

Promoting Access, Quality and Capacity-Building in African Higher Education

The Strategic Planning Experience at the Eduardo Mondlane University

Peter Fry and Rogério Utui

A Report of the ADEA Working Group On Higher Education

This study was commissioned and financed by the Working Group on Higher Education which is sponsored by the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA). It was also supported by substantial in-kind contributions from staff of Eduardo Mondlane University. The views and opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors and should not be attributed to ADEA, to its members or affiliated organizations, or to any individual acting on behalf of ADEA.

Published by the ADEA Working Group on Higher Education

The World Bank
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20433
U.S.A.

The Working Group on Higher Education (WGHE) was founded in 1989 to strengthen collaboration between African governments, development agencies, and higher education institutions. Its goals are to improve the effectiveness of development assistance and, more broadly, to support the revitalization of African universities. The lead agency of the WGHE is the World Bank, which works closely with the Association of African Universities (AAU) in carrying out the WGHE's activities.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Method	2
The University	2
The end of colonialism: 1962-1974	2
Independence and socialism: 1974-1989	3
<i>The Present and Perspectives for the Future</i> : 1989-1996	4
Rethinking the university: 1996-1999	7
Analysis	12
Evolution of the planning process	12
Disagreement and conflict	13
The plan in relation to government and donors	16
Conclusions and Lessons Learned	17
Participatory planning is painstaking	17
Participation occurs in different ways	17
Planning cannot be evaluated on documentary evidence alone	18
Divergence and conflict are a normal component of planning	19
Participatory planning has a positive impact	19
<i>Annex 1</i> – Persons interviewed	
<i>Annex 2</i> – Documents consulted	

Promoting Access, Quality and Capacity-Building in African Higher Education: The Strategic Planning Experience at the Eduardo Mondlane University

Peter Fry¹ and Rogério Utui²

Introduction

This Report analyzes the aspirations and accomplishments of the Eduardo Mondlane University (UEM) in Mozambique, in its efforts during the 1990s to carry out strategic institutional reforms intended to expand access to higher education, to improve the quality of university teaching and research, and to strengthen its capacities for institutional planning, program implementation, performance monitoring, and output evaluation. Planning at the Eduardo Mondlane University has passed through four major phases: the final years of Portuguese colonialism (1962-1974); the years of post-independence socialist central planning (1975-1990); the five years which saw the end of the civil war, the demise of the socialist experiment and the transition to liberal democracy and market capitalism (1990-1995); and finally the last five years which have seen the gradual adaptation of the University to the demands of more democratic and competitive society. This report concentrates on the latter two phases to which international donors have contributed extensively, albeit with mixed results.

The authors came to the undertaking with distinct perspectives. Rogério Utui is a Mozambican physicist who undertook his pre-university training at the UEM, pursued his undergraduate and master's degrees in the former Soviet Union and completed his doctorate in Sweden. He is now Assistant Professor of Physics at UEM and was a prominent member of the Commission responsible for drawing up the university's new Strategic Plan. Peter Fry, a British-born anthropologist who has lived and worked in Brazil for the past thirty years, was closely involved with the University from 1989 to 1993 when he was responsible for the Ford Foundation's program in Mozambique. Since then he has maintained continued if sporadic contact with UEM, mainly from the donors' point of view.

These two perspectives, insider versus outsider, "doer" and "donor," physicist and anthropologist, have proven, we believe, useful in helping us present the most balanced possible account of the planning process at UEM, which provoked in 1998 considerable animosity and what many have described as a serious crisis. In analyzing this process, we have tried to avoid taking sides, preferring to concentrate on discussing the diverse understandings of the present and future of the University, which the dispute reveals. Conflict is, of course, painful, but it has the analytical "advantage" of bringing otherwise latent contradictions to the fore. We will conclude, together with many of the people we have talked to, that a thorough understanding of this crisis could make a positive contribution to the future development of the University. We also share the optimism of most of our interlocutors that the planning process has been well worthwhile in promoting greater awareness of the University's problems, a wider feeling of belonging on the part of staff and students and a strong consensus on the need for reform.

¹ Nucleus for the Interdisciplinary Study of Inequality, Institute of Philosophy and Social Sciences, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

² Department of Physics, Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique.

Method

The knowledge on which this paper is based is drawn from the personal experience in Mozambique and the UEM of each of the co-authors, a reading of a series of documents produced by the university and other consultants (see bibliography), a number of structured interviews with senior university and government officials, administrative staff, faculty members, and students. Peter Fry was also able to attend a regular meeting of the Planning Commission in the Department of Geology where the implementation of the Strategic Plan was discussed. We gratefully acknowledge the generosity with which we were received and the frankness of the discussions that ensued. They reveal the depth of interest in and commitment to the institution, and the great freedom of expression that has been achieved over the past few years in the University in particular and Mozambique as a whole. We also acknowledge pertinent and generous comments on a first draft from Dr. William Saint of the World Bank; Dr. Brazão Mazula, Rector of the Eduardo Mondlane University; Dr. Lídia Brito, Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs; and Dr. Narciso Matos, Secretary General of the Association of African Universities and former Rector of the University.

There is no originality in the observation that universities, although molded by a global university culture, think about and organize themselves in relation to their local context. In the case of the UEM, it is difficult to understate this truism, given the dramatic economic, political, cultural changes that have taken place in Mozambique over the past thirty years. This period has witnessed the end of colonialism, the early socialist years of Independence, an internecine civil war, and then a peace built upon the principles of democracy and a market economy. Furthermore, we found that all of our interlocutors themselves interpret the past, the present and the future of the University in the light of their understanding of these changes. It is for this reason – no mere formality therefore – that we begin our Report with a succinct account of the recent history of Mozambique and the development of the UEM.

The University

THE END OF COLONIALISM: 1962-1974

In 1962, soon after the commencement of the African wars of independence, the Portuguese government founded the first institution of higher education in Mozambique. General University Studies of Mozambique, as it was called, began with courses in Education, Medicine, Agronomy, Forestry, Veterinary Sciences and Civil, Mining, Electrical and Chemical Engineering. By 1968, when it became the University of Lourenço Marques, it had acquired departments of Theoretical and Applied Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology and Geology. As the war for Independence intensified, the University expanded to include courses in Roman Philology, History, Geography, Economics and Metallurgical Engineering.

The University catered basically to the sons and daughters of the Portuguese colonists. Although the Portuguese government preached non-racism and advocated the “assimilation” of its African subjects into the Portuguese way of life, the notorious deficiencies of the colonial education system established under Portuguese rule ensured that very few Africans would ever succeed in reaching university level. In spite of Portugal's attempts to counter international criticism of racism in its colonies by expanding African educational opportunity in the late 60s and early 70s,

only a about 40 black Mozambican students—less than 2% of the student body—had entered the University of Lourenço Marques by Independence in 1975. The state, industry, commerce and the university continued to depend heavily on the Portuguese and their descendants.

INDEPENDENCE AND SOCIALISM: 1974-1989

The Revolution of the Carnations began in Portugal in April 1974. It brought Portuguese universities, including the University of Lourenço Marques, to a standstill as many teachers and their students left for political activism. When the University of Lourenço Marques re-opened in January 1975, the staff and student body had been severely depleted due to the exodus of Portuguese colonists fearful of an African government with socialist tendencies. Student numbers fell from 2,433 in 1975 to 750 in 1978, while the Mozambican teaching staff was reduced to a mere 10 persons.

Soon after Independence in June 1975, the Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO), which had been assisted during the war for Independence by the Soviet bloc, adopted a Marxist-Leninist form of government, ushering in a period of central planning. The resulting national Indicative Prospective Plan (PPI), drawn up in 1980 after countrywide discussion, aimed to bring Mozambique into the modern world in the space of ten years. The educational system was nationalized, and the University was renamed in honor of Eduardo Mondlane, anthropologist and first President of FRELIMO. The Rector, Fernando Ganhão, an historian who had won his spurs in the war for Independence, thwarted moves to close the University—it was regarded by some as an unnecessary expense—by taking measures to adapt it to the daunting task of rapidly training cadres to implement the socialist program.

To justify its existence, the University adopted a utilitarian stance, training human resources for the pressing needs of the national economy. Courses considered of lesser priority and which had very few students were closed. These included Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Geology, Mathematics, Geography, History, Modern Languages and Educational Sciences. Teachers in these disciplines were deployed to the pre-university courses to increase the number of university entrants. To enable government to expand primary and secondary education, the University also trained teachers in the Faculty of Education. A Faculty of Marxism-Leninism was set up to provide instruction to all university students. A Faculty for Combatants and Vanguard Workers was inaugurated to train party cadres in management. The University also absorbed the Museum of Natural History, the National Archive, and the Mozambican Institute for Scientific Research, which became the Center of African Studies. Scientists from the soviet bloc and sympathizers (*cooperantes*) from all over the world filled the shortage of trained faculty. During those heady years, personal careers were also subject to central planning. Individual vocation was subordinated to the national interest. The Ministry of Education assigned students to what were considered appropriate courses of study for them. On graduation they were similarly allocated to positions within government and party “structures.”

Mozambique's Independence, socialist orientation and support for the South African and Rhodesian liberation movements provoked the wrath of Rhodesia and South Africa who, one following the other, provided financial and logistical support to the rebel Mozambican National Resistance (RENAMO). Continuous violent war compounded by drought and the growing unpopularity of FRELIMO's socialist program brought the Mozambican economy to its knees. By the end of the 1980s, Mozambique had become the poorest country in the world with a per capita income of US\$60.

As government sued for peace, and as the soviet bloc crumbled, Mozambique's relations of dependence on the wider world shifted from the former Soviet Union and East Germany to Europe and the United States. The government began to relax its socialist program, accepting loans from the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank from 1987 onwards. Concomitantly it also began to shift from socialism to democracy and in 1990 a new liberal constitution was adopted. After years of negotiations under the aegis of the Catholic Church in Rome, a Peace Accord was signed in 1992. In 1995 the first democratic general elections were held.

These dramatic changes had an enormous impact on the University. As the war progressed and government revenues declined, morale foundered. The University lost all possibility of research outside the city of Maputo. At the same time, buildings, laboratories and other facilities became increasingly decrepit.

In February 1990, Dr. Narciso Matos, a chemist who had studied as an undergraduate at the University of Lourenço Marques and who had completed his doctorate in the former East Germany, became the first black Mozambican Rector of the University. Soon after taking up his post, the new Rector was confronted by a student strike. At a meeting of the entire University chaired by the Rector in the University Gymnasium, the President of Mozambique, Joaquim Chissano, listened to a very hard-hitting speech by the student leader, who structured his argument around the contrast between the ostentatious wealth and well-being of the country's leaders and the poverty of the students and the people as a whole.

Although this strike does not figure in the official history of the University, students to whom we spoke consider that it was crucial in marking the changes underway in the country and in drawing the attention of government to the problems of the University. In an important sense they are right. Theirs was the second strike since Independence (the first occurred during the previous year), marking the beginning of the emergence of an active civil society. Government did in fact take the strike seriously, and took measures to increase support to the University. But more importantly, the frank confrontation between the students and the authorities signaled a freedom of expression that had been seriously curtailed throughout the colonial period and the post Independence war. It is significant that this signal came from the University. And it is also significant that shortly afterwards the University took important steps to diagnose its ills and to prepare a strategic plan for their resolution, even though there was no direct causal relationship between the strikes and the planning process.

THE *Present and Prospects for the Future*: 1989-1996

By 1989, it was clear that the University needed to adapt to the changing economic and political scenario, seeking funds and support from the international donor community. In 1990 the Ministry of Education organized a major meeting to assess development plans for education. The University was invited to present its views as part of what was expected to be a holistic approach to education. During this meeting, donor agency representatives from Sweden, Netherlands and Canada, which were already strong supporters of basic education in Mozambique, suggested to the Rector that they would be willing to contribute more effectively to the University if they could receive a plan which would give them a view of the basic aims of the University and how other donors were involved. Since the senior management of the University had also felt the need for a coherent plan, the donors' suggestion encouraged the Rector to call in the University's senior academic and administrative staff to diagnose the needs of the University and to devise a five-year development program.

This process resulted in the production of a two-volume document entitled *The Present and Prospects for the Future*, which was presented formally to representatives of government, donor organizations and Mozambican civil society as a whole at a Consultative Meeting in April, 1991. Volume I contains 12 authored essays which point with considerable frankness to the major problems facing the university in the general areas of teaching and curriculum reform, research, governance, human resources, publications, and specific issues relating to research and teaching in medicine, economics, social sciences, and engineering. Volume II presents a development plan "defined in relation to the goals set forward by the government of Mozambique and the University, taking into consideration the financial, material and human resources which it is hoped possible to mobilize" (Eduardo Mondlane University 1991).

The plan focussed on five problem areas: the difficulty of training and maintaining qualified Mozambican staff and the need to reduce dependency on expatriates; the small number of student admissions and a marked regional imbalance between students from the south and the center/north; a high student dropout rate and low rate of graduation; a paucity of research and outreach activities; and an inefficient, cumbersome and over-centralized administration.

By 1990 one-third of the teaching faculty was made up of expatriates, most of whom were provided by donor countries without consulting the University on its real needs. Of the Mozambicans, only 5 had doctorates. Furthermore, because of low salaries in comparison with the growing private and NGO sectors, it had become increasingly difficult to attract young Mozambicans. Even those who joined the University were obliged to seek second jobs in order to make ends meet.

To address these problems the University proposed material and academic incentives, advocating an increase in salaries, the construction of faculty housing, and a post-graduate scholarship program. Through these measures, the University expected to reach the end of the decade with 550 full time faculty members. Of these, it was hoped that 150 would have obtained doctorates, 250 master's degrees, leaving 270 with only *licenciatura* degrees. As a result, the number of expatriate teachers would be reduced to 40.

The University envisaged increasing the student population to 5,500 by 1996 and then maintaining numbers at that level, thus upholding a 1:8.5 teacher/student ratio. Concern was expressed at the fact that 61% of students were from the more developed southern provinces of the country. To counter this imbalance, it was proposed to explore "different alternatives such as setting aside a pool of openings in all the courses of study for students outside Maputo, together with an expansion of university housing and scholarships for such students" (UEM, 1991, Vol. 2: 36). Interestingly, gender issues were not raised at this time.

In 1990, the overall drop-out rate was 11%. Only 50% of the students actually completed their courses, and of these less than half did so in the allotted time. The average time taken to graduate was 1.2 times the normal duration and only 5% of the total student population graduated in any one year. Although there were no estimates of the total cost per student graduated, it was felt that the university was extremely inefficient. It was therefore planned to reduce the drop-out rate to 5% and to increase the graduation rate from 5% to "at least 10%."

To achieve these goals, it was proposed to improve learning opportunities by producing teaching manuals in Portuguese, opening a university bookstore, disseminating computer equipment, bringing libraries up to date, renovating laboratories and generally improving teaching aids. In addition, it was hoped to introduce a more selective admissions process, and to initiate a

curriculum reform to allow more options for students and to reduce the social distance—marked by hierarchical formality—between professors and students.

The Present and Prospects for the Future indicated that very little research was undertaken at the University with the exception largely of the social sciences in the Center of African Studies. It proposed to boost research by twinning arrangements with overseas universities designed to strengthen teaching and faculty development, by seeking international support, and by tapping the increasing social demand for research. This latter activity was expected to bring in additional revenues to the University.

Poorly developed research and teaching at the University was attributed to the low educational standard of the University's technical and administrative staff and to archaic and highly centralized management structures. It was therefore planned to initiate a staff training program and to commission studies on management structures, information systems, the computerization of academic records, social services and development of the physical plant.

The plan ended with a rough costing estimate and an impassioned plea for a greater degree of autonomy in the utilization of governmental and donor funds. It was argued that restrictions on the use of donor funds "complicate, and at times impede, the normal processes of program implementation. In this context, special reference must be made of the desire to have autonomy over the training of Mozambican personnel and the acquisition of equipment." Donors were accordingly encouraged to contribute to what was termed a "Flexible Access Fund" (Eduardo Mondlane University 1991:54).

The response of government and the donors, all of whom recognized the quality of the University's plan and the commitment of its leadership, was very positive. Government approved a new salary scale for university teachers, different from the rest of the civil service. The World Bank included the University in its Capacity-Building Program for Mozambique, awarding it USD 23.3 million over five years. SAREC stepped up its funding for research. The Ford Foundation increased its support for research, faculty development in the social sciences, the central library and a study on university management and planning. Only SIDA responded to the University's appeal for "flexible funding," allocating a total of 49,500,000 Swedish crowns for Core Support, i.e. a sort of reserve fund that the University could utilize when delays occurred in government pay-outs (Wield *et al.* 1998).

By 1995 considerable progress had been achieved in meeting the goals of *The Present and Prospects for the Future*. Student numbers had passed the projected 5,500 level and the teaching staff had reached a total of 711. Salary levels had increased considerably, and a number of university houses had been built or renovated for teaching staff and a small number of senior administrators. The percentage of expatriate staff had dropped from 26% in 1991 to 17.7% in 1996. The qualifications of the Mozambican staff had improved. The percentage of those with doctorates rose from 5% to 9.4% and those with master's degrees from 12% to 20.6%. Another 23.4% were engaged in graduate training abroad.

Various institutional assessments had been carried out, including a major review of governance, planning and management (Commonwealth Secretariat, 1992). A University Bookshop had been planned. The University Computer Center had expanded rapidly and established an efficient Internet service for staff and the wider community. The Eduardo Mondlane University was one of the first African universities to establish a commercial Internet service and to become an Internet Service Provider (ISP).

In spite of this significant progress, the principal problems signaled in 1991 persisted. Graduation rates continued to hover around 4 or 5%, 61% of the student body continued to be recruited from the southern provinces, and women continued to account for only 25% of the student body. Staff retention also remained a serious problem, having been compounded by the growth of the Mozambican economy, which had begun to provide lucrative alternatives for highly trained Mozambicans. Although salaries at UEM were higher than the civil service norm, they fell well behind salaries offered by the private sector, the NGOs and International Development Organizations such as the UNDP, UNICEF, USAID and the World Bank. Furthermore, and in spite of the many studies carried out and a few reforms, the management of the University continued almost as inefficient as ever. Problems resulted from the juggling of donor funds to offset the unpredictability of government pay-outs.

On balance, however, it was generally agreed that the institution had made important steps in the right direction and that *The Present and Future Perspectives* had been significant not only in raising funds but also in giving the University a clear sense of purpose.

RETHINKING THE UNIVERSITY: 1995-99

In 1995, Narciso Matos left the University to become Secretary General of the Association of African Universities in Accra, Ghana. The new Rector, Brazão Mazula, who had studied for his Ph.D. on education in Mozambique at the University of São Paulo, Brazil, came to the University with a laurel of having successfully overseen the 1995 general elections as President of the National Electoral Commission. Affiliated to no political party, the new Rector was the first not to belong to the ruling party.

Times had again changed. Multi-party democracy had become a reality, the privatization of state-owned firms had moved apace, and the image that Mozambique presented to the world was less that of a war-torn country in need of compassion and aid and more an attractive opportunity for investment. The macro-economic situation became increasingly buoyant with annual GDP growth soon moving into double figures. The educational field underwent concomitant changes. A number of private schools were founded and three private institutions of higher learning came into being, the Instituto Superior Politécnico e Universitário, (Higher Polytechnic and University Institute), the Instituto Superior de Ciências e Tecnologia de Moçambique (Higher Institute of Science and Technology of Mozambique), both based in Maputo, and the Catholic University of Mozambique based in the central and northern towns of Beira, Nampula and Cuamba. Fees at these universities ranged from five to ten times more than at the UEM.

Soon after his nomination, the new Rector was confronted in May 1996 by another student strike for better food and living conditions. The students sealed off the campus and the Rector was denied entry under heavy rain as he tried to dialogue with the strikers. In the end, police were called in to open campus. The strike ended with governmental promises to improve student living conditions. From the point of view of the student leadership with whom we conversed, the students were once again in the forefront in demanding reform. From the point of view of some members of the teaching staff to whom we spoke, the strike and its aftermath pointed to a completely new and positive “informal” relationship between the Rector and the students. Others, however, argued that it demonstrated the inappropriateness of “consensus politics” in the context of the University. They would have preferred a more decisive stance on the part of University management. Be that as it may, the situation revealed the emergence a more “egalitarian” ethos in university management in line with changes within Mozambique and with the Rector’s own inclinations.

The change of Rectors coincided with the end of the five-year plan put forward in *The Present and Future Prospects* and set the stage for the development of a second five-year plan. Rector Mazula, under the motto “Rethinking the University,” urged the university community to develop a second five-year plan in the context of the wider changes in Mozambican society. He appointed a Commission charged with drawing up what was termed an Indicative Plan (*Plano Indicativo*), which he expected to be completed in time for the 6th Consultative Meeting with donors and stakeholders in April 1998. Three donor agencies responded positively to requests for support both for the planning process *per se* and for the establishment of a Planning Office. SIDA provided 250,000 Swedish Crowns, the Ford Foundation USD 100,000 and the Dutch Government USD 80,000.

The thirteen-member Commission, which was coordinated by veteran academic and professor of Veterinary Science, Patrocínio da Silva, was composed of a cross section of more and less experienced teaching and administrative staff, but not heads of departments or faculties. In March 1996 it embarked on an exercise designed to involve the entire university in the planning process through departmental meetings, consultations with the Association of University Students, which would help identify problems, propose solutions and regularly comment on documents produced by the Commission itself. The procedure was in marked contrast to that of *The Present and Future Prospects* which had relied on the concerted efforts of a small group of senior faculty and administrative staff. The Rector hoped that the participatory planning process would bring reform to the University not just in terms of improvements in management and academic performance but also in a moral sense. He felt that the University should be a model for society, a haven of honesty and accountability.

The process of drawing up the strategic plan followed three phases. During the first phase, the Commission collated and studied previous planning documents, and held preliminary meetings with 150 senior members of the university, government officials and with the student leadership to list the major problems of the University. This led to the production of a closed questionnaire that was distributed to 350 members of the University. Of these, 154 were returned, 78 from administrative staff, 43 from the teaching staff and 33 from students. The analysis of these meetings and the survey resulted in four documents: “Diagnosis of the Situation in UEM,” “Minor issues raised in meetings and suggested solutions,” “Report on the Opinion Survey,” and “The Opinion of some members of the government on higher education and the UEM.”

Following these activities, individual Commission members visited universities that had carried out strategic planning. These included the University of Putra, Malaysia, the universities of Natal, Witwatersrand and Western Cape in South Africa, the University of Dar es Salaam and the University of Zimbabwe. So far as we were able to ascertain there was no direct relationship to the ADEA Working Group on Higher Education.

The second phase of the process involved another round of discussions with directors of faculties, research centers and administrative units, which resulted in two more documents: “The Development Tendencies in the Faculties of UEM;” and “Development Tendencies in the Central Administration of UEM.”

The next round of discussions, including a general seminar in September 1997 and another one specifically for students in October, were devoted to developing a Mission Statement for the University, after which the Commission set about writing the strategic plan. Again, more meetings were deemed necessary. A workshop was held at the UEM at which experts from the

Universities of Witwatersrand and Dar es Salaam spoke of their respective planning experiences. The first draft of the plan was finally written at a retreat at the seaside village of Bilene, and, after two revisions, was officially handed over to the Rector in December 1997.

This plan of December 1997 contained a Mission Statement and defined eleven objectives that were set out in some detail. In conclusion, it proposed a rough timetable which gave priority to "those activities that aim to transform procedures and regulations" (UEM, 1997: 29), thus clearly signaling the urgent need to reform curricula and management structures and procedures. The document did not, however, consider the strategies for meeting all the objectives of the plan, nor did it estimate costs or define who would be responsible for developing these strategies. The Commission understood that these aspects would be developed during the next stage of the planning process as each faculty and administrative unit transformed the general ideas of the Plan into concrete strategies for action under the overall guidance of the Commission and the University Planning Office.

However, instead of continuing with this rather slow procedure, and with the intention of submitting a complete strategic plan to the Consultative Meeting scheduled for April 1998, the Rector appointed a second Commission under the leadership of the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs, Dr. António Saraiva de Souza. This Commission, composed mainly of directors of central administrative services, was charged with "operationalizing" the plan. For three months, the commission worked on transforming the general suggestions of the planning document into a set of concrete objectives based on projections for the growth of the University to the year 2010.

At the 6th Consultative Meeting, members of the original Planning Commission were surprised to find that the document which was to be presented to the donors and the wider community was not that which they had handed to the Rector in December, 1997. Instead, they found a document that had been produced by the second commission, and which was entitled "A Project for the Third Millennium." Their own document was nowhere to be found. This fact generated considerable ill feeling on the part of the first Commission and many of those who had cooperated with it. Even those who recognized a number of interesting aspects of the new document questioned the way in which it had been produced. It had been their understanding that the participatory process which had led to the identification of the University's priorities would be continued to define projections, costs and implementation strategies. The situation became the more tense when the Rector of the University left the conference hall for a meeting with the President of the Republic just as de Souza was rising to present the "Project for the Third Millennium." This led to the *perception* that he had dissociated himself from the opinions of the Vice-Rector and the second document.

Participants in the meeting talk of "great confusion" and "open crisis," as groups and individuals positioned themselves on one side or another. During the months that followed wounds were opened that will be difficult to heal. As the schism within the University deepened, the politics of accusation took over, extrapolating to the national press. In November of 1998, the Rector asked the Directors of the central administration to submit letters of resignation. Three close associates of the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs left their posts and in December António Saraiva de Souza himself resigned.

Meanwhile, the Rector nominated a third Commission under the leadership of historian Arlindo Chilundo, whose task it was to examine both documents and draw up a synthesis of the two. This resulted in a final document "Strategic Plan 1999-2003" which was approved by the University Council in October 1998.

This final document is composed of three parts, "Analysis of the Present Situation in the University," "The Mission of the Eduardo Mondlane University," and "The Strategic Objectives for the UEM (1999-2003). Although this document makes use of some ideas expressed in the "Project for the Third Millennium," it bears greater resemblance to the document handed to the Rector in December 1997 and avoids any quantification.

This analysis of the University lists the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT analysis) based on the meetings and survey carried out by the first Commission. The principle internal strengths of the institution were defined as its great cultural diversity, the low value of student fees, the fact that it has a large concentration of highly trained Mozambicans, that it is better equipped and offers more courses than the other universities, that it has a reputation as the oldest university in the country, and that it has been able to raise substantial donor funding.

The primary internal weaknesses of the University were identified as its lack of autonomy; its weighty, inefficient and over-centralized bureaucracy; a chronic shortage of finance; low salaries which, it would seem, are the cause of lack of enthusiasm and the low productivity of teachers and administrative staff; weak leadership at all levels; a gradual decline in the quality of instruction; the inexperience of most teaching staff; a lack of interdisciplinary cooperation; decrepit laboratories and physical plant; out-dated libraries with limited opening hours; total absence of cultural and sporting activities and little opportunity for recreation; a small percentage (25%) of women students; out of date courses with a heavy classroom load; and archaic teaching techniques with little teacher/student interaction.

Favorable opportunities open to the University included the fact that UEM graduates occupy important decision-making posts at various levels, that there are many potential sources of finance, that the rapid growth of secondary schools will produce greater and higher quality candidates for university places, that the UEM is seen by society as a whole as the most prestigious institution of higher learning, and that unique opportunities arise out of the rapid development of the Maputo Corridor and the Southern African Development Community.

The main external threats to the institution were defined as the low academic level of secondary school graduates, growing crime and poverty, the high cost of living in Maputo, competition from other universities in Mozambique and the region, and a reluctance on the part of government to increase investments in the university at the cost of basic education, health and transport.

The first part of the document concludes on a somber note: "The internal weaknesses of the institution, coupled to a weighty and inefficient bureaucracy and weak leadership ... place the University low on the list of priorities for government resources ... Government is doubtful about conceding autonomy to the University in the light of the weakness of its governance" (UEM, 1998, 21). The University management informs us that this reluctance on the part of Government was also due to a certain misunderstanding of the degree of autonomy involved.

The second part of the Strategic Plan sets out the Mission Statement of the University:

"Eduardo Mondlane University is committed to being a center of excellence in the educational, scientific, cultural and technological contexts, educating its graduates for life and assuming responsibilities in the process of innovation and knowledge transfer and in sustainable development. Eduardo Mondlane University strives to integrate itself in the world scientific community, and to be both agent and object of change and transformation in society" (UEM, 1998: 23).

The third and final part of the document consists of the “Strategic Plan” itself which consists of twelve basic objectives, which we list in full:

- Moving towards university autonomy. The plan assumes that the university will move towards greater autonomy and that this will imply a process of administrative decentralization and the institutionalization of more democratic, transparent and efficient management;
- Guaranteeing excellence and quality. The University will carry out a major reform of the curriculum to bring courses more into line with “national reality” and to introduce new teaching methods. This is expected to increase productivity and reduce cost. Information technologies will be introduced to “revolutionize” the teaching process.
- Developing financial sustainability. The University budget is not sufficient and it will not grow. It is therefore necessary to plan and to cut costs. Even so, the University must seek to diversify its sources of finance;
- Developing infrastructure. The University must maintain its infrastructure and construct new buildings to cater for increased student numbers;
- Stabilizing and Developing Human Resources. The University must continue to train teaching and administrative staff and develop a suitable career structure;
- Increase student admissions. The University must increase admissions and guarantee that the regional imbalance is reduced without affecting quality;
- Improve social conditions. The University should promote improvements in the quality of life of students, teachers and administrative staff, but it should gradually find ways of freeing itself from the direct management of social services which are not its primary vocation;
- Guarantee gender equity. The University must promote equality of opportunity for women and men;
- Develop international cooperation. Linkages and financial support have a role to play.
- Stimulate the academic environment. The University cannot limit itself to the transmission of technical and scientific knowledge. It must also stimulate solidarity, a critical spirit and creativity.
- Publicize and disseminate the achievements of the University.
- Guarantee continuity of the planning process. The University must develop its planning capacity to oversee the implementation of operational planning.

With the official approval of the Strategic Plan, and after the hiatus of the 6th Consultative Meeting, the participatory process resumed. More meetings were held with managers throughout the university to discuss the concrete strategies for achieving the objectives that were set out in the Plan and to distribute a manual for the completion of forms that contain fields for a description of each action to be undertaken, its priority, cost, timetable, criteria for evaluation and

the person responsible. The completed forms were to have been handed into the Planning Directorate by the end of March 1999, but at the time of writing (March 1999), the deadline has been extended to mid-April. The Planning Office will then be confronted by mammoth task of collating all these forms and defining priorities over the coming five years.

Analysis

EVOLUTION OF THE PLANNING PROCESS

The major problems and objectives are common to both plans. They attest to the difficulty of bringing about change in the University. The most persistent and serious problems are the still very small number of students who graduate each year and the cumbersome and over-centralized bureaucracy. New problems and strategies to resolve them have arisen through the 1990s in the context of the advance of democracy and the market economy in Mozambique, the emergence of competition from the private universities, and the rapidly increasing incorporation of Mozambique into the wider regional and world community.

Under the plan put forward in *The Present and Perspectives for the Future*, the problem of staff retention was addressed by raising salaries, improving working conditions by renovating building, refurbishing laboratories and restocking libraries, offering grants for post-graduate training in developed countries, and revising career structures. An important component was the provision of housing, a left-over from the years of socialist planning when access to essential goods and services was not always mediated by money. By 1999 some 160 dwellings had either been built or renovated. However, the provision of houses had not resolved problems of staff retention, which have if anything been exacerbated by the buoyant labor market for highly trained personnel. Few teachers actually leave the University on a permanent basis, but 'moonlighting' is ever more frequent and students complain that teachers appear at the University only to give their classes. Under the most recent plan, the problem of staff retention is addressed by proposing opportunities for further learning, clear career structures including rules for admissions and promotions, higher salaries, a health insurance plan, regular evaluation with annual prizes and loans to purchase equipment.

The Present and Perspectives for the Future recognized the need for curriculum reform in order to reduce dropout rates and increase the rate of graduation. It also took important steps to improve teaching skills through the Staff Training Development Program (STADEP) which was established to improve the pedagogy of teaching staff. The new plan gives even greater prominence to curriculum reform, advocating an urgent reform of course content and criteria for evaluation and bringing the degree structure in line with neighboring countries. This would involve a major restructuring of the present five-year *licenciaturas* (seven years in medicine and six years in the architecture), which consist of a series of obligatory disciplines, each one a pre-requisite for the next. These also include the submission of a final dissertation that students very often fail to produce either because of lack of supervision or time, since most students are recruited into the labor market soon after commencing their studies. The *licenciatura* would be substituted by a three-year bachelor's degree, which would be based on a credit system to allow for greater student choice and initiative. Masters and doctorate degrees would be initiated in those faculties with a sufficient number of teachers with doctorates. In addition, the second plan again urges a reform in teaching methods, encouraging greater interaction between students and teachers and allowing more time for students to study on their own. One of the principal achievements of the planning process has been to provoke a wide consensus on the need for these reforms, and our conversations with the University leadership confirm that a radical curriculum reform is of the highest priority.

A third innovation in comparison with *The Present and Perspectives for the Future* is the issue of gender. The 1998 plan includes gender imbalance as one of its twelve priorities. Earlier drafts of the plan suggested the introduction of quotas for women students, especially in engineering. The final version adopted a less radical posture, which apparently reflected the opinions of some feminists on campus who argued against quotas and in favor of taking steps to change attitudes both of women and men.

The final innovation is in the planning process itself. The 1998 plan, generated by a participatory methodology, was conceived in contrast to *The Present and Future Perspectives* which was understood to have been produced by a small number of senior notables. "Rethinking the University," then, was aimed at doing much more than producing a five-year development plan. It sought to change the ethos of the university. Breaking with an hierarchical tradition where decisions were perceived to have been taken by a small number of senior academics, it aimed to usher in a more "participatory" process, by which decisions would be taken continuously on the basis of intense discussion at all levels of the university.

Greater participation is also built into the monitoring of the new strategic plan. Whereas responsibility for devising and monitoring *The Present and Perspectives for the Future* were very much in the hands of the central administration, the new plan has devolved these responsibilities to faculties and departments. These were charged with not only defining actions to be undertaken but also for attributing responsibilities for their execution and monitoring. The Director of Planning will be responsible for overseeing the monitoring process while a Strategic Plan Steering Committee will be responsible for negotiating overall priorities. The changes proposed for the classroom are thus mirrored in the changes proposed for the University as a whole.

DISAGREEMENT AND CONFLICT

The planning process set in motion by Rector Mazula was also intended to create a greater sense of belonging among the teaching staff, the administrative staff and the students of the University. Undertaken at a time when Mozambique and its major public university was adapting to the impact of democracy, market competition and globalization, this participatory process was probably the most adequate form of involving the University as a whole in the process of change. Although many would agree that the participatory planning process did effectively involve a large proportion of the University community, thus fostering a greater sense of belonging and "ownership," the events we have described show that it also led to heated debate and a serious conflict, which resulted in the at least temporary departure of a number of senior members of the University.

Participatory planning is not a merely technocratic exercise. On the contrary, it is essentially a political process, which challenges the status quo and brings groups and individuals into a series of alliances and confrontations. In the case of Mozambique, which has gone through such dramatic change over the past thirty years, it would have been surprising if the planning exercise at Eduardo Mondlane University had not engendered heated debate over academic and management issues which can only reflect the tensions and conflicts in the wider society.

The crisis that broke during the 6th Consultative Meeting threw the major issues into sharp relief. Although questions of individual personality and style had their part to play, the confrontation revealed the existence of disagreements over certain key issues within the University, in particular the planning process itself. The main criticism of "Project for the Third Millennium" was that it had been produced without the general participation of the university community. But

the crisis also revealed tensions between specific groups within the University, not least between a new generation of scholars who have recently returned with overseas doctorates and who were active in the planning commission, and their former teachers.

During the early years of Independence, academic distinction and experience were almost monopolized by white and mulatto Mozambicans, who continued, therefore, to occupy a prominent position within the university leadership. The first black administrative officer, Luisa Shadraca, was appointed in 1965 and, as we mentioned earlier, the first black Rector was appointed only in 1989. For historical reasons, therefore, the academic and management hierarchies of the University were racially marked, although during those heady Marxist days “race” was very much a taboo subject.

“Rethinking the University” gave members of this new generation the opportunity to speak out. Needless to say the thirty odd young Mozambicans now with doctorates pose a threat to the hegemony of the predominantly white “old guard.” But it must be emphasized that race relations in Mozambique are not construed in the same way as they are in South Africa and other anglophone countries, and cosmopolitanism is a strong national value. The confrontation is not direct and there are strong alliances across the lines of age and color. It was with a poignant amalgam of pride and apprehension that one white interlocutor observed that the University is one of the few remaining multi-ethnic, multi-national and multi-racial public institutions in contemporary Mozambique.

Apart from this major crisis, the planning process has also provoked differences of opinion on a number of issues, in particular the relation of the faculties and centers to the central administration, the question of student admissions, staff/student ratios and the nature of the planning document itself.

Since *The Present and Prospects for the Future* and probably before it too, the relations between the central administration and the faculties and centers have been marked by considerable tension. Central management has always alleged that it would like to see strong faculties and centers but that it could not concede too much autonomy because of their academic and institutional weakness, and also out of a desire to maintain control over the quality of the University. The faculties and centers for their part resent the inefficiency and “interference” of the central administration which, they allege, stifles creativity and initiative with the consequence that it ends up creating a vicious circle that weakens even further the institutional capacity of the centers and faculties.

What this discussion reveals is the enormous institutional impact of the post-graduate training component of the first strategic plan. Until quite recently there were so few highly qualified Mozambican staff that the central administration and the university process as a whole depended on a handful of qualified Mozambicans and a number of *cooperantes*. The new cadre of young Mozambicans who are now leading the process of change also enable a realistic process of decentralization.

The proponents of the second strategic plan claim that the participatory method guaranteed due concern for the faculties, departments and centers, above all during the implementation stage, when each of the component parts of the University will be charged with developing its own strategic plan. They also point to recent moves to increase the autonomy of faculties and centers by allowing them to open their own bank accounts and administer their own donor-funded projects. Critics of the participatory method, however, argue that participation may be more a question of theory than practice. Some, for example, claim that their suggestions went unheeded,

while others take the view that when all the documents have been handed in to the Planning Commission, they will lose control over the final decision making process. The Commission argues back that the final implementation strategy will be discussed widely before its final submission to the University Council and the Rector for approval.

The expansion of the University has also produced an interesting debate, which rages around the issues of quality and equity and also the relationship between university courses and the labor market. The themes of this debate are, of course, common throughout the African higher education community. While all would agree that the University has a capacity to accept more students, they are nevertheless fearful that this will imply a lowering of quality. The other point of view—more general among the younger teaching staff—is that the University could well absorb many more students and that quality could actually be enhanced, above all by bringing the curriculum up to date and by reforming teaching methods.

Another issue is that of the relation between courses and the demands of the labor market. Some argue that courses should only admit the number of students that can be effectively absorbed by the labor market. Others argue against this position pointing out that the future of the labor market is difficult to predict, that there is little economic sense in not admitting students to expensively staffed and equipped departments, and that Mozambique urgently needs human resources with university-level training in whatever area. The reformers argue further that a close fit between university courses and the labor market can not be engineered. The socialist experiment with its allocation of individuals to courses and careers can not easily be forgotten. They maintain that the most important task of the university is to admit as many students as possible and to produce creative and autonomous graduates who can adapt more easily to a labor market that demands greater flexibility.

A final controversial issue is the nature of the Strategic Plan itself. Critics of the Plan complain that it contains neither plan nor strategy. They point out that items have not been ordered in terms of priority, that there is no attempt to relate planned activities to available human and material resources and that no clear decisions have been taken on such important issues as the desirable rate of staff and student growth, staff/student ratios, and the ideal relationship between faculties, centers and central management. They describe the strategic plan as a “shopping list,” which lists the shortcomings of the University and all or most of the activities that were suggested to overcome them.

Defenders of the Plan argue that the document that was approved in October 1998 was never intended to go much further than to recognize the principal problems of the University and to propose possible solutions. They affirm that clear strategies and priorities in relation to available and projected resources will be developed during the implementation stage. But they also put forward other interesting arguments in defense of their document. One is that many issues are still contentious and require more time for decision-making. Another is that it is extremely difficult to plan in detail when the volume and nature of financial resources are so unpredictable.

The University, like Mozambique as a whole, depends on donor support and multilateral lending institutions for just over 60% of its income. The donor agencies are perceived as unpredictable entities whose agendas change over time in accordance with trends in the donor community as a whole and in each agency in particular. To present them with a “shopping list” is perceived as an extremely rational strategy since the donors can feel free to invest where most convenient with the perceived guarantee that they are meeting the needs of the institution. Ironically, therefore, the donors, who are generally the first to demand strategic plans, may in effect be contributing unawares to more “plan” and less “strategy.” This brings us to the final point of our analysis.

THE PLAN IN RELATION TO THE GOVERNMENT AND THE DONORS

Although some donors may well be content to receive the University's plan as it is, others are concerned that it does not address issues of cost-effectiveness. They have been unable, for example, to find (as were we) estimates of the cost per student graduated. One donor told us that he brought about considerable embarrassment at the 6th Consultative Meeting when he divided the funds expended per year by the number of students graduated reaching the astronomical figure of \$100,000 per student effectively graduated! The University authorities argued that dividing the total annual expenditure of the University by the number of students graduated was not the most adequate form of assessing the real cost per student. All the same, the very fact that the issue was raised had the effect of drawing attention to the problem and we are told that a commission has been installed to produce estimates of the cost of each student. More than one senior university official, however, recognized that the cost was far too high and probably on the increase. Government and donors are applying pressure on the UEM begin to look seriously into these questions. Demands for "rationality" on the part of the donors are comprehensible. What they rarely take into account is the "irrationality" of the financial and political environment in which the University operates, and to which the donors often, albeit unwittingly, contribute in significant measure.

The University has, however, taken steps to reduce that "irrationality" by maintaining regular meetings with donors and by trying to achieve greater autonomy vis-à-vis Government. The annual Consultative Meetings have played a very significant role in stimulating accountability of the University leadership to the university community itself, to the government and to the donors. They have also been useful in bringing donors' attention to the problems affecting the institution as a whole. As we observed earlier, the Swedish International Development Authority bought into the university's "flexible fund" shortly after the 1991 donor's meeting. Other donors have since provided more general support, with special emphasis on governance issues. Even so, coordinating donors is no easy task and the University will continue to have difficulty in persuading donors to act in strict accordance with the University's own priorities. But, as mentioned above, this fact in its turn contributes to the University's own reluctance to define too clearly those priorities.

During the early phases of the planning process, meetings with senior government officials revealed that they would be reluctant to grant greater financial and administrative autonomy to an institution which they perceived to be inefficiently managed and which managed to produce so few graduates. In return for any such concessions, they demanded "concrete and clear plans." (Silva, José & Utui 1997). In our own meeting with Minister Eneias Comiche, who takes a leading role in coordinating government policy on higher education, we heard similar reservations. Conversations with the Rector and the Vice-Rector for Administration reveal, however, that negotiations with the Ministry of Finance for the signing of an agreement between Government and the University setting out the terms and conditions of greater autonomy are well advanced and should be signed in the near future. This is seen as a major achievement of the planning process and should stimulate—and provide the conditions for—enhancing the "rationality" of the University's financial environment.

For the time being, there is little political will either on the part of the University or of Government to augment university revenues by increasing student fees. This is partly because Mozambique is in an election year, and government is fearful of introducing potentially unpopular measures. But this is also because it is still felt by many that public universities should not charge substantial fees in the interests of equity. The University authorities fear that high fees

would exclude poorer African students from higher education. Indeed, as we observed earlier, the low fees at the University are seen as a strength rather than a weakness. This is not to say, however, that the administration is not quite clearly aware of the distortions that will arise from this policy. They fear that in the long term Mozambique could become similar to Brazil where public universities which do not charge fees cater to the sons and daughters of parents who can afford to send them to private secondary schools, condemning the children of less wealthy parents to paying exorbitant fees at lower quality private universities. One senior administrator commented that the system at present in operation provides a double subsidy to the wealthy: subsidized fees (just less than \$10 per discipline per semester, ten times less than the ISPU, for example) which are equivalent to a "tax rebate" from the state, and the "exploitation" of badly paid yet highly qualified teachers!

If these fears are realized, Mozambique's biggest and most prestigious public university could well become less of an instrument for social justice than a mechanism for the reproduction of privilege. Such a process would also discriminate against the central and northern provinces of Mozambique, where secondary educational opportunities are minimal and of much lower quality than those in the southern provinces of Maputo, Gaza and Inhambane. Indeed, the University feels almost powerless to overcome the regional imbalance (the percentage of students from the south remains the same as it was in 1991), although the plan does contemplate a distance education program and experimentation with alternative criteria for university entrance.

Conclusions and Lessons Learned

In this last section we will summarize our findings and draw some conclusions that may be useful for other universities that are considering embarking on a participatory planning process. Although the Eduardo Mondlane University represents a very specific case, the basic issues of access, quality and capacity building are common to all Universities both in Africa and elsewhere. A few points of general relevance can therefore be advanced.

- **PARTICIPATORY PLANNING IS PAINSTAKING**

Participatory planning processes, especially in a context where democracy is a relatively recent innovation as in Mozambique, tend to be long drawn out and painstaking. A number of people to whom we talked complained quite bitterly about the amount of time and energy they had had to invest in "planning," often at the expense of their teaching and research. In the case of the Eduardo Mondlane University an attempt to take a short cut prior to the 6th Consultative Meeting was instrumental in causing the crisis we described. Universities wishing to undertake this kind of planning exercise should be aware of these difficulties and ensure that they do not impede the day to day working of the university.

- **DIFFERENT GROUPS WILL NEED TO PARTICIPATE IN DIFFERENT WAYS**

Participatory planning must involve the commitment of as many members of the university as possible. In the case of the Eduardo Mondlane, this was achieved to a certain extent, but is still under dispute from some quarters. We cannot emphasize too sharply the importance of not only listening to everyone but to be seen to be listening also. A way of ensuring greater participation would be an efficient information system whereby members of the university and the wider society can accompany the planning process step by step. We are informed that just such a system is due to be initiated at the Eduardo Mondlane University in June 1999. This will include

setting up a database, which will be available on the Internet. It will include information on staff, students, rates of graduation, and budgets. In addition, the University plans to publish a regular newsletter with information on all recent developments.

One of the problems of participatory planning is that the participatory procedures very often conceal that the process is very much under the control of the university leadership, who, after all, takes the initiative to design and inaugurate the planning process itself. After our many discussions, it became clear to us that all do not participate in the same way. Nor could they, since the perceptions of a laboratory technician, for example, can hardly be the same as those of a Vice-Rector. Differential participation should therefore be taken into account when initiating the planning process, creating mechanisms to increase awareness of the various points of view within the university. Again a simple and efficient information system would go a long way to reaching this objective.

Just as university leadership requires the participation of all members of the university community in the planning process, we would suggest that they should also participate not merely as coordinators but as privileged actors in the university community. They should not hesitate to provide right from the outset their own perceptions of the university's problems, and convey to all the members of the university community the basic political issues at stake. A useful way of doing this would be to consider the likely scenarios that would ensue as the result of particular decisions. In this way, they would foster rather than pre-empt discussion.

During the preparation of this Report we, like many others who have written about the Eduardo Mondlane University (Commonwealth Secretariat 1992; Wield *et al.* 1998), encountered some difficulty in pulling together basic data on student numbers, the composition of the student body, staff/student ratios and the like. As we have mentioned, certain data simply do not exist. One of the important ways in which senior management themselves might participate more in participatory planning would be to build a basic data base and make it freely available to the university community as a whole before extending consultation to the wider community. The Planning Office at the University must first plan itself in order to be able to assist in the planning of the University as a whole.

We are therefore very much in agreement with Ekong and Plante, who, after analyzing six African universities, concluded that successful strategic planning depended heavily on "an internal leadership committed to Strategic Planning and to the involvement of all the stakeholders in the process," and "a skilled planning staff and technical support for systems analysis" (Ekong & Plante 1996:19). We go one step further to argue that senior management must also *participate* in the way only they can, taking the initiative to provide basic information and to play a leading role in the stimulation of debate.

- **PLANNING CANNOT BE EVALUATED ON DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE ALONE**

A reading of the Eduardo Mondlane University's Strategic Plan alone could lead to the conclusion that it contained neither plan nor strategy. This would be unjust. For a start, the conception of planning put into effect by the University emphasizes that it is a continuous process. Furthermore, the results of the planning process are not confined to the formal documents. We are convinced from what we have heard that for all the tension and ill-feeling that the planning process engendered, it had the most important effect of increasing a sense of belonging and commitment, especially on the part of those who are normally excluded from discussions on the University's future. We are also convinced that the planning process

effectively catalyzed public debate on the major issues at stake. We cannot therefore emphasize sufficiently the importance of fostering this debate and making it more fruitful still. Again, a simple and efficient information system would be useful.

- **DIVERGENCE AND CONFLICT ARE A NORMAL COMPONENT OF PLANNING**

As we have noted before, planning is not a simple technocratic exercise. It should catalyze intense political debate. The heated exchanges and open conflict at the Eduardo Mondlane University should therefore be understood as a normal and desirable consequence of the planning process; not signs of failure. Universities are built on the premise of the free debate of ideas and it is incumbent on the planners to take this into account in preparing the planning process. Maybe the Eduardo Mondlane University could have avoided such particularly painful conflict had it been better prepared for it from the start. We agree with those many members of the Eduardo Mondlane University to whom we have spoken and who feel that the crisis in the University had the advantage of clarifying the principal lines of tension and could be turned to positive effect if the lessons were well learned. Universities might therefore consider planning for conflict, both in the sense of anticipating and assuaging major collisions, and then knowing how to turn them to their best advantage. The leadership of the Eduardo Mondlane University recognizes how useful the planning process was in revealing that the University was not a homogeneous whole, but rather a complex institution with numerous fault lines. They recognize that the challenge before them is not to smother difference, but to work with it in the direction of building a university which guards its autonomy but maintains its commitment to academic quality, continuing service and relevance within a rapidly changing society.

- **PARTICIPATORY PLANNING HAS A POSITIVE IMPACT**

Almost all of the members of the University to whom we spoke agree that for all its problems, the strategic planning process has been worthwhile. *The Present and Perspectives for the Future* effectively mobilized donor support and led to a rapid increase in highly trained Mozambican staff, a larger student intake, the first steps in research in science and technology, and improved living conditions of students and staff. *Rethinking the University* built on this prior experience and extended the planning process to all levels of the University. It had the immediate advantage of widening awareness of problems, encouraging a greater feeling of “ownership” among students, and academic and administrative staff, and gave to the major actors hands-on training in planning and budgeting.

We must emphasize that the crisis we have described, although leading to the hopefully temporary disillusionment of some senior academic staff, provided the University leadership with greater awareness of the major fault lines within the institution and provided an important stimulus to undertake necessary reforms, particularly of the curriculum. Indeed, one of the most important effects of the participatory model adopted was to permit the formation of a strong consensus on this issue. Finally, the appointment of a new Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs, Dr. Lídia Brito, brought a greater cohesion to the University management, which is committed to bringing the planning process to fruition.

PEOPLE INTERVIEWED FOR THE STUDY

Amadeu dos Muchangos, Department of Geology, UEM
Antônio Saraiva de Souza, former Vice Rector, Academic, UEM
Arlindo Chilundo, Director of Planning, UEM
Boaventura Chicuele, President, Students Association, UEM
Brazão Mazula, Rector, UEM
Carla Massunda, Student, Chemical Engineering
Célia Diniz, African American Institute
Célia Gomes, Student, Chemical Engineering
Claes Kjellstrom, Program Officer, Natural Resources and the Environment, Swedish International Aid Agency (SIDA), Maputo
David Hedges, Department of History, UEM
Didana Mujuaburre, Student, Chemical Engineering
Domingos Chiconela, Department of Geology, UEM
Dulce Rodrigues, Student, Electrical Engineering
Eneias Comiche, Special Minister for Economic and Social Affairs
Fátima Mendonça, Faculty of Arts
Fernando Ganhão, Social Sciences, UEM, former Rector
Florência Marrão, Student, Electrical Engineering and Vice President of the Students' Assembly
Fortunato Cuamba, Department of Geology, UEM
Ismael Mussa, Director, Social Services, UEM
Jamisse Taimo, Rector, Superior Institute for International Relations
Jan Willem van der Velden, Department of Geology, UEM
João Carrilho, Director, Institute for Rural Development
João Paulo Borges Coelho, Department of History, UEM
José Capão, Director, University Bookstore, UEM
José Negrão, Department of Agronomy, UEM
Juarez Maia, Advisor to the Rector, UEM
Kátia Alves, Student, Civil Engineering
Ken Wilson, Program Officer, Ford Foundation
Lídia Brito, Vice-Rector Academic, UEM
Lopo de Vasconcellos, Head, Department of Geology, UEM
Luis Covane, Cultural Archive, University Council
Luisa Shadraca, lawyer and former Administrative Officer, UEM
Manuel Araujo, Population Studies Center, UEM
Manuel Macia, Social Sciences, UEM
Mouzinho Mário, Education, UEM
Natália Magaia, Student, Chemical Engineering
Nesha Tackle, Advisor, Ministry of Industry and Commerce
Norinho Ernesto, Student, Social Sciences
Óscar Jaueta, Responsible for the Geological Museum, Department of Geology, UEM
Patrocínio Silva, former Coordinator Strategic Planning Commission, UEM
Polly Gaster, Computer Center, UEM
Rafique Cassamo, Coordinator World Bank Capacity Building Project, former Director of Human Resources, UEM
Silva Magaia, Department of Civil Engineering, UEM
Teresa Cruz e Silva, Director, Center of African Studies, UEM
Venâncio Massingue, Vice-Rector Administration, UEM

DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- Commonwealth Secretariat. 1992. *Eduardo Mondlane University Review of Governance, Planning and Management*. The Commonwealth Secretariat and the Ford Foundation.
- Eduardo Mondlane University. 1991. *The Present and Prospects for the Future, Vols. 1 and 2*. Eduardo Mondlane University.
- Eduardo Mondlane University. 1992. *Annual Report 1991-1992*. Eduardo Mondlane University.
- Eduardo Mondlane University. 1993. *Annual Report 1992-1993*. Eduardo Mondlane University.
- Eduardo Mondlane University. 1994. *Annual Report 1993-1994*. Eduardo Mondlane University.
- Eduardo Mondlane University. 1995. *Annual Report 1994-1995*. Eduardo Mondlane University.
- Eduardo Mondlane University. 1996. *Annual Report 1995-1996*. Eduardo Mondlane University.
- Eduardo Mondlane University. 1997a. *Annual Report 1996-1997*. Eduardo Mondlane University.
- Eduardo Mondlane University. 1997b. *Proposal for a Strategic Plan for the five-year period 1998-2002, draft #4*. Eduardo Mondlane University.
- Eduardo Mondlane University. 1998a. *A Project for the Third Millennium*. Eduardo Mondlane University.
- Eduardo Mondlane University. 1998b. *Strategic Plan 1999-2003*. Eduardo Mondlane University.
- Ekong, D. & P.R. Plante. 1996. *Strategic Planning at Selected African Universities*. The Association for the Development of African Education Working Group on Higher Education (ADEA/WGHE).
- Republic of Mozambique. 1995. *Política Nacional de Educação e Estratégias de Implementação (National Educational Policy and Implementation Strategies)*. Ministry of Education.
- Silva, P., V. José & R. Utui. 1997. *The Opinion of some members of the government on higher education and the UEM*. Eduardo Mondlane University.
- Wield, D., A. Bay, S. Gustafsson & P. Mlama. 1998. *Swedish Support to the University of Eduardo Mondlane in Mozambique*. Swedish International Development Agency - SIDA.