**Audit Trail Template**

*(To be completed by Project Management to show how the received comments on the draft report have (or have not) been incorporated into the review report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the report.)*

**To the comments received on (date) from the midline review of the “Independent cluster evaluation of UNITAR’s joint master’s degrees and other postgraduate non-degree programmes”**

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft review report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft review report** | **Consultant response and actions taken** |
| PM | 1 | Conclusions | Suggests that the conclusions section should be more precise but highlighting all key points from the findings | Additional conclusions added. |
| MDPU | 2 | Findings | Suggests adding on the advantages of having a “University-driven” agreement process including the flexibility it provides as it helps for developing new products and opening up to new markets and develop new joint products in an organic way. Additional agreement templates would rather have the opposite effect. | Added. |
| PTPU | 3 | Recommendation 5 | And include the importance of collaborative partnerships to focus on Agenda 2030. | Added. |
| PTPU | 4 | Recommendation 5 | Recommending we edit text on p xii para 1 'UNITAR is a training institute established within the framework of the United Nations and not an academic institution' to 'UNITAR is a training institute established within the framework of the United Nations and it welcomes collaboration with institutions of higher education and universities to deliver the SDGs' | Adjusted. |
| PTPU | 5 | Recommendation 5 | The recommendations mention ' explore the potential of accreditation for the programmes offered'.    Most of the master programmes are accredited by the universities we collaborate with. This is standard procedure since the award (i.e. certificate, diploma, or degree) is issued by the partner universities, who hold degree awarding status/powers. From UNITAR, we may issue a 'certificate of participation'. This said, some divisions do offer non-recognised or accredited master programmes. This said, my understanding is that the majority of the Master programmes/awards are issued by an accredited university partner.    The value proposition in terms of seeking institutional accreditation for UNITAR would have far more benefits, and cost savings, for UNITAR an as an institution, rather than seeking programme accreditation for programmes that do have accreditation through our university partners. | The recommendation was adjusted. |
| PTPU | 6 | Recommendation 6 | Provide clarification on feedback mechanism | Added.  A feedback mechanism in this context means “i.e. a set of procedures and tools established across the programmes for effective and timely communication between the university and participants”. This explanation was added to the report. |
| GCP | 7 | recommendations | Put more emphasis on the need for a strategic approach in the recommendations | Recommendations were adjusted. |
| PTP | 8 | Lessons learned 1 | Add peer-facilitated learning | Added. |
| PTP | 9 | Recommendation 4 | Add “and programme of study value proposition” | Added. |
| SCYCLE | 10 | overall | I had two long discussions with Eshetu as regards UNITAR’s role in higher education and science based research. And very important factors UNITAR is substantially missing in this domain are (i) a pool of experienced scientists steering such work, (ii) the accreditation, and (iii) a high-level strategic decision to develop and invest in this area.    I do not think (i) and (iii) have been substantially addressed in the evaluation. But we have to keep in mind that those who have been awarded a university BA, MA or even PhD are not automatically experienced and qualified to develop UNITAR’s higher education strategy, especially because it must differ from the present approach in many ways – and one of such is certainly the accreditation, also for meeting quality standards. But engagement in university Master Courses also requires scientific staff, who must be attracted by UNITAR and its work, requires financial resources, usually provided through competitive acquisitions, which would also not (easily) allow UNITAR’s cost-recovery policy, because universities operate in higher education in first place under a core-funding.    I think the work especially MDP does in these courses shows the way, but for increasing these activities and developing it strategically further, it also requires a high-level decision also to invest in this area. | Added.  Recommendation 6 suggests establishing a cross-division working group on joint programmes. One of the key tasks of this group is making a high-level strategic decision to develop and invest in the joint programmes, furthermore this group may also design a strategy that could include research activities in the programmes and working with a pool of experienced scientists. These suggestions were included in recommendation 6. |
| GCP | 11 | overall | “The evaluation is broadly positive and this is great to see. I am not sure that I understand the point about UNITAR needing to be accredited. Accredited to whom by whom? And the document seems to imply that some programmes are accredited and some not. So perhaps this needs to be unpacked a little more.    The point about focusing on vulnerable countries is particularly interesting. Our experience, mainly through PAGE, has been excellent in terms of developing course modules that can be embedded within existing university offers. However it no cases (Mongolia, South Africa, Mauritius, Kyrgyz) have we found opportunities for a cash return to UNITAR. This is partly because our donors might find this a bit bizarre (or might question the basis of their support for that particular area) but also because the additional costs could not be borne by the market in these countries.”    It would be great to add the comment to the audit trail and if possible unpack the accreditation a little more. | Added.  Recommendation 6 suggests establishing a cross-division working group on joint programmes. This working group will further explore and design methods and strategy of accreditation at programme or institutional level, this can be done case by case or can be started as a pilot, during this time by whom and to whom will be further analysed. This point is included in the report.  The joint programme should focus on addressing vulnerable countries without compromising the additional costs borne by the joint programme. This point is included in the report. |