extremely weak) to 6 (a role model).

Each institutional assessment exercise facilitated by external assessors includes: a preparation phase, a field phase and a reporting phase. The field phase implies a 9 calendar day visit of the candidate IUC partner university by a lead assessor (international expert) who is accompanied by a 2nd assessor, a national/regional expert. The entire institutional assessment approach is described in the methodological guide for Institutional Assessment of candidate IUC universities.

2.3.2 Institutional self-assessment process

The self-assessment process involved consultative meetings, understanding the tool and selection of the participants. The consultative meetings involved a Skype meeting with the external assessors and the project writing team. The Skype meeting focused on the assessment agenda and a detailed understanding of the self-assessment process.

A consultative meeting with the project writing team was held on the 27th of February 2020 to internalize the content of the tool. In order to get an all-inclusive assessment process, the core writing team agreed to select additional participants that were not directly involved in the project writing to participate in the self-assessment exercise. It was at this meeting that the relevant participants were then selected. A total of 13 participants were involved to jointly conduct a comprehensive (self) assessment of the Institution. These participants were selected on the basis of faculty representation, gender, disciplines and institutional roles. The composition of the participants included the academic and the non-academic staff.

The self-assessment tool was shared with the selected participants and after they filled the tool, the writing team received their feedback, synthesised it and compiled it into one representative report.

During the kick-off session of the external assessment, the members of the self-assessment team shared their appreciation of the self-assessment process. The exercise made them more aware about the functioning of their university, especially of what lies beyond their own unit or faculty. Participants also appreciated the comprehensiveness of the tool.

Persons involved in the self-assessment			
Nr	**Name**	**Position**	**Gender**
1	Associate Professor Grace Birungi	Associate Professor, Chemistry	Female
2	Sr. Jane Yatuha	Senior Lecturer, Biology	Female
3	Associate Professor Julius Lejju	Associate Professor, Biology	Male
4	Professor Jerome Kabakyenga	Professor, Public Health & Chair Quality Assurance	Male
5	Dr. Ronald Twongyirwe	Senior Lecturer, Environment and Livelihood support systems,	Male
6	Ms. Florence Beinempaka	Lecturer, Nursing	Female
7	Dr. Johnes Obunguloch	Lecturer, Biomedical Engineering	Male
8	Dr. William Wasswa	Assistant Lecturer, Applied Sciences and Technology	Male
9	Mr. Amos Baryashaba	Head, Computing services	Male
10	Mr. Rogers Mwavu	Assistant Lecturer, Computing and Informatics	Male
11	Mr. Joseph Oloro	Assistant Lecturer, Pharmacology	Male
12	Dr. Fortunate Atwine	Lecturer, Nursing	Female
13	Dr. Fred Kagwa	Lecturer, Computing & Vice Chair Quality Assurance	Male

2.3.3 External institutional assessment process

In preparation of the external institutional assessment, the IA Team Leader prepared a list of stakeholders to meet during the field visit, the type of meeting to be scheduled with them and the required duration of each of the meetings. A preliminary agenda was also prepared to guide scheduling of the requested meetings. Throughout the mission, the IA Team remained flexible and adapted its planning to the availability of MUST staff and stakeholders in order to avoid disrupting the general functioning of the university. The local IUC coordinator managed scheduling of all meetings during the field visit.

The Institutional Assessment exercise started with several introductory meetings:

- First, a **courtesy call** to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor of MUST (acting VC). During this meeting, the IA team was presented and the objectives and approach for the external IA were briefly explained.
- Secondly, a meeting was held with the **self-assessment team,** allowing an initial discussion on the findings of the self-assessment and to clarification of certain aspects.
- Thirdly, an **open kick-off meeting** for all staff members was held to explain the objectives and the approach for the external institutional assessment exercise.

For the fact-finding part of the IA mission, several methodologies were combined:

- Site visits to make observations on the state of the physical environment in which MUST staff is functioning on a daily basis were conducted on all sites of the university.
- Individual interviews were held with key staff members to collect information on the content and the scope of their responsibilities.
- Individual (in-person or by-phone) meetings with external stakeholders were conducted to collect information on their perception on the functioning of MUST were conducted
- Focus groups with larger groups of stakeholders (students, academic staff and non-academic staff) to collect information on their perception on the functioning of the university were organized
- An extensive review of documents pertaining to the regular functioning of the university was also conducted. These documents helped to confirm or nuance the information collected during individual interview and focus groups. A list of types of documents consulted can be found in §7.4.

During the mission, regular informal feedback and consultation sessions were held with the local IUC coordinator to update him on the progress of the IA process and request feedback on certain observations. The objective of these meeting was to make the external assessment as participatory as possible and to install a joint learning process for all involved.

Prior to the mission debriefing, a quality assurance session (via skype) was organized with the lead assessor from C-lever.org (Patrick Stoop). This session helped to structure findings in a coherent way and calibrate findings with observations from other universities to ensure harmonization of results.

The external IA in MUST was concluded with a **formal debriefing** for senior management and members of the self-assessment team. Prior to this debriefing, the findings of the IA were discussed in detail with the local IUC coordinator, together with a limited number of core members of the self-assessment team.

It is important to mention that, because of the Covid-19 crisis, the Lead Consultant was forced to leave Uganda halfway through the IA in MUST, on March 16th, 2020. However, he continued to participate in the assessment through WhatsApp from Belgium, sitting in and participating in meetings conducted in Mbarara by the Regional Consultant.

3. Institutional assessment of the university

3.1 Capability to achieve coherence

3.1.1 There is a shared and coherent vision and strategy on university/faculty level

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	4	*Selected maturity level*	3+
Justification of selected maturity level The university has a well written vision, mission and a 10 year strategic plan which is well displayed onto the university website and available in the different offices. Much as some faculties such as Faculty of Medicine, Faculty of Applied Sciences and Technology have developed plans, others such as Faculty of Computing, Faculty of Science, Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies and Faculty of Business and Management Science have not yet. However, strategic plan development process for those faculties has started. The implementation of the strategic plan has partly been affected by deficits in funding.		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* The mission and vision of MUST are spelled out in the University's Strategic Plan (2016/17-2025/26). But even though these are displayed in many of the public meeting rooms, they don't seem to be well known by staff and students. (P1) The Strategic Plan itself is quite recent. However, in order to align to the National Development Planning (NDP) cycle, MUST adjusted its ten-year Strategic Plan and developed a new 3-year plan for the 2017/18-2019/20 time period. Both strategic plans have the same outline and content, albeit with different timelines. The university intends to develop a new 5-year strategic plan aligned to the new National Development Plan III (NDPIII). Due to delays in the development of the NDP III, the process of developing the new MUST strategic plan has not started yet and will probably be delayed. The existing Strategic Plan is not reviewed periodically; while a regular strategic review (every 2 or 3 years) is generally considered to be good practice. Nonetheless, annual workplans are developed, which are loosely connected to the Strategic Plan. There seems to be some form of follow-up of their implementation, although this could be done in a more systematic/structured way, focussing on targets, timelines and indicators. (P2) The existing Strategic Plan seems to be based on a comprehensive analysis of the internal and external environment as well as cross-cutting issues such as gender, HIV/AIDS, etc and a review of the degree of implementation of the previous plan. Most information is translated into the SWOT analysis incorporated in the Strategic Plan. A particular weakness is the lack of explicit link between the SWOT analysis and the strategic goals identified in the Strategic Plan. (P3)	

	Two Faculties and one Department have their own Strategic Plan. However, these vary in the level of alignment to the university's overall Strategic Plan: • **Department of Nursing (2020-2024):** In this Strategic Plan, there is no mention of the mission, vision or values of MUST. The template with strategic goals of the university is not followed at all. The timing of the strategic plan is also not aligned to the NDP cycle as intended in the university's Strategic Plan. • **Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies (2016-2026):** This Strategic plan has the same timeline as the original 10-year strategic plan of the university. Mission and vision are the same as in the overall Plan but the values are a bit different. The template with strategic goals is also different from the university's Strategic Plan. • **Faculty of Medicine (2018-2024):** This Strategic plan has a different timeline. The vision in this document is the same as the vision of MUST, the mission more specific for the faculty. The core values are also slightly different. The template with strategic goals follows the one of the overall Strategic Plan of the university. The observations summarized above clearly show that there is currently insufficient strategic alignment between the Faculty level and the university level. It would be desirable for MUST to ensure this strategic alignment when developing its new 5-year Strategic Plan. In this context, it is important to note the shift in the strategic and operational planning process, initiated by the central government, towards more participation of the lower level user units through a bottom-up planning and budgeting process. (P4) In the existing Strategic plan, there is coherence between the mission and the vision on the one hand and the strategic goals on the other hand. The strategic plan has not really been implemented as foreseen, mainly because of a lack of resources. According to estimates by the chairman of the University Council, only about 20% of the funding required for implementation of the 10-year Strategic Plan is currently secured. As such, processes and especially concrete actions are only covering a limited part of the Strategic Plan. We believe that MUST should reflect on the usefulness of such unrealistic (because unfunded) strategic planning. It is important to be ambitious but still set realistic targets for the coming year to be able to assign responsibilities for achieving them. (R5) One final remarkable fact: the mission of MUST doesn't explicitly mention research as one of the university's main areas of intervention even though this is one of the core functions of the university.
Conclusion	
MUST's vision and mission are part of the university's Strategic Plan (2016/17-2025/26). However, in order to align to the National Development Planning (NDP) cycle, MUST adjusted its ten-year Strategic Plan and developed a new 3-year plan for the 2017/18-2019/20 time period. Both strategic plans have the same outline and content, albeit with different timelines. Due to delays in the development of the NDP III, the process of developing the new MUST strategic plan (2020/21 – 2025/26) has not started yet and will probably be delayed.	

In the existing plan, there is coherence between the mission and vision on the one hand and the strategic goals on the other hand. Unfortunately, the strategic plan is not connected to the annual workplans. Annual workplans are monitored on a quarterly basis; however there is no evidence of strategic-level monitoring & control, linked to MUST's strategic plan.

3.1.2 Existence of a set of simple principles which govern the university's/faculty's operations

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	5	*Selected maturity level*	4
Justification of selected maturity level There are clear values shared among the university community and a number of policies/processes are existent to govern the operations of the university. These include, but are not limited to: university council charter, internal finance and budget committee, research policy, gender policy, guiding principles of the disability and special needs policy, examinations rules and regulations, postgraduate handbook, ICT policy, Intellectual property policy, sexual harassment policy, international relations office, research ethics committee and human resource manual. In addition, MUST has an established Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation (ITFC) located in Bwindi which spearheads environmental sustainability research.		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* The core values of MUST are mentioned explicitly in the Strategic Plan. These values are explained to some extent in the strategic plan, but no information is provided on how these values are intended to influence the functioning of the university. From interactions with staff and students, it is clear that these values are not really known to the majority of stakeholders within the university. Because of this, we can assume that these values only have a very limited influence on day-to-day processes in the university. (P1) MUST has most major academic, administrative and access policies in place as mentioned in the self-assessment. Critical but lacking are policies on community engagement, communication and e-learning. (P2) MUST being a public body, to the extent that its core values are translated into policies, they contribute to principle-based governance. However, there is little evidence that the values as such explicitly serve as guidance in governance or decision making. (R3)	
Conclusion			
The core values of MUSt are mentioned and, to some extent explained, in the Strategic Plan. However, they are not really known within the university and as such probably only influence day-to-day processes in a very limited way. Overall, the major academic, administrative and access policies are in place.			

3.1.3 University's/faculty's governance/management structures are effective

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	5	*Selected maturity level*	4
Justification of selected maturity level The University and faculties' organograms are available. The governance bodies are well constituted and functional. These include the university Council and its committees, the senate, faculty/directorate boards and departments. The faculties and the university boards have annual operational work plans that inform the management and budgeting processes. The university council, which is the supreme governance body, is guided by rules of procedures as stipulated in the university council charter. There's however needed improvement in balancing participatory approaches to ensure effective and efficient decision making.		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* MUST's entire internal organization is based on the provisions in the Universities and other Tertiary Institutions Act (revised 2006). The university has: • A functional Council with statutory subcommittees, acting as the supreme governance body of the university • A functional Senate with statutory subcommittees, acting as the management body in charge of academic affairs • A functional Management committee (VC, DVCs, the University Secretary, HR Director…) in charge of daily (strategic) management of the university • Functional Faculty and Departmental Boards, in charge of daily management of Faculties and Departments. • An organogram with Deans, Heads of Departments and their deputies, responsible for the academic functions (education, research and outreach) of the university on the one hand and Heads of Units and their deputies in charge of steering and support functions of the university on the other hand. The key functions in the organogram are prescribed in the Act which means that it's near impossible to change them. It is important to note that, given the lower than initially foreseen staffing levels (17-30% of establishment filled – see below) the organogram seems a bit top-heavy with a relatively high number of managerial functions, compared to the number of staff members being managed by them. However, the Act doesn't allow any flexibility to tailor the structure of the university to its specific needs. It is noted that MUST, being a relatively small university, doesn't necessarily require the elaborate organizational structure as outlined in the Act. (P1) With the exception of the management committee, in each of the governance and management bodies mentioned above, different stakeholders (e.g. private sector, local government, students, staff,… for the Council – Staff and students for Faculty Boards) are represented, as required by the aforementioned Act. Even though we were unable to pinpoint specific cases, this level of representation/participation clearly presents a risk of delayed decision making, especially at the (lower) level of management. More in general, it would have been better to clearly separate management roles from stakeholder oversight in governance, limiting the involvement of stakeholders to governance bodies and not involving them directly in management. But because of the provisions in the Act, MUST currently isn't at liberty to change the composition of its management bodies. (P2-R7)	

	The University Council provides direction to senior management, with proposals prepared by management being discussed in committees and subcommittees of Council before the plenary Council takes a decision. Where necessary, Council members can also submit agenda items for discussion. (R6) MUST has an annual workplan that is only loosely linked to the Strategic Plan: • The template used for the annual workplan is not the same as the one for the Strategic Plan. • Activities foreseen in the Strategic Plan are not necessarily included in the Annual Workplan, mainly because of budgetary constraints. • General areas of intervention, foreseen in the Strategic Plan (education, infrastructure,…) are also present in the workplan albeit sometimes with a different wording or order. (P3) The workplan is developed in a participatory way, starting with input from the Departmental level that is first consolidated at Faculty level and later at University level before being submitted to the central government (Ministry of Education and Sports). However, a forensic audit report, cited in the minutes of a Council meeting held on November 15th, 2019 mentioned the need to make the budgeting process more inclusive so that all existing needs are clearly identified. This could indicate that annual workplan preparations at Departmental level are not necessarily done with the involvement of all staff members. It could also indicate a lack of communication on the budgeting process and, more specifically, on the strategic decisions made during the course of this process by management. (P4) The workplan doesn't have clear timelines and responsibilities while indicators vary between input, activity, output and outcome level. Workplans are monitored at Departmental, Faculty and university level but the focus in monitoring is clearly put on budget implementation and not so much on (intermediate) outcomes. Since the workplan is integrated in the budget tool, it is clearly linked to decision making. Activities not foreseen (and thus not budgeted for) in the workplan cannot be implemented. However, despite this clear link between planning and budget, in his report for FY2018/19, the Auditor General noted that only 61% of reviewed activities in the workplan were fully implemented while 28% were partially implemented and 11% were not implemented at all. (P4)
Conclusion	
MUST, as all other public universities in Uganda, is governed by the Universities and other Tertiary Institutions Act. In this Act, the required governance and management structures for public universities are described in detail. Given the limited flexibility to tailor these structures to its real needs, MUST's internal organization is quite heavy given its size. Nonetheless, MUST's Council and management seem to function correctly. MUST has an annual workplan which is developed in a participatory way. The plan itself is only loosely connected to the university's Strategic Plan. Monitoring of its implementation is focussed on budget implementation and not so much on outcomes. Despite the clear link between planning and budget, the university doesn't manage to implement its workplan as foreseen.	

3.2 Capability to deliver on development relevant objectives and commitments

3.2.1 The university provides high quality, development relevant education

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	4+	*Selected maturity level*	4
The university is currently ranked by webometrics as the second leading academic institution in Uganda. The university has well set systems for developing and reviewing curricula. The curricula are developed and reviewed by the faculty committees, university quality assurance committee, Senate and Council. The curricula are then submitted to the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE). A call to review and renew curricula for re-accreditation is usually made one year to the expiry of the running curricula. The university needs to strengthen efforts in evaluating curricula in terms of the needs of the labour market. Furthermore, there's need to improve the academic human resource capacity to adapt and implement upcoming curricula.		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* It is mandatory requirement by the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) that a curriculum is reviewed every five years. Under the overall supervision of the Academic Registrar, all Departments of MUST undertake curricula review processes to comply with the requirement of NCHE. There is variation across faculties in the level of integration of new knowledge and adjustments in curricula to reflect the changing contexts. The sampled reviewed curricula show that some Faculties take in-depth review of curricula content, course titles and recent reference materials, while in some other Faculties, the changes in the reviewed curricula are hardly noticeable. New research findings are to some extent incorporated in the reviewed curricula. (P1) Efforts by the university to develop curricula based on labour market needs through involvement of a range of stakeholders are apparent. Medical professionals, government official, representatives of private companies are consulted, either in meetings/workshops or through surveys. Feedback obtained from community in relation to community engagement activities is synthesized and is said to be used in review of curricula. However, this statement could not be objectively verified by the external assessment team. Stakeholder involvement, as described above, is mandatory at MUST, both for new academic programs and for the review of existing ones. However, the intensity of stakeholder engagement largely depends on availability of (external) funding to facilitate consultation processes. In some cases when resources are available, a wide range of stakeholders are involved in the curriculum review processes. When such resources are not available, the review is done internally, with the involvement of only a few selected stakeholders. This type of stakeholder feedback seems to have been taken into account when developing and reviewing curricula. (P3-P4) Besides the mandatory process of curriculum review, lecturers also have the liberty to continuously adapt the curriculum content to emerging needs and tweak delivery methods to enhance learning without exceeding 20% of the curriculum per year. Such incremental adjustments should allow lecturers to introduce new knowledge and skills in the curriculum even before the end of the five years. Moreover, it also makes it easier for lecturers to conduct a comprehensive review once the 5-year accreditation period is coming to an end. However, in MUST, there is no evidence of continuous adaptation of curricula other than the	

	mandatory review. Individual staff members may take initiatives to adapt their delivery method but such initiatives are not requested nor stimulated by management and usually not documented. (P1) A quality assurance committee established under the office of the Academic Registrar is responsible for ensuring quality of education. Overall, this committee is charged with ensuring quality of curriculum development and review, examinations, internal monitoring of teaching (through student evaluations and student attendance) and recruitment of staff. For operational purposes, similar committees are established at Faculty and Department level to apply the established standards at all levels of the organization, from the Departments to the university Senate. Quality measures for education at MUST include the following: • There are minimum qualifications for lecturers to teach different levels: graduate trainees can only teach first and second years of undergraduate programs; and graduate programs are only taught by staff with advanced degrees. However, there are no pedagogical requirements before allowing someone to teach. • Timetabling of the courses is done centrally under the Academic Registrar's office in coordination with the Deans and Heads of Department. This allow for a more rational use of available classroom space, adapted to the number of students for each course. • Lecturers have a maximum teaching load of 12 contact hours per week. Excess load is assigned to part-time lecturers or remunerated separately for permanent staff going beyond the established maximum teaching load. • The Quality Assurance Committee has developed an online evaluation form that can be used by students to provide (anonymous) feedback on the quality of their courses. Unfortunately, the voluntary nature of these evaluations, combined with the difficulty the many students encounter to access the internet, contribute to very low response rates. In addition, with the online evaluation, it is not clear who is responsible for analysing the data to be able to provide feedback to the individual lecturers. • Individual students always have the opportunity to discuss issues with respective course lecturers and/or with the Head of Department. • Representatives of students in existing management bodies (Faculty Board and Senate) can signal issues with certain courses or lecturers for discussion in those bodies. • Exams are moderated by peers to ensure an objective evaluation by the lecturers. Lecturers are also required to develop marking schemes for each of the exams set, which is also reviewed by peers during examination moderation. • It is a requirement that, before students sit the final semester exams, they must have had at least two tests as part of the continuous assessment process.

	• For graduate exams, and especially the thesis, external examiners are appointed by the Directorate for Research and Graduate Training. However, because of lack of funding, it's not always easy to find the right experts and to have them respect the agreed timeline for examination. • Students' results are discussed and approved in Departmental and Faculty Boards. Discrepancies are further investigated and analysed to flush out any issues related to the quality of teaching and/or evaluation before the results are forwarded to Senate through the Academic Registrar for approval. An area currently not covered at MUST is the systematic verification of prescribed contact hours, by Deans and Heads of Departments. (P2) In most cases, the feedback mechanisms mentioned above are a trigger for self-improvement by lecturers. In rare cases the lecturer is replaced or supported by another lecturers for team-teaching. However, there doesn't seem to exist a systematic approach to strengthen pedagogical capacities of lecturers to improve teaching at MUST, connected to existing feedback mechanisms such as student evaluations or the annual appraisal process (see below). The National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) is the national regulator that accredits programs (new and revised) before they are implemented. In January 2020, the status of accreditation of MUST programmes was as follows: • 56 programmes were accredited; • 13 programmes were submitted for accreditation but overdue; • 6 programmes were not accredited; • 2 programmes were pending inspection by NCHE (new curricula); • 2 programmes were phasing out. (R5) The external partners interviewed during this institutional assessment greatly commended the community-oriented education (through community placement, clerkship, internship, twinning) that MUST is offering. In their view, this approach provides practical skills in real-life context and also enhances service delivery to the community. The students interviewed shared this view and really appreciate the hands-on training in the communities. However, a number of students also expressed their concerns that, with the increasing number of students, the quality of field engagement might decline. There is little quantitative evidence of the labour market relevance of the education provided by MUST. The IA team was unable to find any tracer studies on employment of MUST alumni. However, given the general

	appreciation of the quality of education provided at MUST, we can consider that the labour market relevance of education is generally of decent quality. (R6)
Conclusion	
MUST seems to comply only partially with the mandatory requirement, from the National Council for Higher Education, to review every curriculum every five years, prior to re-accreditation. Also, there are no indications of continuous adaptation of curricula outside this mandatory review. Feedback mechanisms and quality assurance measure on education exist but there doesn't seem to exist a systematic approach to strengthen pedagogical capacities/practices of lecturers to improve teaching at MUST, connected to existing feedback mechanisms such as student evaluations or the annual appraisal process. There is little quantitative evidence of the labour market relevance of the education provided by MUST. However, given the general appreciation of the quality of education provided at MUST, by key stakeholders such as students and community members, we can consider that the labour market relevance of education is generally rather good.	

3.2.2 The university is a multidisciplinary institution that produces major amounts of high-quality research

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	4	*Selected maturity level*	3+
Justification of selected maturity level The University staff are increasingly getting motivated and engaged in conducting research. MUST organises academic conferences such as the Annual Research Dissemination Conference (ARDC) and we are fairly represented at national and international research conferences/seminars. The ARDC takes place every year and this has been happening for the last 15 years. Research is being conducted in a multi-disciplinary manner and there are currently multi-disciplinary research teams. There are numerous high-quality academic publications that have been produced by the university. There are some flagship research centres such as the Pharm-Bio Technology and Traditional Medicine Centre (PHARMBIOTRAC), Maternal Newborn Child Health Institute (MNCHI) and Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation (ITFC).		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* In MUST, staffing levels are generally low (see §3.4.2 below) and some staff members are on (partial) study-leave and thus not available to provide courses. Since the first priority is to ensure that courses are taught to the students, the available academic staff tend to be over-loaded with teaching responsibilities, leaving limited time to engage in research and outreach. It is estimated that staff spend about 70% of their time on teaching leaving only 30% for research and outreach. Research time is further limited by the lack of appropriate up-to-date research equipment which requires staff to sometimes use laboratories and equipment from other institutions. (P1) Generally, the only real incentive for staff to conduct research is promotion, for which the number of publications in peer reviewed journals is one of the main criteria. There are no specific demands on academic staff from management to conduct research and publish; although in some Faculties, peers encourage and motivate each other to publish. In the Faculty of Applied Sciences, for instance, all academic staff members have set themselves the target of publishing at least one paper every year. Another, more individual incentive for research is the possibility of career development and the opportunity to come into contact with researchers working on the same subjects in other countries (international networking). (P1) It was noted that academic staff in MUST often lack capacities in area such as scientific writing, proposal writing, research design and grant management. The bulk of the budget for capacity strengthening comes	

There is, however, inadequate funding available to facilitate more community research outreaches	through external projects. Because of this, staff members of Faculties benefitting from a lot of external funding have a higher chance of receiving further capacity strengthening. This is for instance the case in the Faculty of Medicine. Individual Faculties sometimes have small budgets for staff capacity development; but it is unclear how these funds are used exactly. In any case, neither the Directorate of Research and Graduate Training nor the HR Directorate are involved in organizing capacity strengthening activities using these budgets. (P1) MUST organizes its annual dissemination conference (ARCD in self-assessment) to share research findings and interact with scholars from partner institutions. This annual conference is preceded by a PhD symposium where PhD students share their research findings. Faculties also sometimes organize conferences and workshops in their respective thematic areas of specialization. Two examples: • The Community Health Department (Faculty of Medicine) is hosting its own conference for the second time this year • The Faculty of Computing and Informatics is organizing an annual “Innovation technology summit” for the second time this year as well. However, these conferences have a national or regional focus and don’t regularly attract international participants. (P2) Adequate representation of MUST in external conferences and seminars is not guaranteed as this is dependent on availability of funding. Participation in such conferences/seminars is most often supported by external projects. The university itself only has a very limited budget for participation in networking events and is only able to provide some financial support in rare cases. It was mentioned that only senior or well-connected academics from the university manage to secure financial support from the university to participate in conferences. The IA team was unable to confirm or disprove this point of view, but it was shared by several staff members interviewed. As a consequence, the majority of academic staff members interviewed, did not participate in any conference or seminar in 2019. The ones who did, did so: • As a speaker, since in that case, attending the conference was free of charge. • As a co-organizer, for the same reason Except in these cases, staff members are required to pay the participation fee themselves which the majority of staff members cannot afford. (P2) Multi-disciplinary research is appreciated in MUST and there are multiple examples of such research; thought the practice is yet to be institutionalized as the way to do research in the university.

	Some examples of multi-disciplinary research are provided below. • The Faculty of Computing and Informatics, together with the Faculty of Medicine developed several digital health applications. • The Faculty of Science and the Faculty of Medicine collaborated on research regarding the management of Bilharzia. • Biologists and Psychologists from MUST collaborated on research on knowledge and attitudes on the use of impregnated mosquito nets. (P3) MUST has no specific systems to prioritise research projects based on their potential to generate added societal and development value. However, the perceived "Benefits to local communities" is one of the criteria used by the Research Ethics Committee to assess (and validate) research proposals. (P4) There is no overall university research agenda that guides research priorities even though some Departments and Faculties have started to work on their own research agenda. This situation is strongly related to the fact that most (if not all) research is supported through external funding. MUST is reluctant to reject donor funding for research on account of it not fitting in their own research priorities. (P4) Currently, research projects are assessed in the following way: • First, research proposals are discussed at department and faculty level which serves as a peer review mechanism; • Second, research proposals are reviewed by the Directorate of Research and Graduate Training • Finally, the Research Ethics Committee, decides on the ethics, the methodology, the developmental relevance and the alignment with national priorities of the proposed research. (P4) There are no traces of the existence of a system to assure cost-effectiveness of research in MUST. However, based on information obtained from interviewees and during focus group meetings, we can assume that the limited budget for research constitutes a default incentive for cost-effective research. (P5-R7) Quality assurance of research is done through the following mechanisms: • Monthly reporting on research results for externally funded projects. • Semester report on research progress and results by graduate students at Department level and to the Directorate of Research and Graduate Training. • Peer review by colleagues at Department and Faculty level for staff-led research.

	• Peer review by (international) partners, often related to the publication of research results in (international) journals resulting from (international) partnerships. The scientific production in MUST is sufficiently high with 179 publications in 2018 and 2019 from 75 staff members with a PhD. Some of this research has been published in international journals, others in the form of monographs. In terms of quality of research, MUST seems to have managed to maintain a good balance between practical relevance for the communities in which it is active and publishing in international journals and thus being scientifically relevant. (R6) The potential flagship research centres identified during the IA were Pharm-Bio Technology and Traditional Medicine Centre (PHARMBIOTRAC) and the CAMTECH Uganda Innovation Centre. (R8)
Conclusion	
MUST is producing sufficient amounts of high-quality research. The university also has experience in multi-disciplinary research. Even though MUST regularly organizes national networking events, these events don't really draw an international audience. MUST staff is insufficiently represented in regional and international conferences.	

3.2.3 The university is perceived as a real actor and driver of Change

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	4	*Selected maturity level*	4+
Justification of selected maturity level The University's research and education processes facilitate research and innovation that are community relevant. There are avenues of disseminating new ideas and research results. This has led to our university education to generate added societal value. There is however need for the university to actively contribute to public policy debates and uptake at all levels.		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* Staffing levels in MUST are not very high and the teaching workload is high, as such, it's not always easy for academic staff to work at community level and to find time to disseminate research findings. Nonetheless, service delivery to society, and community outreach in particular, seems to be the strong suit of MUST. As a means of operationalizing its mission to contribute to community transformation, the university tries to influence development change in the community through field attachment of students to provide services and learn from and with the community on the one hand and by encouraging action-oriented research by graduate students and staff on the other hand. The main formal incentive to engage in dissemination of research finding is through promotion. However, this option is not very compelling to less ambitious staff. Moreover, the government ban on promotions has	

	further reduced the existing incentives, except for the moral obligation to disseminate research finding to the general public. (P1) Staff members of MUST participate to some extent in the public policy debate. This is mostly visible at the local and district level where, as a result of the University's research dissemination, a number of by-laws were passed. Two examples: • In Mbarara town, new by-laws were passed by the mayor on garbage management after research findings on the extent of pollution of the river Rwizi which flows through the municipality. • In Bugoye, a sub-county in Kasese district, by-laws on hand washing and latrine use were passed after research on hygiene and disease incidences in the area. At the national level, some efforts have also been made to influence public policy. Some examples: • Policy briefs were developed by the Institute for Interdisciplinary Training and Research on the role of smallholder farmers in national coffee, tea and fruit sub-sectors (2016). • Input was provided by MUST on the regulation of the profession of Biomedical Engineer, a new professional training area in Uganda for which MUST is among the pioneers. • Input was provided on policies regarding oil and gas extraction and ways to minimize its impact on local communities. It is unclear whether and to what extent these activities have contributed to actual policy changes at the national level. Even scientist involved in these policy briefs had no real evidence to support the claim of real policy influence. Direct engagement with policy makers at the national level, with a view to influence policy processes, has not been achieved yet and is a possible area for capacity strengthening.(P2-R7) The IA team didn't find any examples of MUST research being taken up by big(ger) existing companies or by the broader private sector. However, MUST encourages and supports its students to translate their research and innovative ideas into viable SMEs. Several faculties, such as the Faculty of Computing and Informatics with its "Software Incubations Unit" have business incubators in place to help students with this process. Also, the Faculty of Business and Management Sciences, has a university-wide Business Incubator Clinic in place. This Incubator, financed by AfDB, supports students from all faculties in creating their own businesses by providing mentoring support as well as seed funding for selected high potential projects. As is the case for many initiatives of the university, the scope of this support depends to a large extend on the level of (external) funding received. Whereby the Business Incubator Clinic is currently well financed by the AfDB, the software incubation unit only has limited funding and as such, less time to dedicate to mentoring and a lack of seed money for its student projects.

	It is worth noting that, even though all these initiatives ultimately serve the same purpose (business creation), there seems to be little methodological and practical coordination between all these different initiatives. Through its community-oriented research and education, MUST has certainly contributed to the creation of added societal value in target communities. Some examples: • The Faculty of Computing and Informatics provides industrial training whereby students are placed in companies and community-based organizations (such as cooperatives) to work on specific problems of such organizations. • The Faculty of Interdisciplinary Research and Training has a twinning programme through which 2nd and 3rd year students work with community members every Thursday to identify community problems and together work out solutions to these problems. Some of these projects amounted to the establishment of commercial enterprises such as soap making, fishing for women and backyard farming. • The Faculty of Medicine has students conduct clerkships in 55 community health centres in the Western Region of Uganda and in the Mbarara Referral Hospital. (R8) MUST also has a number of innovative products in the pipeline, derived from its own research that might create additional societal and even economic value in the short and medium term: • "Get a plot", an alternative social media platform for the Ugandan market is currently in the final stages of development in the Faculty of Computing and Informatics. • "Sani Drop" a sanitizer has been developed. This product is yet to be commercialized for large scale production and marketing. • The Pharm BioTech is supporting the production and the commercialization of traditional medicine in Uganda. • At its centre in Bugoye, MUST and its research partners from Australia are testing a technology for generation of oxygen (Free – O2) from a river. The technology is to enable local production of oxygen used in health facilities.
Conclusion	
Community engagement through education and research is well developed in MUST. The external assessment found many examples of societal value created by the university's staff and students. MUST is less active in policy making; its influence can mostly be observed at the local level but less at the national or international level.	

3.3 Capability to relate to external stakeholders

3.3.1 The university creates the condition for effective network development and is aware of the importance of formal institutional alliances

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	3+	*Selected maturity level*	3
Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation The University has structures to effect communication to different stakeholders. Some of these structures include the Public Relations Office (PRO) and the International Relations Office (IRO) under the vice Chancellor's office. The university regularly communicates at individual and organizational level and creates conditions for effective partnerships. Some of the partnerships include Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH), Epicentre, Vrije Universiteit Brussels (VUB), Africa Development Bank (AfDB), SNV, National Research Agriculture Organisation (NARO), district local governments, Technical University of Giessen, and Bishop Stuart University. There are numerous memoranda with different relevant stakeholders. The university is financially constrained and this affects funding allocation to the networking.		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* External and internal communication is managed by different organizational units in MUST: • The office of the Academic Registrar is responsible for overall promotion of the educational programmes of the university. It does so by organizing school visits with lecturers to promote specific programmes. • The Directorate of Research and Graduate Training is responsible for promoting all of MUST's graduate programmes. • The different faculties have a similar role but only for their own programmes. There is some level of competition between the Faculties over prospective students. • The University Secretary is responsible for communicating on the activities/decisions of the University Council. • The Public Relations Office (PRO) is responsible for external and internal communication on subjects other than the ones mentioned above. Activities of this office include: publication of a monthly newsletter (just started), email and WhatsApp communications to target specific internal stakeholders, organization of networking events with stakeholders, such as breakfast prayer meeting, updating of the MUST website, managing of the official university Facebook and Twitter accounts, partnerships with media for publicity and coverage of major events at the university, … • The International Relations Office (IRO) works closely with the PRO but with a focus on attracting and supporting international students and accommodating international visitors to the university (see §3.3.3 below). Until the beginning of 2020, all the above-mentioned communication was done in a rather disjointed way. There was (and still is) no written strategy guiding communications and nobody was managing the MUST brand in a coordinated way(P1). Since January 2020, the PRO started working on streamlining communication to external stakeholders by: • Identifying focal persons in each Faculty to form a university communications committee. These focal persons are the staff members already involved in communication efforts at the Faculty itself.	

	• The PRO is currently trying to review all outgoing communication: content of the website, communication through social media, and flyers to ensure coherence in the messages that go out to the public. It remains to be seen to what extend these efforts will harmonize communication practices in the university. The Public Relations Office (PRO) currently has only one full time staff member (the PR Officer) who is periodically supported by a volunteer (student) and two IT experts that work as website administrators. According to the PR Officer, this team is scheduled to be strengthened in the coming months with an extra staff member. The PR Officer seems to have a good understanding of communication strategy and methods, even though the last training provided to her on the subject dates back 4 years ago. Most of the expertise comes from self-study and benchmarking with PRO's in other universities. (P2) Academic staff, with limited expertise in this area, is responsible for communications from the office of the Academic Registrar and the Directorate of Research and Graduate Training. Communication focal persons in the Faculties also have limited background in this area. However, they may have gained some experience through practice in recent years. Until now these staff members have not received any support to strengthen their capacities in communication. However, in April 2020, a training is scheduled for some of the focal persons on website design and use of social media in communication. This one-shot training is unlikely to provide sufficient expertise to the staff members involved. (P2) In its Strategic Plan, network development and partnerships are mentioned on three occasions: • First of all, community engagement is explicitly mentioned in the mission of the university • Secondly, the Strategic Plan also mentions internationalization and Public Private Partnerships in light of external resource mobilization. • Thirdly, the Strategic Plan also touches upon the need to involve alumni in academic life. (P3) As explained above, community service has really been the flagship identity of MUST. To institutionalize community service, supervision of students' field attachment and community service are part of the criteria for promotion of academic staff. In that sense, some incentives have been provided to balance individual interests with organizational performance in the area of networking. Whereas networking is essential for external resource mobilization, this is constrained by limited capacity and opportunities for networking. Currently, staff members are rarely supported financially to engage in networking activities and grant writing requires staff to invest their private time. As such, individual staff members bear almost the entire financial burden (and risks) related to networking and resource mobilization, albeit with some support from the GMO. On the other hand, the fruits of successful grant writing benefit the organization first and foremost. Successful proposals strengthen the image of the university and awarded overhead costs benefit the central administration first. The Faculty and the Department of the

	successful grantee also benefit financially, particularly with regard to equipment and research facilities, but to a lesser extent. However, MUST currently doesn't have a system whereby successful project proposal also generate a financial reward for the responsible staff member. The only real benefits are the ones related to increased exposure in the international environment and more chance of publishing in international journals through collaboration with scholars from other countries. (P4) MUST doesn't have an explicit strategy on networking and relating to other stakeholders. However, as is shown in §3.3.2 below, this doesn't seem to significantly hamper the networking of the university. Nonetheless, the existing network of the university seems to be more the result of the initiatives taken by individual staff members, than of an intentional approach to strengthen the university's network, supported by the institution. There is reason to assume that a more systematic support to and institutional embedment of networking could significantly increase the volume of external funding flowing into MUST. It is worth noting that the Grant Management Office is providing some support in grant writing, such as continuously scanning of websites of potential funding partners to identify funding opportunities; organizing grant writing teams to respond to interesting calls (see §3.4.6), providing technical support such as budgeting, compliance issues and submission of the applications. However, apart from the circumstances for project development and implementation, MUST doesn't follow the work of potential partners to proactively identify potential areas of collaboration as part of the institutional culture to network and partners with other stakeholders. Joint planning and implementation are only done in the context of common projects where success depends on such joint activities. (R6)
Conclusion	
There is no written strategy guiding communications and nobody at MUST is actively managing the university's brand in a coordinated way. Since January 2020, the Public Relations Office started working on streamlining communication to external stakeholders. Despite these recent efforts, communication is still handled by different parts of the organization in a somewhat disjointed way. Staff members involved in communication could be better supported to increase the overall impact of internal and external communication. MUST doesn't have a real networking strategy either and the overall support and incentives provided by MUST to its staff members in the area of networking are insufficient.	

3.3.2 The university has a vast network which is actively used

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	4	*Selected maturity level*	4

Justification of selected maturity level	*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation*
The University organizes networking activities; the habit of networking is adopted by some academic staff, uses external stakeholders when reviewing curricula and has networks with universities and training research Institutes. The university regularly involves the community in its activities and this has given MUST more visibility in the community as a result of students and faculty engagement with the community. There's however need to increase on the number of engagements with the different stakeholders and the communication office capacity in terms of numbers.	As mentioned in §3.2.2 above, MUST and its Faculties organize national and regional conferences and seminars from time to time. Some of these are academic in nature and intended to disseminate research findings to the scientific community while others are intended to expose the broader public to scientific knowledge. (P1) Even though management of MUST encourages networking, the limited financial support provided to staff doesn't help to create a habit of networking among staff. Therefore, networking efforts largely depend on the personal interest of individual staff members and their existing connections with other professionals within their field of discipline. There doesn't seem to be an intentional/proactive approach to networking. Networks do exist but seem to be linked to preparation and implementation of projects. (P2) As mentioned in §3.2.1 above, external stakeholders are systematically involved in curriculum development and review. The intensity and manner of this involvement largely depend on the availability of (external) resources. (P3) External and internal communications are managed at different places in the university, with the PRO trying to harmonize approaches. At the various points, communication is mainly done by focal persons, academic staff who do not have expertise in communication. Investments by the university to strengthen the existing communication and networking capacity are inadequate. Communication focal persons, have not received any support in recent years to strengthen their capacity in these areas and neither has the PRO. (P4) Despite the scattered and not so well coordinated approach to communication and networking, MUST has managed to establish a decent network with different types of stakeholder. Their existing network involves the following actors (R5) • **Other universities**: MUST has established relationships with many Ugandan universities such as Makerere University, Mountains of the Moon University, Bishop Stuart University and Kampala International University. It is also involved in south-south collaboration with African universities such as the University of Cape Town (South Africa), Kenyatta University (Kenya) and the University of Lagos (Nigeria). Further, MUST also has a lot of collaborations with universities in the North: Indiana University, Massachusetts General Hospital, University of Northern Carolina (USA), as well as VUB, UA, KUL and UG in Belgium,… • **Community members**: these relationships are often the result of collaborations during community outreach activities.

	• **Actors within civil society**: MUST has an ongoing agreement with Mobile Hospice on palliative healthcare training. More generally, students from the university often work for farmer associations or cooperative organizations when conducting community outreach work. • **Private funders:** Many of the external funders of MUST (see §7.5) are private donors such as the Welcome Trust Fund, the Wyss Foundation, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation,… • **Alumni:** MUST has a quite active alumni programme. Alumni are organized under what is called the Convocation. The university organizes and Annual General Meeting for its alumni. Last year, around two hundred participants attended this meeting. Alumni are actively engaged as informal ambassadors and potential mentors for students and they are represented in the top governance body of the university, the Council. Relationships also exist with other stakeholders, as explained below, but these are less developed, compared to the ones mentioned above: • **Private sector stakeholders:** As mentioned above, individual private stakeholders are regularly consulted when developing or reviewing curricula. Also, MUST students from certain Faculties go for industrial attachment/internship training in private companies in Mbarara. • **Political stakeholders:** As mentioned in §3.2.3, MUST is only to some extent involved in policy making. Relationships with political stakeholders are more active mainly at the local level. • **Civil servants:** Two examples of existing collaborations are the work with district community development officers for the dissemination exercise of research on coffee and tea production and the collaboration with the Mbarara Regional Referral Hospital for participation in curriculum development and clinical and practical training of students. • **Multi- and bilateral donors**: as shown in the list of ongoing projects in §7.5, MUST is currently supported directly by only one bilateral donor (USAID). There are no multi-lateral donors among MUST's funders. In the cases of VLIR-UOS and NUFFIC, funding coming from a foreign national government is channelled through an entity specialized in university cooperation. However, in the past, MUST has also collaborated with SIDA (scholarships for staff development) and with AfDB (establishment of the new campus). As already stated above, extension services are regularly provided by MUST through field attachment. Consultancies by staff members are mostly conducted on an individual basis; the university doesn't have a formal structure nor any guidelines in place to govern and manage consultancies as an institution. (R6)

	However, all stakeholders interviewed during the institutional assessment were appreciative and in praise of MUST for its positive influence on the communities in which it is currently active through community outreach as described above. (R7)
Conclusion	
Despite the relatively weak support provided to its staff members in the area of networking, MUST manages to maintain successful relationships with an important and diverse group of external stakeholders. This potential could be strengthened through well-targeted institutional support in this area.	

3.3.3 The university obtains additional project funding

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	4+	*Selected maturity level*	4+
Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation The university has pursued the internationalization through the establishment of the International relations office. This has facilitated more collaborations and exchange programs. MUST has put in place strategies for the staff to raise resources through grant writing. There's a Grants office established which manages and monitors externally funded projects funds. There's need to increase more external funding given the declining government funding to facilitate core university operations. The university delivers upon funding agreements however its procurement procedures need to be improved.		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* MUST doesn't have explicit strategies for internationalization nor for resource mobilization. Nonetheless, the International Relations Office (IRO) is providing a number of services aimed at attracting foreign funders and students: • The IRO facilitates international visitors of MUST with regard to securing visa, transport, hotel accommodation and content-wise (liaising with internal stakeholders). • The IRO communicates on MUST's programmes to potential foreign students via its website. • The IRO provides practical support to foreign students enrolled in MUST in areas such as housing, welfare, visa and cross-cultural exchange. To-date, the share of international students at MUST is still minimal. As shown in the Senate minutes from July 24th, 2019 the investments in the international office have not yet yielded the intended success. The proportion of foreign students in MUST remains below 1% against the ambition of the Senate to achieve 25% that year. MUST seems more successful in attracting externally funded projects. The presence of an IRO and of a Grants Management Office shows a clear understanding of the international funding environment and its requirements. On proposal writing, little capacity strengthening support is provided to individual staff members. However, the Grants Management Office (GMO) does provide organizational support in proposal writing. This office searches for funding opportunities (open calls) and identifies potential internal teams to prepare the	

	application. The office supports the writing team by preparing budgets and ensuring compliance and submission of the application. (P2) Administrative monitoring of externally funded projects is also done by the GMO (see §3.4.6 for more details). Monitoring of content of externally funded projects is done using the normal systems of the university: • Before the start of the project, the Research Ethics Committee reviews and validates all research proposals. • The Directorate of Research and Graduate Training monitors implementation through monthly meetings with the external project coordinators. • Regular reporting on the project is also done at Departmental and Faculty level. (P3) MUST currently has 78 ongoing externally funded projects with a total budget ranging between 3,000 and 2,800,000 euros. The average annual budget of these projects combined is higher than the budget received from tuition fees. On this basis, we may conclude that MUST is currently raising significant and diverse external funds on a regular basis. (R4) Direct feedback received from two long-standing partners of MUST, the Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWE) and the Global Health Collaborative, indicates that MUST usually delivers on the results agreed upon in the funding agreement. Also, the audit report by PwC, submitted in March 2020 on 17 projects implemented by the Grants Management Office showed: • High budget implementation rates in all but 2 projects • Financial and programmatic reports submitted to the funder in time as required for all but 2 projects (R5)
Conclusion	
MUST seems quite successful in attracting externally funded projects. The presence of an IRO, in charge of supporting internationalization, and of a Grants Management Office (GMO) shows a clear understanding of the international funding environment and its requirements. The Grants Management Office (GMO) provides organizational support in proposal writing and is also responsible for management of external funding in MUST. Evidence collected by the IA team suggest that this is done in an adequate way. However, on the former, little capacity strengthening support is provided to individual staff members. Content-wise, monitoring of externally funded projects is done using the normal systems of the university	

3.4 Capability to act and commit

3.4.1 The university is able to make and implement decisions

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	4	*Selected maturity level*	3+
Justification of selected maturity level The University decisions are made through established structures such as Departments, Faculties, Deans' committee, top management, senate, subcommittees of University Council and Council. Through the existing of structures, delegation of responsibilities and roles are executed to support decision making. These structures inform the planning and budgeting processes. Most University decisions are informed by the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act, the University policies and established procedures although the process of implementation ought to be improved. For instance, the established procedures are bureaucratic which sometimes delays timely decision making.		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* Most decision-making in MUST is done using a cascaded bottom-up approach whereby lower levels of management (more or less formally) provide input to higher levels of management that make the final decision. A good example of this way of working is the process in place for budget preparations. At the start of this process, lower management (e.g. Heads of Department) is requested to provide an initial budgeted plan, based on the perceived needs at their level and considering a preliminary budgetary envelope defined by senior management. These plans are then consolidated at Faculty level and, these Faculty plans are in turn consolidated for the entire University by senior management. At each stage, priorities are set and certain proposals from the lower level are retained while others are dropped, based on the anticipated budget limits. Senior management makes the final decision on the budget that is presented to the University Council. In general, all decisions that have a potential impact on staffing, the budget or the external reputation of MUST are made in that way. It is important to note that this type of decisions is also discussed by the University Council, first in respective Council committees before they are passed in the quarterly plenary session. (P1) However, for academic matters (results of students, planning of courses, examinations,…), a different approach is used. Here, Departmental and Faculty Boards are empowered to take these decisions. Only in exceptional cases are the decisions of the Departments and Faculties reversed by senior management. It is important to note that, to aid administration at Faculty level, several faculty committees have been put into place. These include, but are not limited to: • Examinations and irregularities committee; • Academics and quality assurance committee; • Appointments and Promotions committee; • Estate and space allocation committee; • Finance, planning and welfare committee;	

	• Higher degrees, research and innovations committee. It is clear that the type of bottom-up cascaded collaborative decision making takes more time than a centralized decision-making process. For academic decisions, it fully empowers the core academic units (departments and faculties) to make the important decisions with involvement of relevant stakeholders. However, for management decisions, involvement of every intermediate level may make the decision-making process very slow. There is a trade-off in balancing participation of relevant stakeholders in all decisions and quick decisions that promptly respond to the needs. (P2-R3) Interviewed staff members recognize the difficult context in which MUST's senior management has to operate and make decisions. And given this context, staff members perceive the decision-making process to be appropriate. However, two issues have been raised on different occasions by interviewed staff: • Communication on decisions made by senior management to staff needs to be improved. There are many decisions made by the top management or by the Council which are not promptly communicated to all staff. • Resources allocation should prioritize academic work over administration and support function. Because of inadequate funds, there are counter subjective perceptions of staff regarding prioritization of academic versus administrative activities. Academic staff have the perception that academic activities are not given due priority while administrative staff think the reverse is true. In general, most of the management decisions are largely reactive in nature, leaning even towards crisis management. (R3) In terms of timeliness of decision making, senior management seems to be quite proactive in areas such as the preparation of the annual workplan, preparation of the academic calendar, etc which are quite foreseeable. However, given the limited budgetary space, and the general absence of a risk identification and management approach, emergencies that arise cannot always be resolved within a short time. Also, because of bureaucratic rules, implementation of decisions by senior management can be slow which can sometimes create the perception of a general slowness in decision making. The two main systems through which MUST can formally engage and commit are the following: • The signing of Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) to engage in partnerships with a wide range of stakeholders. Such partnerships often include some kind of grant agreement. • The signing of contracts with private contractors for the delivery of goods and services, following a public procurement procedure.

	For both options, the university has specific systems in place: • MoUs are first discussed at the lowest level, between initiators in MUST and in the partner organization. The draft MoU resulting from this dialogue is then discussed at Faculty level before being assessed by the University's legal advisor with the involvement of the IRO. Based on the advice of the legal officer, the proposed MoU is either directly sent to the Council for final approval or amended first to take into account any observations made by the legal officer. According to staff interviewed, this internal process normally doesn't take a long time. However, the most time-consuming part of the MoU signing process is obtaining approval from the Ministry of Finance. The normal lead time of this formal approval process is estimated to take at least 3 months. • Systems for procurement follow the regulations outlined in the Public Procurement and Disposal Act (PPDA). Below, in §3.4.5, procurement performance in MUST is discussed more in detail. In principle, MUST can also sign contracts to deliver services (consulting, training,...) but such commercial services are more provided by individual staff members and rarely by the university as an institution.
Conclusion	
Except for academic matters, most decision-making in MUST is done using a cascaded bottom-up approach. Overall, decision making at MUST seems to be done in an adequate and timely manner. However, timeliness of decision making seems to be influenced to some extent by the number of hierarchical layers in the university and the overall collaborative approach to decision making in committees. Suboptimal communication on management decisions also negatively influences staff perception on the appropriateness of certain decisions. The two main systems through which MUST can formally engage and commit are the signing of Memoranda of Understanding and the signing of contracts.	

3.4.2 The university has adequate and well managed Human Resources

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	4	*Selected maturity level*	3
Justification of selected maturity level Mbarara University of Science and Technology has over the years pursued an all-inclusive recruitment process based on gender, race and religion. The existing faculty is well trained and have recently promoted good research and education outputs. In terms of the Quality Assurance framework requirements, some		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* MUST strives to make its hiring processes as inclusive as possible. A number of policies and practices clearly point in that direction: • First and foremost, in the Gender Policy and in the Disability and Special Needs Policy, the importance of non-discrimination based on gender or disability is emphasized. • Secondly, all positions are advertised internally and externally while potentially discriminating selection criteria are eliminated or reformulated	

departments are not balanced in terms of staffing. There has been limited retaining of skilled staff due to limited funding to create a conducive operational environment to facilitate more research and teaching outputs. Funding is therefore needed to build the capacity of staff and invest in infrastructure that can facilitate retaining of skilled academic staff.	• Finally, the recruitment process is conducted in a transparent way, with final decisions being made by a committee, the proceedings of which are recorded in minutes. However, despite these efforts, over the last 3 years (2017-2020), the proportion of female staff in MUST has remained stable at around 34%. This is probably due to the current ban on new recruitments, imposed by the Government of Uganda and the very limited turnover at MUST. It's important to note that MUST has been consistently performing very well in annual External Assessments, conducted by the Uganda's Equal Opportunities Commission, on gender and equity requirements imposed by the central Government. (P1-R8) As mentioned above, staffing levels are generally low, especially compared to the approved establishment of MUST: • **Academic staff:** The establishment has 855 approved academic positions of which 261 (30%) are currently filled. • **Non-academic staff:** The establishment has 1634 approved non-academic positions of which 277 (17%) are filled. One could argue whether the establishment was correctly developed in the first place. The current student to teacher ratio of 18:1 is comparable to the average of all universities in the United States and the same as KU Leuven in Belgium. On this basis, one could argue that academic staffing levels in MUST are not extremely low. (P3-P4-P5) The qualification level of permanent academic staff in MUST is as follows: • 8 academic staff members (3%) are Bachelor's degree holders • 178 academic staff members (68%) are Master's degree holders • Only 75 academic staff members (29%) are PhD holders This information shows that the majority of academic staff currently doesn't have the optimal degree to teach in a university, which is a PhD. However, most bachelor's degree holders are already enrolled in a Master's degree programme and 54 Master degree holders are enrolled in a PhD programme either at MUST or in other universities. (P2-P3) Professional development of academic staff, especially in the areas of education and research, is not really supported in a structured way at MUST. Almost all training is done through external funding since MUST's budget for professional development of staff is very low and its use is focussed on increasing formal qualifications of staff members, as shown above. To this end, MUST is using a system of fee waiver for staff interested in studying at MUST. However, this system is mostly reserved for staff in priority areas (Applied

	Sciences and Medicine) and is oriented towards the current function and not so much towards career development. The University Training Committee ensures that training provided is aligned to the current job requirements (focus on academic staff) and that the training budget is correctly distributed among staff members. Most professional development of staff members is done through self-tutoring, sometimes with feedback from students or peers as a trigger. MUST also doesn't have a staff development plan to guide systematic staff training in critical areas of expertise required for higher job performance. (P3-P4) Formal systems for horizontal or vertical staff mobility (promotion) exist in MUST. Horizontal mobility can be done through internal recruitment or through re-designation. In the latter case, staff members can request or can be requested to assume a similar position (in the same pay scale) in a different unit of the university. However, in MUST re-designation is almost solely used as a negative measure, either to solve conflicts or to punish poor performing staff. It is almost never linked to career development. (P6) Promotion is strictly related to a number of criteria that need to be followed. The three most important ones are the following: • A position at a higher level must be available in the university's establishment • The person wanting the promotion needs to meet the formal requirements (e.g. education, seniority, experience) related to the position • Budgetary space must allow to absorb the extra cost related to promotions. Currently, the absence of budgetary space, because of scarce government funding, is limiting the possibilities for promotion of staff at MUST. This is creating frustration among staff and even social tensions within the university. In the area of Performance Management, MUST is supposed to follow the general regulations of the Ugandan Public Service. In this framework, annual face-to-face individual planning and evaluation is to be conducted and results of the appraisal are to be communicated in writing to the staff member and shared with HR for follow-up. The appraisal process is also to some extent connected to the system for promotion. In the appraisal, the supervisor is expected to recommend whether a specific staff member would be eligible for promotion, given his/her merits in research (published articles), in supervision of students and/or in community outreach. However, despite this legal requirement, Performance Management is poorly implemented at MUST. In his report for FY 2018/19 for instance, the Auditor General observed serious shortcomings in adhering to these regulations. At the time of auditing, none of the 528 staff members had developed performance plans. And by the end of the financial year, only 25 staff members (5%) had been appraised. (P6)

	The MUST HR Manual lists a number of formal bodies for resolution of conflicts that go beyond the immediate management levels: • Staff has the right to formally **submit grievances** in writing to the HR Directorate. • The **Internal Staff Disciplinary Committee**, a subcommittee of the Appointment Board, that can pronounce sanctions in case of serious misconduct (theft, fraud,…) by staff members. • The **Appointments Board**, a committee of the University Council that can also pronounce sanctions in case of serious misconduct (theft, fraud,…) by staff members. Appeals against decisions made by the Internal Staff Disciplinary Committee are treated at this level. • The **Staff Tribunal**, an independent mediation body where the aggrieved staff can appeal, before considering going to the regular courts of law. However, as mentioned by MUST's HR Director, most conflicts and misunderstandings are resolved by management at Departmental and Faculty level, sometimes with the informal support of the HR team. (P7) MUST doesn't seem to have any problems with attracting and retaining qualified staff. Currently, the government ban on public recruitment doesn't allow the university to hire new permanent staff members. As far as retention is concerned, the turnover rate is quite low. In the last 4 years there were only a few departures of staff members registered. (R9)
Conclusion	
Human resources are a challenge for MUST, especially in quantitative terms. Budgetary constraints don't allow MUST to recruit the required number of academic or non-academic staff members, nor to invest in the professional development of existing staff. Improvements are also needed in other areas of HR management. Although most HR management processes are in place, issues exist with performance management and career development through mobility.	

3.4.3 The university has an adequate infrastructure

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	3	*Selected maturity level*	3
Justification of selected maturity level The University has expanded its training infrastructure at Kihumuro Campus to facilitate teaching and learning although there is still		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* MUST currently has two major sites: • The Kihumuro campus, which houses the Faculty of Applied Sciences, the multi-purpose laboratory, an administrative building and the new central library. On this site, buildings are new and spacious. On the	

room for more expansion. The University has flexible but limited research funds. Though there is a well fledged ICT unit, there is still inadequacy in terms of equipment, digital platforms, e-learning and digital systems and effective intranet services. There are inadequate centralised ICT systems that would facilitate a state of art research and data processing. Furthermore, there is inadequate laboratory equipment and infrastructure in regard to the academic staffs' technical expertise to facilitate learning	same campus, a new building for the Faculty of Computing and Informatics is currently still under construction and is expected to be ready by the end of this year. • The town campus, with old and crowded buildings which houses the other faculties and some administrators. Taking into account the new buildings, MUST has the adequate space to conduct research and deliver classes in an appropriate environment. The new campus and its expansion will certainly help to decongest the town campus in which students are still receiving courses in small and old classrooms and inappropriate laboratories. (R4) The new buildings, and especially the new laboratories are also provided with the required equipment for research in applied sciences, particularly in the engineering discipline. In the town campus, only the pharmacy lab seems to be equipped with specialized equipment to conduct research. The other labs being mostly teaching labs. (R5) Two important challenges can be noted with regard to the use of the available specialized equipment: • While the equipment is available, funding for consumables is very limited and this limitation might hamper the use of this equipment for teaching and research. • Specialized equipment requires specialized maintenance. However, there are not many technicians available to take up responsibility in this area. Moreover, the technicians available don't always have the required skills to ensure the type of maintenance required, even after mandatory training provided by equipment suppliers. (R6) In general, access to functional ICT systems poses a real challenge in MUST (R2): • First of all, internet access is very slow or inaccessible, mainly because of the limited available bandwidth and the high population of internet users among staff and students. This is especially the case in the town campus but can also be expected in the Kihumuro campus once more courses shift to the new campus. Coverage of internet is very limited. Whereas the new campus is connected by fibre, this is only the case for 60% of the town campus. • Secondly, power outages, pose a real challenge for effective IT use, especially since the university doesn't have the necessary financial resources for continued use of diesel-fuelled generators nor for installing solar energy solutions. These power outages not only disrupt internet use but also sometimes damage existing IT infrastructure such as servers. • Finally, there are insufficient computers available for the number of students currently enrolled at MUST. Estimates by the ICT Unit speak of ratios of about 1 computer for every 15 students. MUST has a number of technological facilities available (R3):

	• An e-learning platform exists and lecturers are encouraged to use this platform. However, currently, only a few courses, mainly from the computer-based faculties, are available on the e-learning platform. The capacity of the existing university server doesn't allow a wider use of e-learning in the university. • The university library makes use of the open access databases such as DOAJ and DOAB • Finally, the central library has a number of paid subscriptions to e-resources through a consortium of Ugandan Libraries and other subscriptions to five databases: HINARI for biomedical sciences (paid by WHO), AGORA for agricultural and environmental sciences (paid by FAO), ARDI for ICT and innovations and GOAL for law and related fields Other technological facilities are currently still absent: • MUST doesn't have a functional digital repository, even though it is under development. It is expected that this will be launched with the opening of the new central library, later this year. However, populating the repository still faces challenges digitizing resources that are currently only available in hard copies. • The university doesn't have a real intranet with centralized internal information on the university. The only information centrally available is the information on students through the digital student management platform (AIMS), installed by the Ministry of Education and Sports. Staff records are only available on paper. • Faculties and Departments don't have any specialized software for data collection, analysis, etc., except the ones obtained individually by staff members through legal (e.g. trial versions) or illegal (e.g. pirated software) means. In general, the use of the existing technological facilities is seriously impacted by the poor state of ICT systems as described above.
Conclusion	
With the new Kihumuro campus nearing completion, MUST has sufficient space to conduct research and deliver classes. Overall, laboratory infrastructure seems adequate, especially in the new campus. However, in this area, funding for consumables and the presence of skilled technicians are the main challenges. The university has limited technological facilities available for staff and students, mainly because of the poor state of IT infrastructure in the university. This hampers further development of research and education and also has a negative impact on digitalization of other processes in the university.	

3.4.4 The university has adequate and well managed financial resources

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	5	*Selected maturity level*	4+ for management of financial resources 2 for level of funding
Justification of selected maturity level MUST has well established clear financial management structures and systems. For instance there are strong internal control systems such as periodic internal auditing and annual external auditing by the Auditor General's office. There is an established a MUST Grants Office with adequate staff to manage external funding. MUST implements the government statutory obligations such as the Public Procurement and Disposal of Assets Act, Integrated Financial Management System, National Social Security Fund (NSSF) and Uganda Revenue Authority (URA) remittances. There is still a need to strengthen the functioning of the internal control systems and reduce delays in the procurement processes.		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* MUST, like all public bodies in Uganda, follows the Ugandan Public Finance Management Act and uses the financial management systems (IFMS/AIMS) provided by the central government. This system is robust and has sufficient checks and balances to allow for and ensure adequate financial management of available resources. It also allows tracking and reporting of financial operations and accounting by source of funding. (P1) All internal stakeholders interviewed agree that the budget provided to MUST is insufficient to fulfil its statutory mandate in an adequate way. (R2) This may be illustrated with some examples from the Faculty of Medicine, with a total budget of about 3.72 million euros the Faculty, being the highest budget in the entire university. • Out of this overall envelope, around 3.49 million euros (94%) is spent on staff salaries. This high spending on staff leaves limited room for other expenses. • Another important budget line is "Allowances". It was explained to the team that this budget line is also regularly used to cover salaries for temporary staff. The total budget allocated to "allowances" is about 43,000 euros, 1,2% of the total faculty budget. • Other important budget lines include: support to community outreach (54,000 euros), scholarships and other related costs (28,000 euros), medical supplies (30,000 euros), office supplies (10,500 euros), ICT equipment (5,000 euros) and staff training (1,000 euros). It is clear that, with such a limited budget, it is extremely difficult to properly manage this faculty of about 2000 students for an entire year. Despite this limited budget, MUST has managed to keep its domestic arrear at a very reasonable level. According to the report of the Auditor General for FY 2018/19, it amounted to about 71,000 euros with outstanding receivables for a comparable amount. With regard to management of resources from external funders, MUST seems to be doing a commendable job. In March 2020 PwC issued an external audit report on financial management of 17 externally funded projects, managed by the Grants Management Office. This report gives an overall positive picture but cited the following issues:	

	• The projects show a large number of reconciling items1 which, according to the report, might be an indication that project balances may not be accurate. • A few instances of inadequately supported expenditures. • Instances of ineligible costs under 3 projects. • Erroneous computation of certain taxes for projects. • Several cases of non-adherence to PPDA guidelines, especially procurement with only 1 quotation obtained. Nonetheless, people interviewed from the Global Health Collaborative felt satisfied with the results of this audit and especially the progress made by the Grant Management Office in the last years. (R3) It is important to note that these external reports don't mention delays in procurement, even though these seem to be quite common for procurements using government funding (See §3.4.5 below). This situation is probably related to the availability of dedicated procurement staff in the Grants Management Office for externally funded projects. The most recent external audit report from the Office of the Auditor General (FY 2018/19) only cited a few minor issues: • A slight under-absorption of the awarded budget (99,3% implemented) • Existence of unremitted off-budget receipts • The aforementioned domestic arrear of 71,000 euros and outstanding receivables for about 55,000 euros However, in general, this recent audit report from the Office of the Auditor General was very positive for MUST. (R4)
Conclusion	
The budget provided to MUST is insufficient to fulfil its statutory mandate in an adequate way. However, information obtained during the external assessment shows that overall, the available resources are managed in an adequate way by the university.	

[1] Budget items for which there is a difference between balances from two sources e.g. bank statement and own monitoring tool

3.4.5 The university has effective systems and processes for administration and procurement and logistics

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	4+	*Selected maturity level*	3+
Justification of selected maturity level The University has well established academic and administrative systems, structures and processes through which decisions are made and implemented. In addition to improved academic and management establishments, there are a number of service units that have been established. These include but are not limited to; the Procurement Unit, Directorate of Research and Graduate Training, Centre of Innovations and Technology Transfer, Directorate of Human Resource, internal management committees and International Relations Office. There are clear and established procurement systems with adequate staffing. In terms of implementation however, there is a need to improve the performance of procurement functions.		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* As described above (see § 3.1.2 above), MUST already has a number of crucial policies and processes in place. One of the most developed processes relates to student administration. This process is almost entirely digitalized. Using the Academic Information Management System (AIMS), students can login online to apply for admission, pay fees, register for exams and results management. The use of digitalized student administration through AIMS has two potential major advantages: • This automation process can speed up processing of admissions considerably. • Moreover, because of digital registration and payment, the transparency in student administration is increased. It's important to note that use of the AIMS application currently still has some system issues: • The system is not 100% stable and as such is sometimes not functional for an extended time period. • Existing issues with ICT systems in MUST (§ 3.4.3 above) make accessing the AIMS application even more difficult. In his most recent report (FY2018/19), the Auditor General also pointed out the existence of a number of organizational issues related to the use of AIMS: • A lack of documented roles and responsibilities for different users of the system • A lack of review of postings in the system by staff members • Inadequacy in ledger reports generated by the system. According to the Auditor General, these anomalies indicate control weakness that may lead to irregular/erroneous transactions. One example of such transactions was found in the minutes of the Senate meeting of October 3rd, 2019 where a case of 20 wrongly entered results of student was discussed. (P1-R3) Procurement and logistics management apply the statutory regulations laid out in the Uganda Public Procurement and Disposal Act (PPDA - 2003). Each year, every cost centre in the university (Faculty, unit, directorate,…) is expected to develop a procurement plan, based on the approved budget. The Procurement Unit of the university is responsible for ensuring that procurement processes respect the existing	

	regulations. For each procurement process, the Contracts Committee decides on the procurements following established procedures and verifies the bidding documents. An evaluation committee, established for each individual procurement process, is responsible for assessing the different offers and for making recommendations to the Contracts Committee which approves contracts. (P2)
	
	For FY 2018/19, the Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Authority carried out a procurement and disposal audit in MUST. The results of this audit were the following:
	• The general compliance level for procurement processes conducted by the university was considered satisfactory by the Authority.
	• On procurement performance the following observations were made:
	  ○ Procurement went over and above the procurement plan, due to failure to update the plan on a quarterly basis.
	  ○ There was a lack of evidence of a mechanism to establish and/or assess market prices in the procurement of lab equipment, which led to a purchasing above the market price.
	  ○ Procurements were split in order to avoid more competitive (and longer) procurement procedures.
	  ○ Some contract supervisors did not implement contracts in accordance to ToR which led to deviations in delivering within the contractual period in 3 out of 20 audited procurements.
	  ○ Some irregularities were noted at evaluation: restrictive criteria were used to favour a predetermined bidder; inconsistencies were observed between evaluation minutes and evaluation report and new criteria were introduced during the evaluation process.
	  ○ For one of the procurement processes, the Auditor advised to recover a small amount of money (100 euros) from the evaluation team due to non-transparency and fairness in their recommendation to award.
	
	Despite the positive overall conclusion of this audit, it is clear that these observations are quite serious.(R4)
	
	More advanced concepts such as life cycle costing and full costing of infrastructure and value for money procurement are still to be introduced

Conclusion	
Administration and procurement processes are clearly defined and an adequate system (AIMS) is used for student administration. But administration and procurement suffer from bureaucratic rules, imposed by the legislation, which hamper performance in these areas. Also, the implementation of and compliance with established processes need to be improved to enhance performance. Later on, further enhancing the maturity level in these functions would require adopting simple approaches of life cycle costing and value for money procurement.	

3.4.6 The university has effective systems and processes for project management and quality assurance

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	5	*Selected maturity level*	4
Justification of selected maturity level There is an independent grants office to manage project funding and facilitate the implementation of projects. MUST annually organizes budget discussion platforms with internal stakeholders as a quality standard and performance mechanism. This process however needs improvement in terms of budget performance evaluations at external level. Furthermore, because of limited financial resources however, there is a need to strengthen her resource mobilisation strategy to maximise outputs and results. There is also a need to strengthen the University continuous policy engagement domain for improved service delivery.		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* As indicated in §3.4.6 above, MUST has a Grants Management Office (GMO) in place which is responsible for: • Identifying appropriate grants for which the university is eligible to apply • Composing a grant writing team with a Principal Investigator, based on the areas of the call. • Organizing introductory meetings for the grant writing team on the nature/content of the call • Seeking approval for awarded grants at the university level (Council) and at the national level (Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development) • Recruiting project teams: support staff, coordinator, research assistants,… • Renting office space for project teams • Financial management and reporting • Ensuring procurement for projects through a dedicated procurement officer • Ensuring follow-up of projects through monthly reports and meetings on finance and project content. (P1) Efficient use of available resources is to a large extent determined by the quality of the systems in place. As shown by the results of external audit, conducted by PwC in early 2020, the systems in the Grants Management office seem to function adequately. We therefore have no reason to doubt the efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation and management. (R4) On top of the work done by the GMO in this area, quality assurance of externally funded research is done through the following mechanisms in MUST: • Semester report on research progress and results by graduate students at Department level and to the Directorate of Research and Graduate Training; • Monthly review meetings between the project implementation teams and DRGT staff; • Peer review by colleagues at Department and Faculty level for staff members; • Peer review by (international) partners, often related to the publication of research results in (international) journals for staff members .	

	Quality standards for service delivery vary according to the activity in question. (P2) • For research, it is MUST's Research Ethics Committee that sets the standard, using a set of criteria linked to research ethics and scientific method. • In the absence of community engagement policy, quality standards for community engagement have remained largely implicit. • For consultancy, no quality standards have been established yet. This is probably because most consultancies by MUST staff are done individually. We have found no indication that these quality standards were in any way communicated to involved stakeholders nor to the public at large. Nonetheless, from the feedback from different stakeholders, we can conclude that service delivery to community, especially through outreach/field attachment is generally of good quality and highly appreciated. (P3-R5)
Conclusion	
Externally funded projects are administratively managed by the Grants Management Office while the content is management at Departmental and Faculty level. While quality assurance processes can be further improved, project implementation and community service delivery seem to be appreciated by the partners and stakeholders involved. Quality standards are, to some extent, in place for research and community engagement while no standards exist for consultancy. We have found no indication that these quality standards were in any way communicated to involved stakeholders nor to the public at large. Nonetheless, from the feedback by different stakeholders, we can conclude that service delivery is generally of good quality.	

3.5 Capability to adapt and self-renew

3.5.1 Effective management in shifting contexts

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	4	*Selected maturity level*	2+
Justification of selected maturity level The University Council and other organs have progressively initiated and adapted new changes and contexts. For instance recently, there are some processes that have been		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* Given that MUST's senior management has had to manage a number of (complex) change processes in the past, we may assume that it has some understanding of shifting contexts. A few examples of such change processes are provided below. • The implementation of financial deconcentration, including the use of IFMS.	

internally generated such as; the recent University charter and revised management structure. The University however strongly follows the established government structures such as Universities and Other Institutions Act (UOTIA), Public Procurement and Disposal of Assets (PPDA) Act, the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) Quality Assurance frameworks among others which help the University to manage changes. Adaptation to major management changes ought to be improved for greater outputs.	• The introduction of AIMS for digital management of student admissions and payments. • The move to a new campus without any additional resources. (P1-P2) However, the change management approach used in MUST is rather weak. Some (but insufficient) resources have been invested in staff training ("knowledge" in change management jargon) while other dimensions of change management, such as awareness, desire and ability, have been almost completely neglected. Staff members identified internal communication (and change communication for that matter) as one of the most important weaknesses of senior management. This weakness seems to be one of the main causes of serious conflicts between staff and senior management in the recent past. (P3) The capacity to assess trends and changes to inform and manage changes and adaptation still needs to be strengthened in MUST. Management is insufficiently able to predict major changes and proactively take measures to avoid or mitigate impending risks. MUST currently doesn't have a structured approach to risk assessment (e.g. risk matrix) which significantly hampers effective risk management. (P4-R5)
Conclusion	
MUST has limited expertise in predicting and managing change, even though the university has undergone a number of important changes in recent years. The university could benefit from incorporating recent thinking on change management, which focusses a lot on change communication to complement work on more traditional aspects of change such as training. The capacity to assess trends and changes to inform and manage changes and adaptation still needs to be strengthened at MUST.	

3.5.2 The university is continuously adapting and renewing

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	4+	*Selected maturity level*	3
Justification of selected maturity level The University has levels of hierarchy that facilitate adaptation of changes. Furthermore, there is a well-grounded experience to continuously adapt and manage changes. This is manifested in the decisions taken at both management and governance levels. The University has given a		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* As mentioned in §3.1.3, the key functions in the organogram of MUST are described in the Universities and other Tertiary Institutions Act; which means they are quite static. It is important to note that, given the lower than initially foreseen staffing levels (about 17-30% of establishment filled – see above) the organogram seems a bit top-heavy with a relatively high number of managerial functions, compared to the number of staff members being managed by them. In addition, MUST takes a participatory approach to decision-	

priority and incentive to innovation, creativity and change through the establishment of the Centre for Innovation and Technology Transfer (CITT). There is also a Human Resource training plan and staff development committee that periodically promotes staff training and learning. Partially, some University faculties have informed their curricula development and reviews by the generated research findings. There is also easy accommodation of research requests. The level of research uptake ought to be improved.	making whereby many/most decisions are made by committees and not by individuals. This situation can be a constraint to adopt changes quickly within the university. (P1) MUST currently doesn't have a systematic approach for generating, collecting and integrating feedback from internal and external stakeholders. Feedback on the quality of education is rarely collected and it is unclear to what extent any received feedback actually leads to organizational learning and change. (P2) For dissemination activities, most reports prepared by student-implementers contain a lessons-learned section with very practical suggestions for improvement. But again, it is unclear whether and to what extent these and similar recommendations were translated into action afterwards. At MUST, the focus of staff and management is more on compliance then on organizational innovation; this may be linked to its characteristics as a public organization. That said, the examples cited on community outreach show that innovation within existing organizational boundaries is possible and practiced. The same can be said when looking at the work of the Centre for Innovation and Technology Transfer which, among other things, is providing seed money to staff or students on a competitive basis to develop innovative projects. (P3) However, except in the last example, innovation remains more the result of individual initiatives rather than of an institutional approach. Existing incentive systems, related to the appraisal system, focus mostly on (international) publication, supervision of graduate students and community outreach; but there are no institutional incentives for innovation, creativity and change as such. The balance, therefore, tends to tilt towards stability, with insufficient institutional support for organizational innovation. (R7) MUST doesn't have a training protocol nor a comprehensive HR development plan. Moreover, the general absence of real funding for professional development, with an annual budget for staff training of around 16,700 euros for the entire university (FY2019/20), doesn't encourage learning and exchange. (P4) The existing system for curriculum review in MUST is already described in detail in §3.2.1 above. There, it was explained that curriculum review is currently done in two ways: • For development of new programs and re-accreditation of existing ones, there is a mandatory review of the curricula every five years as required by the NCHE. • Within this five-year period, lecturers are authorized to adapt up to 20% of the existing curriculum annually to include new developments in their field of expertise or other lessons learned, e.g. through evaluations by students. For the latter, we have no evidence of this process really taking place. As such, it's impossible to determine whether new research findings are incorporated in the curriculum annually.

	However, for the mandatory review, we were able to compare three randomly chosen samples of new and old curricula of the same programme: • A comparison between the official 2013 and 2019 curricula for Bachelor of Science in Accounting and Finance has shown that new research findings were to some extent integrated into the new curriculum. The new curriculum cited some sources published after 2013. • A comparison between the official 2013 and 2019 curricula for Bachelor of Arts in Planning and Governance (Institute of Interdisciplinary Training and Research) revealed the same. • The same conclusion can be drawn from the comparison between the old (2010) and new (2017) version of the curriculum for the Bachelor of Business Administration. Based on these samples, and on discussions on the subject with internal stakeholders, we can conclude that new research findings are to some extent incorporated in the reviewed curricula. (P5) Finally, to the extent that funding is provided, the university's policies and processes do allow to accommodate external research. Such partnerships are always formalized in MoUs; but, as mentioned above, the approval process of such MoUs (involving the Ministry at central level) often takes a couple of months. (P6)
Conclusion	
At MUST, the focus of management and staff is more on compliance than on organization innovation. Innovation in education and research is to some extent taking place in MUST but innovation of the internal organization is held back by the provisions in the existing legal framework. Nonetheless, within the existing legal framework, MUST could do significantly more to create a real feedback culture that effectively contributes to organizational and individual learning and change. MUST doesn't have a training protocol nor an explicit HR development plan. The general absence of real funding for professional development doesn't encourage learning and exchange.	

3.5.3 The university has an adequate knowledge management system

Findings of the self-assessment		Findings of external assessment	
Selected maturity level	3	*Selected maturity level*	3
Justification of selected maturity level The University has a functional website (www.must.ac.ug) where vital information and		*Justification of selected maturity level - Description of the existing situation* A knowledge management system exists in MUST, but it is hardly digitized nor systemized. • Information on the functioning of the university is mainly shared in meeting, workshops or through email.	

updates are shared with MUST community and her stakeholders. As a way of management and disseminating knowledge, the University has a culture of organizing an Annual Research Dissemination Conference that attracts and disseminates a wide base of knowledge to staff, students and other stakeholders. Such knowledge has however not been efficiently utilised at both institutional, community and policy level. MUST lacks an active knowledge management system and repository to facilitate the sharing of knowledge and informing organizational learning.	• Physical documents (e.g. research, policies) are stored at Faculty and Departmental level but are only accessible to staff members who know where to look for them. The focus for knowledge exchange clearly lies at Departmental and Faculty level, with knowledge exchange between Faculties only happening sporadically or through personal initiatives of individuals. (P1-P2) The university currently doesn't have a functioning repository system to capture, document and disseminate knowledge for organizational learning though it is noted that such a repository is under development. Knowledge generated through the evaluation of daily work (e.g. community outreach, education, research) is kept in the Faculty and, at best, used to improve the internal functioning at that level but even then, this process is not documented. However, this knowledge is not shared with other parts of the university to inform organization-wide improvements there. (P3) As mentioned before, no traces were found of a systematic approach to organizational learning, starting with systematic feedback collection and dissemination and ending with informed changes in daily operations. However, throughout this report, a number of innovations were highlighted, pointing towards existing practices of learning and adaptation. Albeit, these innovations seem to be more the product of individual initiatives (involving continuous learning and improvements) than of a systematic approach supported and promoted by the university. (R4-R5)
Conclusion	
MUST currently doesn't have digital systems for knowledge management. Most knowledge management is done in an analogue way, at the level of the Departments and the Faculties. A university-wide systematic approach to organizational learning, starting with systematic feedback collection and dissemination and ending with informed changes in daily practices is currently still lacking at MUST.	

4. Assessment of the match of the university with the IUC concept

Expected characteristics	Observations
4.1 Institutional characteristics	
Track record or potential of playing a role as driver for change in its surrounding environment, national sub-region and country.	The positive results of MUST in the area of community outreach, especially at the local level, make this university a good candidate for the IUC programme.
Partner institutions are expected to pursue an active policy of cultural, ethnic, social and philosophical non-discrimination.	MUST currently has two major non-discrimination policies: • The Gender policy emphasizes the importance of non-discrimination based on gender. However, despite this policy, over the last 3 years (2017-2020), the proportion of female staff in MUST has remained stable at around 34%. This is probably due to the current ban on new recruitments, imposed by the Government of Uganda and the very limited turnover at MUST. It's important to note that MUST has been consistently performing very well in annual External Assessments, conducted by the Uganda's Equal Opportunities Commission, on gender and equity requirements imposed by the central Government. • The Disability and Special Needs Policy does the same for people with a disability. Probably at least partly because of this policy, all new buildings of MUST are accessible for people living with a disability.
Preference is given to those universities that are active in south-south networking such that possible outputs and results may be spread and/or shared with a wider group of institutions in the partner country or in the Global South.	As mentioned in §3.3.2, MUST is involved in south-south partnerships with Ugandan and other African universities. MUST also interacts with other actors such as civil servants, private sector actors and members of civil society, mainly in the context of its community engagement activities.
4.2 A basic institutional capacity is required *VLIR-UOS is not a funding agency. Therefore, an IUC partner programme based on academic collaboration, does not cater for: (a) major investments in terms of facilities and infrastructure, (b) institutional funding (salaries or other recurrent costs), and (c) basic institutional functioning.*	
An IUC partner university is expected to be able to function adequately at all levels and be able to direct its own institutional destiny in a coherent manner. This assumes an adequate level of institutional planning and management, and an institutional environment that is transparent.	Although strategic planning and management can still be improved in MUST, the foundations are in place to build upon in the coming years. Also, senior management seems committed to further improve and professionalize management of MUST. The results of the self-assessment show an adequate level of insight in own strengths and weaknesses which is a crucial element for moving forward.

Expected characteristics	Observations
A sufficient exposure to research as well as the availability of trained human resources: there is need for institutional stability, and a minimum of own financial means.	MUST has a number of issues in this area. Investments in the training of staff members are low and should be increased. The budget of the university is quite low as well, which has a negative impact on the university's capacity to invest in its further development. Research in MUST is being conducted at an acceptable level.
A readiness to engage in a process of change management.	The willingness to engage in change management is clearly present. At this moment, MUST is already involved in a number of change processes such as the introduction of bottom-up annual planning or the opening of the new campus. Most internal stakeholders are aware of the opportunities to further improve MUST's functioning and performance. However, their capacity requires further strengthening in order to implement future change processes in the most adequate way.
An IUC partner university is expected to have or work on a gender policy, as well as an integrity policy.	MUST already has a gender policy. There is no specific integrity policy but elements of such a policy are included in existing policies (e.g. HR Policy). Moreover, integrity measures and corruption mitigation processes are also included in financial management and procurement management processes and procedures.
English is the IUC working language. Consequently, potential IUC partner universities will be required to demonstrate a sufficient ability to use English as a working language. However, at the level of local programme implementation, other languages can be used (e.g. French in DR Congo, Spanish in Latin America, …).	The entire Institutional Assessment was done in English and MUST students, staff and management have demonstrated a very high mastery of that language.
4.3 Institutional characteristics *Irrespective of size and development stage, a fixed annual budget is availed to IUC partner universities through the VLIR-UOS IUC programme. At the same time a situation of over-funding (risk of over-dependence) or under-funding (no impact) has to be avoided.*	
'Reasonable but meaningful': Preference to collaboration with partner universities whereby VLIR-UOS is one of the more important donors ensuring impact and a genuine institutional dialogue, but where on the other hand funding is not disproportionate with the absorption capacity and thus where the IUC funding will not create a single donor-dependency that could jeopardize sustainability.	MUST currently has 78 ongoing externally funded projects with a total budget ranging between 3,000 and 2,800,000 euros. The average annual budget of these projects combined is about 4,000,000 euros. With an annual budget of 600,000 euro, the VLIR-UOS IUC would become one of the biggest annual contributors. With a total budget of 3,000,000 euros over a 5-year time period, the IUC would also be the largest externally funded project.
4.4 History of cooperation	

Expected characteristics	Observations
Preference might be given to a partnership that could build up on existing links with one or more Flemish universities and university colleges, but only if it adds on to the quality of the proposal.	MUST already has a history of working with a number of Flemish universities. Currently, the university has ongoing research projects with KU-Leuven, VUB, Antwerp University and Ghent University.
4.4 Partnership and ownership	
In order to achieve institutional impact at level of a partner programme should be sufficiently broad based and provide multi-disciplinary opportunities, i.e. not be limited to one department or be very discipline specific. IUC partner programmes have a need for and generate interdisciplinary co-operation. At the level of the selected partner universities this could imply a preference for so-called 'complete' universities. However, exceptions can occur (e.g. in countries where universities are organised by discipline) taking into account the extent to which the concerned partner university is meeting other criteria or considerations.	As explained more in detail in §5 below, the proposed partner programme looks more like a multi-dimensional research programme than an Institutional support programme. The proposal in itself is sufficiently large, tackling 6 research areas, seemingly situated in different faculties.

Conclusion on the match with the IUC-concept

Overall, MUST's profile seems a good match with the IUC-concept. The university is already quite active at community level and delivers clear societal value through education and research. MUST has a well-established network with, among its partners, a number of African and Flemish universities. Through its partnerships, the university was able to secure an important amount of external funding. Given the relatively low amount of each externally funded project, the IUC programme would become the biggest intervention in MUST. This would definitely secure a high level of influence in the university without necessarily creating an unhealthy level of dependence, given the high number of other external funders.

The only real area of concerns for the IA team, at the institutional level, are the limited budget of the university and the challenges in terms of internal communication. We also feel that MUST's IUC proposal should be geared more towards the areas of concern flagged in this report (see below). At this moment, the proposal doesn't seem to express a real desire to improve the internal functioning of the university.

For Flemish universities and university colleges, partnering with MUST presents them with the opportunity to contribute directly to community relevant research in Western Uganda. MUST is a university with a rich history and a good reputation, testimony of which are the numerous partnerships with other national and international universities. Especially in the areas of applied science and Medicine, there is an opportunity to contribute to innovative research that could benefit local communities in Uganda and Africa.

5. Relevance and potential of the proposed IUC programme

What is the match between the university's actual capacities and strategic views and the proposed IUC programme?
Based on the IA, does the proposed programme demonstrate relevance and potential in the choice of domains of change?

In the initial concept note, MUST has identified the following overarching IUC outcome: "**To strengthen MUST's community outreach programme for sustainable demographic dividends in South Western Uganda communities.** This outcome is to be achieved through specific project outcomes in six priority thematic areas of focus:

1. Improved conservation practices of the environment and natural resources
2. Reduced effects of climate change and increased adaptation mechanisms for increased food production and sustainable agricultural livelihoods
3. Increased access and utilisation of affordable energy technologies
4. Improved gender relations and reproductive health to reduce maternal and infant mortality and morbidity
5. Increased youth employability through skilling, innovations, experiential learning and technology transfer
6. Improved community information access and uptake

From an analysis of the initial concept note, it would seem that MUST management mainly sees the envisaged IUC programme as a large-scale research programme in these areas. Such a programme would certainly have some positive effects on the current functioning of the university but would mostly operate from a business-as-usual perspective. The other crucial dimension of an IUC programme, which is to contribute to a change process within the university leading to improved performance in a number of institutional domains, seems to be somewhat underdeveloped.

The two main areas of capacity strengthening touched upon in the concept note (ICT infrastructure and support to PhD, MA and post-doctoral programmes) are relevant as such. However, the concept note doesn't really target MUST's major institutional and organizational challenges flagged in this report. Such key challenges to address are:

- Organizational knowledge management linked to organizational learning, establishing a system that links systematic feedback collection and sharing to organizational learning across the university.
- Internal and external communication, to support the intended internal change processes and to improve overall visibility of MUST and the work it does for community development. In this area, the focus should be on harmonizing all activities related to communication that are now scattered across offices and functions.
- Staff development beyond the obtention of formal degrees.

And, a lesser extent:

- To increase strategic alignment between the university's strategic plan, the strategic plans of the faculties and the annual workplans at these levels.
- To improve the overall performance of the university, in areas such as student administration, procurement, review of curricula and performance management.

6. Overall conclusions

The IA process was smooth and well-organised: scheduling of meetings was done as agreed by the local IUC coordinator and all requested documents were provided in a timely manner. The self-assessment report was also received in time. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the local IUC coordinator was very accessible throughout the external assessment exercise, notwithstanding his already high workload as.

Both MUST and the external assessment team appreciated the institutional assessment process as a positive joint learning experience. For MUST, there was real value in the self-assessment process because it opened up internal discussions on the performance of the university and allowed members of the self-assessment team to better understand the functioning of the university as a whole. Also, the fact that the external assessment largely confirmed the findings of the self-assessment was a source of pride and a motivation to continue using this tool in the future.

For the external assessors it was interesting to notice the level of self-awareness present in the university, as reflected in the level of correspondence between the external assessment and the self-assessment. Also, the provided transparency on existing weaknesses and issues is to be commended and is, to the assessment team, a strong basis on which to build a future partnership.

Overall, MUST's profile seems a good match with the IUC-concept. The only real area of concerns for the IA team, are the limited budget of the university and the challenges in terms of internal communication. Other weaknesses do exist in the university, as is clear from this report, but the IA team witnessed the willingness to address these issues. However, we do feel that the IUC proposal could be geared more towards the areas of concern flagged in this report (see chapter 5) instead of focussing almost entirely on research improvements and treating capacity strengthening as an accessory to this objective.

For Flemish universities and university colleges, partnering with MUST presents them with the opportunity to contribute directly to community relevant research in Western Uganda. MUST is a university with a rich history and a good reputation, testimony of which are the numerous partnerships with other national and international universities. Especially in the areas of applied science and Medicine, there is an opportunity to contribute to innovative research that could benefit local communities in Uganda and Africa.

7. Annexures

7.1 Checklist collection of additional data and documentation

Name of the university	MUST
Status – date:	**20 / 03 / 2020**

Data	**Available**	**Partially available**	**Not available**	**Where to find** (institutional factsheet, self-assessment report, other,)
Overview of all educational programmes	X			Website MUST https://www.must.ac.ug
Number of students enrolled for each educational programme and for each level (Bachelor, master, PhD)	X			Annexe §7.2
Employment data of graduates			X	No tracer studies conducted
Overview of academic research production per relevant unit (faculty, department, other)	X			Available in the university
Overview of recent external funding	X			Annexe 7.5
Data on e-learning use, use of libraries, IT support systems, etc.			X	
Total annual budget	X			Institutional factsheet
% of annual budget government funded	X			Institutional factsheet
% of annual budget from tuition fees	X			Institutional factsheet
Total number of staff (M/F[2])	X			Institutional factsheet
Total number of academic staff (M/F)	X			Institutional factsheet
Number of Master degree holders in academic staff (M/F)	X			Institutional factsheet

[2] MF: please disaggregate data (numbers) by gender (males / females)

Data	Available	Partially available	Not available	Where to find (institutional factsheet, self-assessment report, other,)
Number of PhD holders in academic staff (M/F)	X			Institutional factsheet
Teaching load (percentage of time of academic staff spent on teaching)	X			Institutional factsheet
Academic staff / student ratio	X			Institutional factsheet

7.2 Overview of key additional data collected

Data field	Data	Comments (if any)
Total number of students enrolled	5,015	
• Bachelor - female	1,322	
• Bachelor - male	2,158	
• Master - female	478	
• Master - male	1025	
• PhD - female	13	
• PhD - male	19	
% of graduates employed within 12 months after graduation	/	Data unavailable
% of graduates employed within 24 months after graduation	/	Data unavailable
Total annual budget	UGX 68,824,325,920	Total budget including grants
% of annual budget government funded	55%	
% of annual budget from tuition fees	21%	
% of annual budget from external funding	24%	
Total number of staff	540	
• # female staff	162	
• # male staff	378	
Total number of academic staff	261	
• # female academic staff	69	

Data field	Data	Comments (if any)
• # male academic staff	192	
Number of Master degree holders in academic staff	179	
• # female of Master degree holders in academic staff	54	
• # male of Master degree holders in academic staff	125	
Number of PhD holders in academic staff	75	
• # female of PhD holders in academic staff	19	
• # male of PhD holders in academic staff	56	
Teaching load (percentage of time of academic staff spent on teaching)	70%	
Academic staff / student ratio	1:18	

7.3 Overview of internal and external stakeholders met by the external assessment team

Date	Type of meeting	Persons interviewed	Position/Unit
12/03/2020	Courtesy calls	Prof. Nixon Kamukama	Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
		Prof. Charles Tushabomwe Kazooba	Deputy Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration
		Martha Kyoshaba Twinamasiko	Academic Registar
	Self-Assessment Team	Prof. Lejju Julius	Dean, Faculty of Science
		Fred Kaggwa	Deputy Chair Quality Assurance – Faculty of Computing and Informatics
		Amos Baryashaba	Head, CSU
		Bainempaka Florence	Lecturer, Nursing
		Atwine Fortunate	Lecturer, Nursing
		Nyonzima Vallence	Lecturer, Nursing

		Mwavu Rogers	Ass Lecturer, Faculty of Computing and Informatics
		Asaph K, Katarangi	Deputy Dean, Faculty of Business and Management Sciences
		Nabachwa Sarah	Lecturer, Faculty of Business and Management Sciences
		Johnes Obungoloch	Lecturer
		Medard Twinamatsiko	Lecturer
		Oloro Joseph	Lecturer
		Sr. Jane Yatuha	Sen. Lecturer
		Catherine Atuhaire	Lecturer
		Prof. Grace Kagoro	Assoc. Prof. Faculty of Medicine
		Penlope Yaguma	Ass. Lecturer
		Cleophus Kasoma	Sen. Lecturer
		Prof. Grace Birungi	Assoc. Professor
		Wasswa William	Ass. Lecturer
		Sheila Ninye Twinamatsiko	International Relations Officer
12/03/2020	Kick-off meeting	Denis Tumuramye	CBE Facilitator
		Gad Ruzaaze	COBERS
		Prof. Grace Birungi	Assoc. Professor
		Dr. Emmanuel Ntambi	Sen. Lecturer
		Atwine Fortunate	Lecturer
		Imelda Kemeza	Lecturer
		Prof. Grace Kagoro	Assoc. Prof. Faculty of Medicine
		Dr. Fred Kaggwa	Deputy Chair, Quality Assurance Committee
		Kimera Richard	Faculty of Computing and Informatics
		Mwavu Rogers	Ass Lecurer
		Dr. Johnes Obungoloch	Lecturer
		Tom Ogwang	Lecurer
		Kasifa Namyalo	Lecturer
		Prof. Charles Tushabomwe-Kazooba	Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Finance & Administration

		Sheila Ninye Twinamatsiko	International Relations Officer
		Medard Twinamatsiko	Lecturer
12/03/2020	Individual Interviews	Dr. Nsambu Kijambu Fredrick	Dean, Faculty of Business and Management Sciences
		Prof. Lejju Julius	Dean, Faculty of Science
13/03/2020	Individual Interviews	Dr. Viola Nilah Nyakato	Dean, Faculty of Interdisciplinary Sciences
		Dr. Johnes Obungoloch	Deputy Dean, Faculty of Applied Sciences
		Dr. Fred Kaggwa	Deputy Chair, Quality Assurance Committee
		Felix Magyezi	Internal Auditor
		Vincent Kwatampora	Procurement Officer
	External Stakeholder	Robert Kacherezi	Mayor, Mbarara Municipality
	Council Members	Dr. Nicholas Kamara	Vice-Chairperson, University Council and representative of Convocation
		Dr. Warren Namara	Chairperson, University Council
	Research and Ethics Committee (REC)	Gladys Nakalema	Secretary, REC
		Dickson Muhumuza	Administrative Assistant, REC
		Prof. Grace Kagoro	Member of REC
	Individual Interviews	Felix Magyezi	Internal Auditor
		Vincent Kwatampora	Procurement Officer
16/03/2020	Individual Interviews	Dr. Nabaasa Evarist	Dean, Faculty of Computing and Informatics
		Richard kimera	Lecturer, Faculty of Computing and Informatics
	Focus Group Discussion with Academic Staff (Junior)	Tumuhimbise Manasseh	Lecturer, Faculty of Business & Management Sciences
		Assasira Justus	Lecturer, Faculty of Interdisciplinary Sciences
		Tumusiime Julius	Teaching Assistant, Faculty of Science
		Nakazibwe Immaculate	Teaching Assistant, Faculty of Science
		Kamuganga Francis	Teaching Assistant, Faculty of Computing & Informatics

		Bulondo Fredrick	Faculty of Applied Sciences & ……..
		Magara irene	Assistant Lecturer, Faculty of Applied Sciences & ……
		Wanambwa Siraji	Assistant Lecturer, Faculty of Applied Sciences & ……
	Focus Group Discussion with Academic Staff (Senior)	Dr. Casim Umba Tolo	Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Science
		Dr. Johnes Obungoloch	Deputy Dean, Faculty of Applied Sciences
		Dr. Ronald Twangyirwe	Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Interdisciplinary Sciences
		Dr, Simon Kawuma	Lecturer, Faculty of Computing & Informatics
		Dr. Charles Muchenguzi	Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies
		Dr. Simon Peter Rugera	Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Medicine
		Dr. Grace Kagoro	Assoc. Prof., Faculty of Medicine
		Dr. Imelda Kemeza	Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Science
	Focus Group Discussion with Students	Ampwera Collins	Bachelor of Accounting
		Asiphas Owarangamise	Masters of Medicine (Obstetrics/Gynecology
		Kiiza Patricia Justine	MBA-Accounting and Finance
		Natuhwera Innocent	Bachelor of Business Studies
		Natukunda Faith	PhD Biomedical Engineering
		Mukasa Fazil, B.	Masters of Planning and Governance
		Mugabi Faith	Development Studies
		Tusiime Baingana Faith	Bachelor of Biomedical Engineering
		Raphael Wungarwe	PhD Science
		Kirabo Mercy	Bachelor of Science/ Education
		Seruwo Adrian	Bachelor of Science/ Education
		Mugumya Athur	Bachelor of Electrical Engineering
		Safari Yonasi	PhD Computing
		Ndyamuhaki Lynettee	BSAL
16/03/2020	Individual Interviews	Dr. Gertrude N. Kiwanuka	Dean, Faculty of Medicine

		Jerome Kabakyenga	Director, Institute of Meternal Newborn and Child Health
17/03/2020	Bugoye Health Centre III	Jimmy Muzigiti	In-Charge, Bugoye Health Centre III
		Biira Yolecy	Lab Technician, Bugoye Health Centre III
		Nyangoma Grace	Maternal and Child Health Project
	MUST Staff at Bugoye Health Centre III	Dr. Moses Ntaro	Faculty of Medicine
		Prof. Edgar Mulogo	Faculty of Medicine
	Bugoye Sub-county Administration	David Nasereka	Chairperson, LCIII
		Bimenya Francis	Sub-county Chief, Bugoye Sub-county
	Representative of community beneficiary	Tinka Tadeo	Coordinator, Village Health Team (VHT), Bugoye Sub-county
18/03/2020	DRGT	Dr. Batwala Vincent	Director, DRGT
		Specioza Birungi	Deputy Academic Registrar in charge of DRGT
		Margaret Mbabazi	Grants Officer, MUST Grants Office (MGO)
		Atuheire Ann	Finance Manager, MGO
		Nuhindo Ezra	Finance Officer, MGO
		Mwesigwa Sam	IT officer, MGO
	Partners: Global Health Collaborative	Dr. Annet Kembabazi	Senior Program Manager, Global Health Collaborative, MUST
		Dr. Stephen Asiimwe	Director, Global Health Collaborative, MUST
	Partners: Hospice Africa, Uganda	Antonia Kamate Tukundane	Site Manager, Hospice Africa, Uganda - Mbarara
	Focus Group Discussion with Non-Academic Staff	Karuhanga Julius	Senior Carpenter, NUEI Treasurer
		Gyaviira Kasule	Senior Lab Technician and Chairperson, NUEI
		Bwamnale Johnson	Office Attendant and Organizing Secretary, NUEI

		Tumwesigye Francis	Laboratory Assitant, NUEI Branch Secretary
		Kemirembe Judith	Laboratory Assistant
		Ninsiima Lydia Jolly	Lab Technician and Secretary for Women, NUEI
		Sheila Niinye Twinamatsiko	International Relations Officer
		Vincent Kwatampora	Principal Procurement Officer
		Maureen Kaluma	Senior Warden & Senate representative - SAF
		Amos Baryashaba	Head, Computing Services Unit and General Secretary, SAF
		Mugumya Timothy Ndiona	Legal Office, Member - SAF
		Hellen Akello Bagyenda	Assistant Secretary, Personnel
	Individual Interviews	Melchoir K. Byaruhanga	University Secretary, MUST
		Sheila Niinye Twinamatsiko	International Relations Officer
19/03/2020	Individual Interviews	Angella Nakato Muyingo	Public Relations Officer
		Behangana Prinari	Director, Human Resources
		Wilson Adriko	Ag. Librarian
		Amos Baryashaba	Head, Computing Services Unit
		Prof. Celestino Obua	Vice-Chancellor
20/03/2020	Debriefing meeting	Beinempaka Florence	Lecturer
		Asaph Katarangi Kaburura	Lecturer
		Jerome Kabakyenga	Director, MNCHI
		Dr. Johnes Obungoloch	Lecturer (FCI)
		Kimera Richard	Lecturer (FCI)
		Fred Kaggwa	Lecturer (FCI)
		Dr. Alex Twinomuhwezi	Lercturer (FBMS)
		Dr. Grace Nambozi	Senior Lecturer, Nursing, FoM
		Dr. Cleopnas Kasoma	Senior Lecturer (FIS)
		Prinari Behangana	Director, Human Resources

		Zadock Beebwa	Deputy Secretary (A)
		Rogers Bariho	Dean (FIS)
		Gad Ruzaaza Nda-ruhutse	Faculty of Medicine, COBERS
		Tumuhimbise Manasseh	Lecturer FoBMS
		Grace Kagoro	Faculty of Science
		Robinah F. Nakakeeto	Planning
		Tom Ogwang	Lecturer, FIS
		Imelda Kemeza	Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Science
		Batwala Vincent	Director, DRGT
		Nabaasa Evarist	Faculty of Computing and Informatics
		Sheila Niinye Twinamatsiko	International Relations Officer
		Dennis Tumuramye	Faculty of Medicine, COBERS
		Dr. Joseph Ngonzi	Deputy Dean, FoM
		Mwavu Rogers	Faculty of Computing and Informatics
		Wilson Adriko	Ag. Librarian
		Prof. Julius Lejju	Dean, Faculty of Science
		Eunice A. Olet	Deputy Dean, Faculty of Science
		Prof. Charles T. Kazooba	Deputy Vice Chancellor, Finance & Ad-ministration
		Prof. Celestino Obua	Vice-Chancellor

7.4 Detailed scoring card – maturity levels per domain and aspect

Capability – Domain - Aspect	*Score*
1. Capability to achieve coherence	
Domain 1.1 There is a shared and coherent vision and strategy on university/faculty level	**3+**
P1 - The university has a clear written vision and a mission statement which are widely known.	3+
P2 - The university has a clearly written strategic plan in line with the vision and mission statement which guides work and is reviewed annually.	4
P3 - The University's strategic plan is based on a systemic analysis of the university's context, capacities and potential roles.	4
P4 - The faculties have developed a faculty-level strategy in coherence with the vision and mission statement of the university.	2
R5 - There is coherence between the mission, the strategies, resources, processes, concrete actions and results of the university.	3+
Domain 1.2. Existence of a set of simple principles which govern the university's/faculty's operations	**4**
P1 - Existence of a set of clear values shared among board/ management, staff and students of the university	3
P2 - Existence of a set of policies and processes/procedures which govern the university's operations and are widely known in the university	5
R3 - The university and faculty's operations benefit from principle-based governance.	4+
Domain 1.3. University's/faculty's governance/management structures are effective	**4**
P1 - Existence of an organigram at university/faculty level	4
P2 - Board composition and functioning: the university has a diverse and functional Board that meets quarterly (either face-to-face or virtually)	4
P3 - The university has an annual work plan linked to the strategy and budget, with measurable results, activities, timelines, responsibilities and indicators	3+
P4 - The work plan has been developed collaboratively, is monitored and informs decision-making	4
R5 - The strategic direction, support and accountability of the Board contributes to the university's performance and reputation	5
R6 - There is coherence, thus absence of conflicting visions, in the management, which contributes to the university's performance and reputation	5
R7 - The university adequately balances participatory approaches with effective decision-making	3+
2. Capability to deliver on development relevant objectives and commitments	
Domain 2.1. The university provides high quality, development relevant education	**4**
P1 - The university has adequate systems for curriculum development with due attention for learning outcomes and quality	4
P2 - The university has clear quality assurance standards for teaching which are adhered to	4
P3 - The university makes clear efforts to evaluate curricula in terms of labour-market needs and relevance	4
P4 - The university has adequate systems for adapting curricula, teaching and learning methods to maximise developmental relevance of provided education	4
R5 - The university's educational programmes are accredited	2+
R6 - The education provided by the university is perceived by key stakeholders to be of high quality and relevant for development	5

Capability – Domain - Aspect	*Score*
Domain 2.2 The university is a multidisciplinary institution that produces cost-effective significant amounts of high-quality research	**3+**
P1 - Academic staff have the time, capacity and incentives to conduct research	2+
P2 - The university organises academic conferences and seminars and/or is sufficiently represented at external conferences and seminars.	2
P3 - University's/faculty's research is conducted in a multi-, inter or transdisciplinary approach	4
P4 - The university has adequate systems to prioritise research projects based on their potential to generate added societal and developmental value	2+
P5 - The university has adequate systems to assure cost-effectiveness of its research	1
R6 - The university has produced an adequate number of high-quality and appreciated academic publications.	4+
R7 - The research conducted by the university provides cost-effective research outcomes that are relevant for development.	4
R8 - The university has and uses a number of flagship research centers	4
Domain 2.3 The university is perceived as a real actor and driver of Change	**4+**
P1 - Academic staff have the time, capacity and incentives to disseminate results of their research	2+
P2 - The university actively contributes to public policy debates (local, district, national and/or international level)	3
P3 - The university's research and education processes facilitate the emergence of innovative solutions (relevant for communities, private sector, etc.)	5
P4 - The university supports the dissemination of new ideas, concepts and research results (by setting up processes, extension service, by incl. it in staff performance reviews, etc.)	4
R5 - Research results are used by external stakeholders (incl. spin-offs)	4
R6 - Innovative solutions that emerge from the university are adopted and used by relevant stakeholders (uptake)	5
R7 - The university is effective in contributing to public policy changes (e.g. in higher education, public health, etc.)	3+
R8 - The university's research and education generates clear added societal value	5
3. Capability to relate to external stakeholders	
Domain 3.1. The university creates the condition for effective network development and is aware of the importance of formal institutional alliances	**3**
P1 - An external communication strategy exists and is used to communicate effectively with key stakeholders (government, community, private sector, funders, …)	3
P2 - The university invests in communication capacity at individual and organisational level	2
P3 – The university creates the conditions for effective partnerships in its vision and strategy. The board and management is able to balance individual incentives with organisational performance	3
P4 - The university has a strategy to network and relate to other relevant stakeholders (incl. on extension services to external stakeholders (extension workers, TTO, communication, etc.); on advisory and/or consultancy services to external stakeholders; on (inter-institutional) networks)	3+
P5 - The university allocates adequate resources for networking	3
R6 - The university is knowledgeable about and adequately uses the strategies and work of other organizations; consults and collaborates with partners when planning/ implementing	3+
Domain 3.2. The university has a vast network which is actively used	**4**
P1 - Networking activities are of good quality (e.g. frequency & depth of contacts)	2+
P2 - Habit of networking is adopted by academic staff of the university	3

Capability – Domain - Aspect	*Score*
P3 - The university systematically involves external stakeholders when curricula or courses are developed	5
P4 - The university possesses adequately trained personnel to do networking and communication	1+
R5 - The university has extensive and effective networks with a) Private stakeholders b) Bi- and multilateral donors, foundations, etc. c) Political stakeholders d) Actors within civil society e) Policy makers f) Alumni g) Universities/faculties and training institutes/research institutions in different countries h) Other relevant stakeholders in private/public sector i) Employers (to know their needs)	4
R6 - The university uses its network to provide extension services (as intermediary), advisory and/or consultancy services	5
R7 - The university is well known and viewed as a constructive and empowering presence by the community	5
Domain 3.3 The university obtains additional project funding	**4+**
P1 - The university has strategies for internationalisation, understands the local and international funding environment and has a resource mobilization strategy	4
P2 - The university staff are adequately supported in raising and managing external funds (proposal writing, grant management, etc.)	3+
P3 - The university actively monitors externally funded projects (both administratively and content-wise)	5
R4 - The university successfully raises significant and diverse external funds on a regular basis	5
R5 - The university delivers on the results agreed upon in the funding agreements	5
4. Capability to act and commit	
Domain 4.1. The university is able to make and implement decisions	**3+**
P1 - Delegation of responsibilities: persons with a hierarchic role are empowered to make decisions and are able to implement decisions in time.	3
P2 - The university has effective systems, structures and processes (with a proper legal basis) to engage and commit in a timely manner	3+
R3 - The leadership of the university is effective in timely and appropriate decision-making	4
Domain 4.2. The university has adequate and well managed Human Resources	**3**
P1 - The university's hiring process is inclusive across gender, race and religion	4
P2 - The university possesses enough adequately trained personnel for conducting educational programmes (BA, MA and PhD) using state-of the-art pedagogic approaches	3+
P3 - The university possesses enough adequately trained personnel for doing state-of-the-art research.	3+
P4 - Further training for local staff to strengthen competencies in terms of education and research are available (incl. proposal writing, research management, curriculum development, laboratory maintenance, etc.)	2
P5 - There is sufficient administrative staff in relation to university's needs	3
P6 - The university has a clear, transparent system for staff development, staff promotion, mobility, performance reviews, etc.	4
P7 - The university has mechanisms for conflict resolution, complaint management, etc.	4
R8 - There is a relative gender balance at all levels of the university	2
R9 - The university succeeds in attracting and retaining motivated and skilled staff	4
Domain 4.3 The university has an adequate infrastructure	**3**
P1 - Availability of flexible research funds (e.g. for setting up small experiments)	1
R2 - The university has well performing ICT systems and services (e.g. access to internet for its staff and students, IT systems support for the core processes of the university - (e.g. student administration, library services, etc.) - functional distance education systems).	3

Capability – Domain - Aspect	*Score*
R3 - Technological facilities are available to staff and students (e.g. technology to collect data, data analysis, libraries, specialised software, communication platform, intranet, etc,)	3
R4 - Availability of adequate and accessible space (classrooms, labs, etc.) to conduct research and deliver classes	3
R5 - The laboratories at the university are adequate to conduct state-of-the art research	4
R6 - Infrastructure and equipment is adequate with regard to staff's technical expertise	3
Domain 4.4 The university has adequate and well managed financial resources	**4+ 2**
P1 - The university has performant, smooth financial management systems, with sufficient checks and balances	4+
R2 - Availability of adequate financial resources at department /faculty level and at university level	2
R3 - The university is appreciated for its management of external funding	3+
R4 - The university is financially compliant to statutory and legal regulation	5
Domain 4.5. The university has effective systems and processes for administration; and procurement and logistics	**3+**
P1 - The university has effective administrative systems, structures and processes	3+
P2 – The university has effective systems, structures and processes for procurement and logistics	4
R3 – The administration of the university is adequate with regard to its mission and strategy	3+
R4 – The university effectively organises procurement and logistics	4
Domain 4.6 The university has effective systems and processes for project management and quality assurance	**4**
P1 - The university has adequate systems, structures and processes for project management	4
P2 - Clear quality standards and expectations are formulated for service delivery	2+
P3 - Quality standards and quality performance are communicated to the stakeholders involved and to the public at large	3
R4 - The university ensures the efficient use of its resources to maximize the achievement of its outputs and results	5
R5 - The internal and external service delivery of the university is of high quality	5
5. Capability to adapt and self-renew	
Domain 5.1. effective management in shifting contexts	**2+**
P1 - The management has an understanding of shifting contexts.	4
P2 - The management has experience in adapting to changed contexts	3
P3 - The management has experience in facilitating change	3
P4 - The university and the faculties have developed scenarios for risk mitigation and insuring resilience in case of major setbacks	1
R5 - The university adequately assesses trends or changes and effectively anticipates or adapts to major changes.	3
Domain 5.2. The university is continuously adapting and renewing	**3**
P1 - The university has limited levels of hierarchy (too many levels of hierarchy as a possible constraint to adopt changes quickly)	3+
P2 - The university has a healthy feedback culture which allows to learn out of past mistakes and successes.	3+
P3 - The university has an incentive system which fosters innovation, creativity and change	1
P4 - The university has a training protocol and a HR development plan which encourages learning and exchange.	2

Capability – Domain - Aspect	*Score*
P5 - The university has adequate processes in place to incorporate new research findings on a continuous basis into curricula or courses.	4
P6 - The university's research processes allows easy accommodation of external research requests.	4
R7 - The university effectively balances stability with innovation and renewal	2+
Domain 5.3 The university has an adequate knowledge management system	**3**
P1 - The university has an active knowledge management system to learn from past mistakes and successes	2
P2 - Knowledge exchange is valued and a range of appropriate mechanisms exist and are used for knowledge exchange	3
P3 - The university has a repository and system to capture, document, and disseminate knowledge for program improvement, organizational learning and sharing with external stakeholders (shared folders, library and publication outlets-print, electronic or face-to- face- workshops, seminars etc.).	1+
R4 - Staff generate, learn, share, and use relevant knowledge for the benefit of individuals, units and the organization.	3+
R5 - Evaluation contributes to organizational learning: Programs are evaluated and evaluation findings are discussed, disseminated and inform organizational learning	4

7.5 Documents reviewed during the external assessment

The following documents were consulted during the external Institutional Assessment:

- Minutes of the University Council
- Minutes of the University Senate
- Minutes of the Management Committee meetings
- Minutes of the Faculty Board meetings
- All existing policies, strategies and guidelines
- List of recent publications by MUST staff
- Staffing levels for 3 years back
- Establishment of MUST
- List of current externally funded projects
- Existing legislation: Universities and other Tertiary Institutions Act
- Audit reports: Auditor General, Procurement audits, external audits by donors and internal audit.
- Data on student enrolment
- Strategic Plans of the university and of the Faculties
- Annual Workplan of the university
- Organogram of the university

7.6 Overview of recent external funding

Below, an overview is provided of all externally funded projects currently implemented at MUST.

PROJECT TITLE	PERIOD	APPROVED BUDGET	FUNDER
MNS Program at MUST	9/1/2014- 08/31/2020	USD 48,686	Paiko Foundation
Salary Support for Lecturer, MUST Nursing Program	9/1/2017- 08/31/2020	UGX 261,007,278	Paiko Foundation
Alcohol Drinkers' Exposure to Preventive Therapy for Tuberculosis	9/1/2019- 08/31/2020	USD 120,074	National Institute On Alochol Abuse And Alocholism
Augmented Infant Resuscitator	02/01/2018-01/31/2022	USD 2,000,000	Grand Challenge Canada
Bugoye Integrated Community Case Management	01/01/2015-30/06/2020	USD 350,000	Massachusetts General Hospital
Drinkers' Intervention to Preventive Tuberculosis	9/1/2019- 08/31/2020	USD 138,388	National Institute On Alochol Abuse And Alocholism
Mobile technology to extend clinic-based alcohol counseling for HIV+s in Uganda	04/01/2018-03/31/2020	USD 96,960	National Institute On Alochol Abuse And Alocholism
Gynaecology Care Initiative	11/14/2014-03/31/2021	USD 21,980	West Wind Foundation
Microenterprise to Improve Child Development in Households Exposed to HIV	04/01/2019-03/31/2020	USD 19,159	National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH)
Using i-Dress material impregnated with honey and olive oil to reduce Cesarean surgical site infection	03/31/2018-09/30/2020	USD 99,912	Grand Challenge Canada
the International Epidemiological Databases to Evaluate Aids	08/01/2019-07/31/202	USD 122,721	National Institute of Allergy And Infectious Diseases

Improved Pediatric Inpatient Morbidity and Mortality in Rural Uganda	05/01/2017-04/30/2020	USD 150,000	Izumi Foundation
Real time tuberculosis Mediction Adherence Intervention in Rural Southwestern Uganda	07/22/2016-06/30/2021	USD 494,217	Fogarty International Center
Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons exposure and dietary risk of Esophageal squamous cell carcinoma in Uganda	09/25/2017 -05/31/2022	USD 455,895	Fogarty International Center
Gender Equity, Influencers, Vulnerability and Scale up of Mama-Toto approach following interventions in South Western Uganda,	10/31/2017-10/31/2020	UGX 490,420,000	International Development Research Center
Meals For Nutrition Uganda	01/01/2020-12/31/2020	USD 174,418	International Food Policy Research Institute
Moms Helping Moms	08/15/2015-03/31/2021	USD 174,320	Massachusetts General Hospital
Mbarara University Research Ethics Education program	04/01/2018-03/31/2023	USD 1,247,786	Fogarty International Center
Mbarara University Research Training Initiative	08/28/2015-07/31/2020	USD 3,205,000	Fogarty International Center
Control of Neonatal Septisome and Hydrocephalus in sub-Saharan Africa	02/01/2015-01/31/2020	USD 284,093	Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute Of Child Health And Human Development
MUST HR for Health -Cancer Center (Adult Oncology)	09/01/2014-07/31/2020	USD 188,673	Massachusetts General Hospital
A mechanism for poor outcomes in HIV-exposed but uninfected infants	08/01/2017-07/31/2020	USD 19,261	National Institute Of Allergy And Infectious Diseases
Developing sustainable low field magnetic resonance imaging	06/01/2018-05/31/2020	USD 238,919	Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute Of Child Health And Human Development
Research aimed at developing sustainable low field magnetic resonance imaging	12/13/2017-11/30/2020	EUR 68,480	Wotro

HIV Drug Resistance Prediction Score Study	10/01/2017-07/31/2020	USD 50,061	National Institute Of Allergy And Infectious Diseases
Protecting Remote Infants by SMS	03/31/2018-09/30/2020	USD 99,903	Grand Challenge Canada
Resistance Testing Versus Adherence Support for Management of Patients with Virologic Failure on First-Line Antiretroviral Therapy in sub-Saharan Africa	07/01/2016-06/30/2021	USD 653,252	National Institute Of Allergy And Infectious Diseases
Adherence to periconception HIV risk-reduction among uninfected women in rural Uganda	11/01/2016-06/30/2020	USD 193,718	Dorris Duke Charitable Foundation
Diagnostics and Pharmacotherapy for Severe Forms of TB	2/1/2015-01/31/2020	USD 288,200	National Institute Of Allergy And Infectious Diseases
Smart discharges to improve post-discharge health outcomes in children: A prospective stepped-wedge effectiveness study	4/1/2017-03/31/2021	USD 982,553	Cich@Bc Children's Hospital
Social Networks, HIV Stigma, and the HIV Care Cascade in Rural Uganda	07/01/2017-06/30/22	USD 502,066	National Institute Of Menetal Health (NIMH)
Strengthening Peadiatric TB Services for enhanceing Early detection	11/02/2018-10/31/2021	USD 307,905	UNITAID(Innovation In Global Health)
Expanding HIV testing among Ugandan adults who utilize Traditional Healers	07/01/2017-06/30/2021	USD 110,862	National Institute Of Mental Health (NIMH)
MUST Kayanja Fellowships	08/15/2016-07/31/2021	USD 288,997	Paiko Foundation
Mbarara Akavurugye Clinical Trial	05/01/2018-04/302023	GBP 347,200	Wellcome Trust Fund
Analysis of past and projected future land use change and its impact on sediment fluxes in the Rwizi catchment”	01/01/2018-12/31/2021	USD 276,621	VLIR-UOS
An assessment of Traditional Justice and reconciliation in Uganda: Experience and lessons from West Nile, Acholi and Teso	01/01/2018-12/31/2019	EUR 44,921	VLIR-UOS

Maternal, Newborn, and Child Health Initiative Award	11/02/2017-06/30/2020	USD 10,000	Bacca Foudation
Sexual and Gender-based Violence (SGBV) against the Protracted Refugees in Nakivale Refugee Settlement, Southwestern Uganda: Addressing Gaps in Knowledge and Responses	01/01/2018-12/31/2019	EUR 69,433	VLIR-UOS
African Biomedical Engineering Mobility	2014-2021	EUR 0	Education, Audiovisual And Culture Executive Agency (EACEA)
Camtech First Miles	01/01/2018-05/30/2020	USD 216,179	Wyss Foundation
The First Mile: Powering the Academic Medical Center to Deliver Healthcare in the Community in Uganda- Capacity Building	01/01/2018-06/30/2020	USD 372,908	Wyss Foundation
Genomic research Capacity Building for Cryptococcaosis Translational Studies	06/01/2018-05/30/2020	USD 100,950	National Institute Of Health
Getting Malaria off the Back of Women and Children	03/01/2018-12/31/2020	USD 15,850	Conservation, Food, And Health Foundation
The First Mile: Powering the Academic Medical Center to Deliver Healthcare in the Community in Uganda - Nursing	07/02/2018-06/30/2020	USD 193,279	Wyss Foundation
Digital Citzen Science for community-based resilient Environmental Management	01/01/2019-12/31/2022	EUR 18,500	VLIR-UOS
Harvard University Center for AIDS Research	04/18/2018-04/30/2020	USD 64,036	Center For Aids Research (Cfar)
“Epidemiology of Coronary Artery Disease among People with HIV in Rural sub-Saharan Africa	08/01/2018-05/31/2022	USD 600,124	National Institute Of Health
Paediatric Infections Point-Of-Care: Point-of-care approach for Rapid and Easy Meningitis Diagnosis	04/01/2019-05/31/2020	USD 112,649	Swedish Research Council
Accessible measures of access: Novel tools to measure immunization coverage”	11/01/2019-04/30/2020	USD 48,450	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

“Serial killers to mosquitos: The spatial targeting of larval habitats in rural Uganda using geographic profiling	12/01/2018-11/30/2023	USD 15,174	National Institute Of Allergy And Infectious Diseases
Virologic and pharmacologic determinants of dolutegravir failure in East Africa	12/10/2018-11/30/2023	USD 135,130	National Institute Of Allergy And Infectious Diseases
Let all know	04/22/2019-10/23/2020	GBP 25,000	Wellcome Trust Fund
Adolescent family Planning in Uganda	7/2/2019-12/31/2019	EUR 3,158	VLIR-UOS
Wireless Physiologic Monitoring in Postpartum Women	09/19/2018-08/31/2023	USD 38,545	Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute Of Child Health And Human Development
Patient-centered mobile technology interventions to improve maternal health in Uganda	9/16/2018-04/30/2023	USD 541,991	Fogarty International Center
MMED Fellowship program	09/01/2018-06/30/2020	USD 187,756	Wyss Foundation
HIV Infection, Placental Inflammation,and Early Childhood Outcomes in HIV-exposed, Uninfected Infants in Uganda	01/14/2018-12/31/2023	USD 83,093	National Institute Of Allergy And Infectious Diseases
‘Unpacking Design Thinking Principles through Biomedical Engineering Student’s Innovation Cafes’	08/31/2019-07/31/2020	UGX 171,120,000	Wellcome Trust Fund
A urine tenofovir immunoassay to distinguish adherence versus resistance-based HIV treatment failure	04/16/2019-03/31/2021	USD 5,940	National Institute Of Allergy And Infectious Diseases
The Voices of the Indigenous People of Uganda	08/15/2019-08/14/2021	USD 208,000	USAID
Appraising World Health Organization Recommendations To Switch Nucleos(t)ide Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor At First-Line Virologic Failure	07/01/2019-07/01/2020	USD 19,250	Massachusetts General Hospital
Skills Acquisition and Employability through Volunteering by Displaced Youth in Uganda	6/17/2019-09/16/2022	GBP 201,241	UK Research And Innovation Global Challenges Research Fund.

Creative Network Plus: Baseline Research and Development Project	7/1/2019-04/30/2020	GBP 5,554	UK Research And Innovation Global Challenges Research Fund.
Partnership for Global Health Research Training Program	7/1/2019-06/30/2020	USD 15,120	National Institute Of Health
Research Capacity Strengthening Award	1/2/2019-12/31/2022	EUR 278,970	VLIR-UOS
The Stewardship for Acute Respiratory Illness	8/1/2019-07/31/2020	USD 17,719	Thrasher Research Fund
“Antenatal Couples' Counselling in Uganda	3/1/2020-04/30/2022	GBP 78,237	Medical Research Council(Mrc)
East African Regional Network of Excellence in Dairy Training	10/15/2019-10/31/2021	EUR 34,965	Nuffic
“Population Effectiveness of Dolutegravir Implementation in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Prospective Observational Cohort Study	8/23/2019-08/31/2022	USD 153,321	Viiv Healthcare
Exploring the ancillary systems and processes required to make point-of care HIV-1 viral load testing effective in rural western Uganda	8/2/2019-07/31/2020	USD 10,562	National Institute Of Health
Global medicine residents	7/1/2019-06/30/2020	UGX 22,007,094	Massachusetts General Hospital
Multi-omics characterization of HIV-associated changes in the gut microbiome and host mucosal immunity”	9/14/2019-08/31/2020	USD 36,628	National Institute Of Diabetes And Digestive And Kidney Diseases
Quality of Life and Aging with HIV in Rural Uganda	9/1/2019-06/30/2024	USD 465,089	National Institute Of Aging (NIA)
Making Refugee Integration Sustainable: In Search of Durable Relations with Host Populations in Uganda	01/01/2019-12/31/2022	EUR 11,000	VLIR-UOS
Piloting a Vision Centre in Rural South Western Uganda	04/01/2020-03/31/2021	EUR 45,789	Novartis Pharma
Research for Development on Provision of Technical Research Support to the Regional Development Steering Committee in the Southwestern Region of Uganda	6/10/2019-03/09/2020	USD 89,196	USAID

RECYCLED
Papier gemaakt van gerecycled materiaal
FSC® C008551
www.fsc.org

THE BELGIAN
DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION