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Executive Summary

This paper presents the Cost Benefit Analysis of Setting up Colleges in Makerere University as part of the documents required by the University Council to enable it make an informed decision on the viability of forming Colleges. The present Report should be understood under overarching guiding principle that the College Formation process synthesizes a way of creating an efficient and effective model that structurally, administratively and pedagogically will enhance the management of Makerere University so as to fulfil its revised Vision and Mission as stipulated in its Strategic Plan 2008/2018. Colleges are being proposed under the following assumptions:

1). The formation of college is meaningful and this transformation shall provide synergic academic and functional relations;

2). The Faculties, Schools or Institutes transforming into Colleges will be more effective and efficient since they will have some degree of autonomy within their institutional frames and will be able to constitute and regulate issues which are peculiar and unique to them in a more timely manner;

3). That individuals will have more influence in decision making in administration, finance and in developing programs within their Colleges than it had been before whereby ensuring motivation towards up to date team work approaches in teaching and learning;

4). That the synergies created shall provide Colleges with a better scope and environment in sourcing for funds, re-organising themselves, re-branding their academic image and undertaking other activities within their mandate.

Using the Full Student Equivalent (FSTE) and Workload analytical model, as well as qualitative cost benefit analysis by comparing re-engineered processes, the initial cost of implementation will mean an additional 27 Uganda Million Shillings to the current budget of Uganda Shillings 122,819,687,327 (see table 1 below). This represents an increment of 0.05%. This increment is mainly with the introduction of Communications Officers at each of the colleges. The structures being presented to Council shall enhance motivation of both students and staff through decentralised efficient service delivery and decision making. These structures will also encourage team approach to teaching and learning as well as re-focus the university Vision towards research and knowledge transfer partnerships within the newly established interdisciplinary college units.
Table 1: Summary Cost Implications Ushs bns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Category</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Restructured</th>
<th>50% Establishment</th>
<th>100% Establishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td>27,294,283,998</td>
<td>38,660,809,821</td>
<td>69,321,044,442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>1,052,961,361</td>
<td>1,614,635,256</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,229,270,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Staff (M-10) Centre</td>
<td>4,021,513,672</td>
<td>2,391,321,514</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,727,132,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Staff (M-10) Colleges</td>
<td>778,385,084</td>
<td>2,381,737,630</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,505,030,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,147,144,115</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,773,059,143</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,275,445,076</strong></td>
<td><strong>79,782,477,994</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that restructuring of support and group staff will be in the next phase of the college formation process scheduled for January 2011
1.0 Introduction

“There is no passion to be found playing small - in settling for a life that is less than the one you are capable of living.” Nelson Mandela

“One secret of success in life is for a man to be ready for his opportunity when it comes.” Benjamin Disraeli

Makerere University, over the years has been growing both in student numbers, programs, research and outreach. From a humble technical school in 1922, Makerere is now an internationally well known University with a population of about 35,000 students. This was following the Government’s liberal reforms in the education sector which lead to a rapid expansion in numbers of private students. The growth in the number of programmes, enrolment and activities dictated that the structure of the university needed to realign its self to be more efficient and effective.

Although the concept of Makerere University’s shifting to the College Model of academic organisation has been in the ofing for more than 15 years, the initial impetus for it to take shape was based on the dictates of the University Strategic Plan of 2000/01 - 2006/07. This was structurally against the backdrop of the phenomenal expansion in the student numbers experienced by the University over the preceding years, following the liberal reforms of the Government of Uganda that increased the numbers of private students.

In the Strategic Plan 2008/09 -2018/19, it is envisaged that the University moves towards becoming a research-led institution. This inevitably calls for major reforms in the University’s governance, financial and administrative structures, with the purpose of making them leaner and more efficient so as improve the quality of teaching, learning and research, and harmonize programmes with synergies, as well as eliminate possible duplication. The Strategic line of action has focused on transforming and re-organising the existing Faculties & Institutes into larger Colleges with a view to improving their efficiency and effectiveness. The latter has continued to be the baseline principles upon which the College formation process has been anchored.

In 2006, Makerere University Council approved the “Makerere University Statute for Constituent Colleges”. This, together with the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act, have provided the guidelines for college formation and the Committee has indicated where there were gaps needing amendments to incorporate new positions and nomenclature.
1.1 **Rationale**

Having looked at the various models operating in the different parts of the World including those in the region (*See appendix 3*). The Committee was convinced beyond reasonable doubt that the Collegiate model was found to be the most appropriate for Makerere University for the following reasons:

i) It enhances decision making around the notions of efficiency and consensus.

ii) Decisions made are honoured in deference to the professional and intellectual competence and authority of the makers, and not through politics, rules and other persuasions (Hamilton, 1997).

iii) The benefits of implementing College Formation are greater than the cost of continuing operating under a highly constrained, centralised model.

1.2 **Criteria Used for College Formation**

The new structure of colleges will utilize a coordinated devolution of powers, utilizing the re-engineered process maps for effective and efficient functionality. The reconfiguration into colleges has utilized the criteria elaborated below for efficacy. The criteria are cognizant of:

a) Synergy in mission and objectives of the combining units to promote optimal utilization of the ambient capacities;

b) Potential for resource sharing (human, infrastructural) and mobilization;

c) Potential for modularization of Academic Programmes, rationalization and elimination of duplications;

d) Capacity to form viable college substructures like Academic Boards, Administrative Boards, Procurement committees and Senate as elaborated in the College Statute;

e) Baseline Resources:

   i) Numbers of students;
   
   ii) Number of Programmes;
   
   iii) Number and Distribution of Academic Staff;
   
   iv) Teaching and office Space;
   
   v) Number of Computer access points;
   
   vi) Library facilities;
   
   vii) Laboratory space;
   
   viii) Other capacity indicators considered by the National Council for Higher Education.
1.3 The College Structure

The proposed college structure will comprise of the College, Schools, Institutes, and Departments. For purposes of this structure, the following definitions have been used.

A COLLEGE
A constituent unit of the University consistent with the UOTIA and offers Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates and enjoys Administrative, Academic and Financial semi autonomous status.

A SCHOOL
This is an Academic Unit of a College engaged in Teaching, learning, research and knowledge and technology transfer partnerships based on a focused body of Knowledge.

INSTITUTE
This is a unit of a college which is exclusively research based

CENTRE
This is a unit of a college, which is largely focused on service and knowledge transfer partnerships

DEPARTMENT
This is a unit of a school that deals with core functions of teaching, learning and research functions of a particular focused discipline, with at least one programme leading to the award of a degree.

The Colleges

- College of Natural Sciences CONAS;
- College of Business and Management Sciences (COBAMS);
- College of Computing and Information Science (COCIS);
- College of Engineering, Design, Art and Technology (CEDAT)
- College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHUSS);
- College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES);
- College of Education and External Studies (COEES);

Schools in Transition:
1. School of Veterinary Medicine (to access services through the College of Health Sciences);
2. School of Law (to access services through the College of Business and Management Sciences).

College of Health Sciences: to align its current structure to the new Colleges’ format.
2.0 Benefits To Be Accrued

The Current Strategic Plan 2008/9 - 2018/19 was guided by the basic question. “How can Makerere University reposition herself to meet emerging development challenges in Uganda?” Consequently the re-organization of the Units is intended to enable Makerere be able to produce graduates with problem solving skills and reflective ability and relevant to the new situations.

2.1 Qualitative Benefits

1) Administration

In terms of administration, they have been several bottlenecks in many functions of the University. Decentralized powers and realigning the administrative structure will ease some of these bottlenecks. At the apex, there will be a leaner structure and the span of control will be shorter (Procurement functions, recruitment up to at certain levels, review of programs, Quality Assurance, financial management will now be undertaken at the Colleges). This is in line with the Vision of the University.

2) Financial

The University has been organized around 110 departments, 21 Academic Units each of these of these has been a cost centre with multiplicity of roles. This is now being reduced to 8 and it is hoped that whereas the financial acquisition was initial very long, this will be reduced at the College level as the staff in it will be able to be familiar with their individual needs. The few that may be financial neutral will require a phased approach.

Secondly, budgeting, micro procurement, auditing and reporting which has been very tedious will now be made easier due to the few Cost Centres.

3) Professionalism

One of the core values of Makerere University is professionalism. This however has not yet been translated into a meaningful a catchword. At a College level it is envisaged that it will be possible to encourage, ensure, promote and advance sets standards and ethics within the mandates of these Colleges away from the various fragmentation we have been having. This will be through synergies and relatedness being encouraged in the formation of Colleges. The demonstration of
their professional capabilities will now be more distinct within the College especially with the introduction of Communication Officer for each College.

4) **Customer Responsiveness**

With the increase in Universities in Uganda and the competition therein, our stakeholders have become an invaluable asset that the Colleges will devise different strategies to retain these stakeholders or look at different ways to increase their relevance both within the Institution and in the Country. Customer responsiveness is giving our stakeholders what they want, when they want it, and at a reasonable rate without comprising the University’s Mission and Vision in the process. Due to the long bureaucratic path in the present environment in the University, Makerere University has had a lot of criticisms from all quarters in its ability to take action to identify their customers and react to their needs and wants in a way that satisfies them. Through the introduction of Colleges, our responsiveness is expected to be far better and faster to the satisfaction of our various stakeholders.

5) **An Efficient And Effective Makerere University**

Peter Drucker, a management guru, defined efficiency as doing the things right and effectiveness as doing the right things. While efficiency focuses on the process or “means”, effectiveness focuses on the end. Efficiency is restricted to the present state whereas effectiveness involves thinking long term. Makerere University needs to be both effective and efficient in order to be successful. The repositioning of Makerere University according to the Strategic Plan is intended to make it a top notch University in the continent. This can be done by working on our current weaknesses and promoting our strengths. This reorganization is the beginning of that journey. This will lead to a more participatory approach by the internal stakeholders in decision making, better satisfaction from the various stakeholders and better accountability of University resources.

2.2 **Quantitative Benefits**

The conversion into a common financial denominator of the quantitative costs/benefits has been tabulated in the Appendix 3. The transition between the present structures to colleges is financially a neutral process with less than 0.05% increment on top of the current expenditure.

Drucker, P (2003), The Effective Executive: The Definitive Guide to Getting the Right Things Done (Harperbusiness Essentials) available from Amazon.com
levels. However, the reduction in cost centers and administrative processes is evidently to bring in a savings in transactional costs are normally considered to be recurrent expenditures.

2.3 Cost/Benefit – Net Effect

The analysis of the financial implications of the implementation of the college structures show a normal variation of 0.05% in the wage bill. This is based on moving staff members from the center to the colleges leaving the center with a lean coordinative role.

There is a cost associated with change management with the new roles that will go along with the movement of staff. This will be mitigated by an inductive process for the human resource to induct staff in their new roles.

The benefits, which are largely qualitative far outweigh the cost of reorienting staff in their new roles.

3.0 The Road Map

The plan for implementation of the colleges is attached in Appendix 4. It is envisaged that the college projects will begin soon as the university council has approved the colleges. Full implementation will begin with the first semester of the academic year 2011/12.
# APPENDIX 1- Terms of Reference

We the under mentioned members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Edith Natukunda-Togboa</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer, Languages (French)</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>John K.W. Wabwire</td>
<td>Director, Planning and Development Department,</td>
<td>Internal Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Vincent A Ssembatya</td>
<td>Director, Quality Assurance</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Maria Musoke</td>
<td>University Librarian</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Goddy Muhumuza Muhanguzi</td>
<td>University Legal Officer</td>
<td>Internal Legal Consultant to URAFRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>H. Sengendo</td>
<td>Rector IUIU</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>Ikoja Odongo</td>
<td>Director Institute of Psychology</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>Buyinza Mukadasi</td>
<td>Deputy Director School of Graduate Studies</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Tito Okumu</td>
<td>E-Learning Manager, Makerere University</td>
<td>E-Learning Manager, Makerere University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Tony Oluka</td>
<td>Information Technology Specialist, Makerere University</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Savino Biryomumaiso</td>
<td>Lecturer Faculty of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Alfred .M. Namoah</td>
<td>Academic Registrar- Makerere University</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Francesca Ayaa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Florence Nakayiwa</td>
<td>Senior Economist PDD</td>
<td>Co-Opted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
They were given the following Terms of Reference

- To review the current research function
- To make it more efficient and effective.
- To consider the current administrative structure with a view of making it lean, efficient and effective
- To propose an appropriate college system for the university
- To review the current financial system with a view of improving ITS business processes.
- To make specific recommendations that are appropriate for a research-led university under a college system
- To review the current university programmes.
- To provide a report to the Vice Chancellor on a regular basis.
APPENDIX 2: University Models

i. Bureaucratic model (“Old school”): As might be anticipated, the bureaucratic model of governance derives its strength from the writings of Max Weber who advocated that decision making and planning are the exclusive preserve of the few individuals in the top wrung of the hierarchy ladder. Such decisions and plans are implemented through a coordinated division of labour, standardization of rules and regulations, and a hierarchical chain of command (Weber, 1948; Baldridge, 1971; Hardy, 1990). However, bureaucracies in academe are thought to function in a different manner from traditional bureaucracies found in the corporate world, the private sector, or for that matter, in ecclesiastical settings, because power is decentralized to units such as departments. Academic staff members constitute a specialized cadre which understands its obligations to the organization, thereby obviating the need for a steep chain of command (Tierney, 2004).

ii. The Collegial model: In this model, there is an assumption that a community of scholars operates around the notions of respect and consensus. Proponents of the collegial perspective are convinced that decisions made are honoured in deference to the professional and intellectual competence and authority of the makers, and not through politics, rules and other persuasions (Hamilton, 1997). The collegium is made up of loosely connected individuals embedded in a decentralized edifice. Millet (1962), who is one of the earliest advocates of such a framework summarized cogently the position of the academy when he stated “I do not believe that a structure of a hierarchy is a desirable prescription for the organization of a college….The concept of community presupposes an organization in which functions are differentiated through a dynamic consensus” (p, 5). The collegial model is characteristic of old universities in the UK, e.g. Oxford, Cambridge and a few Scottish universities. In the United States, older universities such as Harvard and Yale which were founded on the Oxbridge model retained such a framework for many decades until a typical American style of university management evolved. The dominant American model is one in which the board of trustees, a self-perpetuating organization, holds the ultimate power in universities and colleges, both public and private (Shattock, 2006).

Students of history, undoubtedly, can trace the origins of the collegial model back to 12th and 13th century when in Paris, the university was conceived to be constituted by the faculty who organized schools, offering professional training. In marked contrast over the same period, Bologna was organized differently in that students were considered to constitute the university. The leaders and owners of the university hired instructors to teach pre-selected curricula and instructors had no rights or tenure and thus could be fired at the whims of management.

iii. The Political Model: The political model arose from the circumstances of the 1960s and 1970s during which students in both continental Europe and North America demanded for a greater say in the governance of their respective universities. Collective bargaining, conflicts, give and take comprised the dominant features of the period. The resolution of such conflicting interests and demands took on a political character rather than the traditional processes and consensus building. Baldridge (1971) outlined the tenets of the political governance by showing that universities are complex microcosms of the larger society with conflicts and intrigues. There exists within universities power and pressure groups that influence decision-making. When sufficient momentum is reached, such pressures are translated into policy and during the implementation phase of the policy, feedback is generated that may become the source of new conflicts.
The problem inherent in the political model, it would appear, lies in the fact that it incorporates under its rubric all other models of governance, i.e. the bureaucratic, collegial and related models become encapsulated in the political model (Hardy, 1990).

iv. The Cybernetic Model: Robert Birnbbaum (1988) is the champion of the cybernetic model which has dominated the theoretical landscape over the last two decades. No better words can describe the theory than to quote from the source. “The cybernetic paradigm integrates existing models by suggesting how bureaucratic, collegial, political, and anarchical subsystems function simultaneously in colleges and universities of all kinds to create self-correcting institutions. The cybernetic paradigm posits that organization control systems can be described in terms of sensing mechanisms and negative feedback loops that collectively monitor changes from acceptable levels of functioning and that activate forces that return institutions to their previous stable state. These self-correction (cybernetic) processes function as institutional “thermostats” (1989, p. 239).

The cybernetic model has attracted a number of criticisms, not the least of which is its limited scope in terms of practical application. It is hard to imagine how an institution can set up sensitive sensing mechanisms in its governance structure, some of which involves handling by capricious human beings. It is even harder to imagine how structures involving human beings can be put in place to serve as negative or forward feedbacks. As pointed out earlier in this report, human beings do not behave as rational machines (Salzenick, 1947; Simon, 1958; Sandgren and Stromqvist, 2006). Another criticism against the cybernetic model is that it may work well for an organization that is well grounded and stable. In a dynamic environment where changes are brought about by rapid advances in technology, and where new learning curves emerge, the cybernetic model will not have sufficient speed and power to bring back the entire system into equilibrium (Christensen, 1997; Frank and Cook, 1996).

v. The Corporate or Managerial Model: The managerial model emerged in the past two decades from management science, particularly in connection with the notion of strategic policy making (Dill and Helm, 1988). Corporate governance emphasizes managerialism, i.e., increasing reliance on market as mechanism for decision making, (Buhbinder, 1993; Bertelsen, 2002; Fulton, 2003) and its preoccupation with efficiency and effectiveness as distinct measures of good management. A corporate model of governance in a university setting is easily discernible because managers of institutions are prevailed upon to adopt the tools of new public management such as mission statements, performance indicators, quality assurance or outcome-based evaluation process, and an obsession with continuous improvements (Meek and Hayden, 2005). The outcry for public management, per se, is fueled by neo-liberalism as a dominant ideology in economic development policy. One of the main characters of corporate governance is the use of an institution’s governing body whose members are largely non-academic, particularly those with credentials from the commercial and financial circles to control the key affairs of the institution.

Historically, the corporate model of university governance (because of its origins in neo-liberal policies) has been associated on a global scale with a number of manifestations including:

a. Cost sharing in higher education  
b. A high expectation on the part of government and the public that universities will be accountable for the expenditure of public funds
c. An increased tendency for the government to provide funds that are tied to specific priorities or are intended to support certain socio-economic activities of special interest to government.

d. Increased pressure on universities to adopt an entrepreneurial culture to generate more revenues (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Meek, 2000; Sandgren and Stromqvist, 2006).

e. Pre-occupation of the state with eliminating all forms of collective bargaining by labour unions representing university employees.

There is a wide acceptance of the corporate model of governance in higher education institutions globally and the trend is towards more acceptance (Gellert, 1993; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Bennett, 2002; Fulton, 2003; Nelson, 2005; Tommaso and Catalano, 2006; Carney, 2006) such that universities like Oxford and Cambridge have been severely criticized by the government and public alike for their reluctance to reform (Oxford, 2005; Shepherd, 2008). Other investigators, on the other hand, are clamouring for a hybrid of the collegial and managerial systems in what has been referred to as shared governance (Quinn and Moore, 1992; Ramo, 1997, 1998; Dearlove, 2002; Shattock, 2002, 2006; Coldrake et al., 2003; Fulton, 2003; Lapworth, 2004; Carney, 2006; Johnson, 2007; McMaster 2007). Tierney (2004) summarized the merit of the hybrid model when he stated:

The challenge is to create processes and structure of governance that enable academic organizations to create and sustain an experimental environment while at the same time holding onto values (Tierney, 2004, p. 114).

vi. The Governance Equaliser Model: The governance equaliser model as proposed by Schimank (2005) attempts to integrate all existing models of university governance in European countries. Schimank suggests that there are five mechanisms or modes of university governance regimes and that each mode has the capacity to influence the other mechanisms at any given time. The five mechanisms are: (1) State regulation (SR) in which the state directs universities as regards what needs to be done; essentially this is a prescription mechanism. (2) Guidance by external stakeholders (ES) takes place when advice is given by interested parties outside of academe in order to achieve the institution’s set goals. The external stakeholders may consist of intermediary bodies established by government, parliament, labour unions or industry. (3) Academic self-governance (ASG) derives authority from the traditional democratic collegial decision making and peer review. (4) Managerial or hierarchical self-governance (MSG) consists of formal hierarchical organization of universities centering on the roles and authority of vice chancellors, deputy vice chancellors, deans, directors, etc. and (5) Competition (C) for scarce resources-money, staff, students within the university and between universities.

As pointed out above, the status and position of each of these mechanisms can influence the rest of the other mechanisms, thereby determining the outcome of the decision-making process or event. Just like in an audio equaliser which enables a person to control or adjust the frequency response (tone) of a sound system, it is possible to manipulate the five mechanisms of governance in a way that gives the optimal performance under given circumstances.

A crude example of how the equaliser model works at the University of Dar es Salaam may be cited whenever Government’s support (SR) falls far short of the needs for running the university. Academic self-governance (ASG) and management self-governance (MSG) units may appeal to government, through external stakeholders (ES), e.g. University Council, for a supplementary budget. On the other hand, the same units may decide to increase student tuition fees in order to make up for anticipated deficits in the university expenditures. Management of the university (MSG) may take it upon itself to appeal directly to donors, developers and local in-
dustry for financial support or support in kind. Individual academic staff members, as an inte-
gral part of the ASG, may apply for research funds available in the public domain in order to
support their research agendas, thereby reducing their dependency on only what the univer-
sity provides. Whenever universities (MSG) work hand in hand with their parent ministry in
lobbying members of Parliament for the passage of the universities’ budgets, they are de facto
adjusting the sliders on the equaliser. The equaliser model acknowledges the perpetual pre-
sence of the different modes or mechanisms as well as recognises the inherent capacity of the
system to change the dynamics that allows relative contribution of each mode to the final out-
put. (Source UDSM Restructuring Program).
APPENDIX 3: Financial Implications
### Appendix 4: Implementation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>Reorganisation of Academic Units</td>
<td>Units converge to discuss and harmonise merger proposals</td>
<td>Focus on the overall organisational structure. Human resource considers Academic and Senior Administrative functions</td>
<td>Proposals by prospective Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>University approval process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved structure by University Policy Organs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and updates based on Council recommendations and comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>Establishment of Implementation and change management committee for oversight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>1- Submission to National Council for Higher Education (NCHE)</td>
<td>With reference to Section 3 of the MUCS on formation of constituent colleges</td>
<td>Acknowledgement and proof of commencement of approval process by NCHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2- Beginning of approval process by the NCHE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January-February 2011</td>
<td>Review of the College of Health Science Structure</td>
<td>Restructure and rationalise the departments, academic and administrative functions</td>
<td>Revised CHS structure in line with the new college structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January-April 2011</td>
<td>Reorganisation of Support Functions</td>
<td>Job analysis of support functions</td>
<td>Restructure and reorganise scale M11-Group based on functions in all Colleges</td>
<td>Revised structure and job descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of administrative and support functions and reporting relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February-June 2011</td>
<td>Verification and Gazetting</td>
<td>NCHE verification visits</td>
<td>Schedules synchronised with the NCHE</td>
<td>Constituent Colleges Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback loop to Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interim review of integration of the established colleges</td>
<td>Based recommendations and comments from the NCHE visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Deliverable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2011</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Implementation of the College system</td>
<td>beginning of new academic year August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Review of progress on implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-Dec 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Update structure according to review report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Updated College Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review status of School of Law and School of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Update status in light of review recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>