IAU, founded in 1950, is the leading global association of higher education institutions and university associations. It has Member Institutions and Organisations from some 130 countries that come together for reflection and action on common concerns.

IAU partners with UNESCO and other international, regional and national bodies active in higher education. It is committed to building a Worldwide Higher Education Community.

IN FOCUS:
Innovative Approaches to Doctoral Education in Africa (IDEA)

ACTIVITIES
The new IAU Board met for the first time
Report on the GMA
IAU undertaking studies on Internationalisation and on Access and Social Cohesion in Romanian Higher Education
IAU 4th Global Survey on Internationalization

UPCOMING
IAU International Conference 2014 on Blending Higher Education and Traditional Knowledge for Sustainable Development, Iquitos, Peru, 19-21 March 2014
MESSAGE FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

OFFERING DOCTORAL EDUCATION HAS BECOME FOR SOME, A SINE QUA NON CONDITION OF A TRUE UNIVERSITY, a key indicator of research-based education and certainly an essential ingredient of innovation. Thus, the state and quality of doctoral programs, their evolution and development are at the centre of much attention, including in African higher education institutions. Doctoral education in Africa is the subject of the 'In Focus' section in this issue of IAU Horizons. The papers presented, coming from a variety of countries in sub-Saharan Africa, offer a concentrate of the challenges being addressed with more or less success, as leaders and academics strive to increase both the quality and the quantity of doctorate holders. Noting, inter alia, the absence of policy frameworks to structure doctoral education, the lack of financial resources to support their development, a very serious shortage of qualified supervisors in most countries and several other issues, the authors also report on initiatives and projects that offer possible solutions. Many of the authors are from universities that have taken part in the IAU project which has for some time now examined the ways doctoral education is changing and what models are being taken up in various universities in Africa. More information on this project is available at IAU’s new portal: www.idea-phd.net/.

Among its other regular features this issue of the IAU’s magazine includes a round-up of news from IAU Board Members who met in Salford, UK for the first Board meeting since their election in November 2012. As reported in the following pages, during the Board meeting various Working Groups and Committees were reconstituted to steer the IAU’s work on various themes in the coming months. The Board also set the working agenda for the upcoming months, confirming the plans for the IAU 2014 International Conference to take place in Iquitos, Peru in March next year. This Board meeting coincided with the 5th biennial edition of the IAU Global Meeting of Associations which invited leaders of university associations to discuss how diversity, particularly institutional diversity, impacted on their work. Association representatives from all continents noted that the concept of diversity itself can take on a variety of meanings and can certainly be both a major source of benefits for a higher educational system and a barrier in the efforts to create a strong, unified voice in support of higher education.

On the occasion of this GMA, IAU happily accepted an invitation from the Association of African Universities to hold the 6th GMA in Accra, Ghana in collaboration with AAU and the University of Ghana.

Diverse IAU activities related to the Association’s priority areas such as promoting equitable access and success in higher education or the launch of the 4th Global Survey on internationalization of higher education are also reported briefly. Institutional representatives seeking ways to get involved in the work of the IAU will also find useful information in the following pages, as we present various calls for expressions of interest for collaborating in IAU projects. And, should you not find the information you are seeking, be aware that IAU’s website is your first point of call for a variety of meanings and can certainly be both a major source of benefits for a higher educational system and a barrier in the efforts to create a strong, unified voice in support of higher education.

Eva Egron-Polak
IAU Horizons 19.2 – Highlights

**P5**
IAU ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD (2012-2016) MEETS IN SALFORD, UK

**P8**
REPORT ON THE IAU Vth GLOBAL MEETING OF ASSOCIATIONS (GMA)
“Institutional Diversity in Higher Education: Advantages or Threat for Associations?”

**P9**
IAU PROJECTS AND INITIATIVES
Including the launch of the IAU 4th Global Survey on Internationalization of Higher Education

**P18**
IN FOCUS – INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO DOCTORAL EDUCATION IN AFRICA:
13 thought-provoking papers by senior academics from Africa and beyond
IMPORTANT IAU DATES

Higher Education Policy (HEP): Special Issue on Doctoral Education in Africa
Authors have been invited to submit papers on: management issues, challenges and opportunities, networking initiatives, innovative approaches to doctoral education and training, supervision in Africa.
Contact: h.vantland@iau-aiu.net

IAU 4th Global Survey on Internationalisation of Higher Education
The Survey was launched in May 2013.
An invitation email with a link to the electronic questionnaire (available in English, French and Spanish) was sent to the Head of Institution and/or Head of International Relations of all university-level institutions listed in the IAU’s World Higher Education Database (2013). Please make sure your institution takes part.
To check, please contact: r.hudson@iau-aiu.net

Higher Education and Education for All: Call for Hosting a Workshop
The International Association of Universities is seeking partner institutions/organisations within its Membership to organise one of the four IAU Collaborative Workshops: A three-step activity to envisage Higher Education for Education for All locally that will be held in 2013 or 2014.
For more details, see the www.iau-aiu.net/content/he-efa-call-hosting-workshop

LEADHER: the next LEADHER competition will be launched in December 2013 for projects to be held in 2014.
Contact: e.boisfer@iau-aiu.net

Any higher education institution can benefit from IAU’s Internationalization Strategies Advisory Service (ISAS).
Members receive services at discounted prices. For more information: www.iau-aiu.net/content/isas or contact: r.hudson@iau-aiu.net

IAU UPCOMING INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
19-21 March 2014:
IAU INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE 2014
ON BLENDING HIGHER EDUCATION AND TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, Universidad Científica del Perú, Iquitos, Peru.

Please mark the dates and join us in Iquitos in March 2014. In the meantime please get prepared and report on activities in the fields relating to the theme of the Conference using the IAU – HESD portal (www.iau-hesd.net).
Contact: iau@iau-aiu.net

IAU PARTNERING WITH:

10-11 June 2013:
IAU-DIT SEMINAR ON THE IMPACT OF THE GLOBAL ECONOMIC CRISIS ON HIGHER EDUCATION, Institute of Technology (DIT), Dublin, Ireland

The IAU and the Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT) jointly developed a Study on the impact of the global economic crisis on higher education. An invitational international Seminar presenting and debating the outcomes of this Study took place at the DIT in Dublin, in June. For more information please read the initial results below or contact: iau@iau-aiu.net

INITIAL STUDY RESULT

The global economic crisis (henceforth Crisis) is having a profound impact on higher education: increasing pressure for higher education institutions (HEIs) to demonstrate greater relevance to and better value-for-money for individuals and society. The continuing shift to the knowledge-based economy, and the rising demand for and costs of higher education, are occurring at the same time that many governments face financial strain – with a knock-on effect on higher education budgets. At the same time, HEIs jockey for an improved position at national or international level as global rankings boost competition, placing issues of quality and performance under intense scrutiny. Faculty are

by Ellen Hazelkorn,
Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland
(ellen.hazelkorn@dit.ie)

Continued on page 4.
11-13 September 2013: IAU-EAIE EXECUTIVE PROGRAMME, 25th ANNIVERSARY EAIE CONFERENCE, Istanbul, Turkey.

The IAU and the European Association for International Education, EAIE are jointly organising an executive seminar and a special programme for university Presidents/Rectors/Vice-Chancellors during this annual conference. The Executive Seminar will take place on the Wednesday, 11 September and will focus on the role and capacity of higher education in what has been called soft diplomacy and how this compares or acts as a counterweight to the competitiveness agenda which has, for some time, provided the fuel for internationalization of higher education as well. The Executive Programme, which includes the Seminar as well as all sessions of the EAIE, is by invitation only; it is limited to 80 Heads of Higher Education Institutions. IAU as well coorganise an EDC Opening Event: Research and innovation for capacity building in African universities with the University of Lille and involving speakers from the University of Yaoundé 2, Cameroon in particular. The session will take place on Wednesday 11 September from 14h to 16. For more information on both events, please contact: iau@iau-aiu.net

7-10 October 2013: EAN WORLD CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION, European Access Network (EAN), Montreal, QC, Canada.

IAU is partnering with the European Access Network by organising the IAU Access and Success Workshop during the Conference and bringing together representatives from 30 IAU Member higher education institutions. See page 10.

16-18 October 2013: THIRD CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAS ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION (CAIE 2013), Monterrey, Mexico.

For the third time, the IAU has been invited to partner with the organizers of the Conference of the Americas on International Education that is planned for 16-18 October, 2013 in Monterrey, Mexico. The third edition of the CAIE has, as its focus, Knowledge Mobility: Responsibility and Resources. The conference is being coordinated by the Inter-American Organization of Universities (IOHE) which holds the secretariat for CAIE until 2013 in collaboration with more than 20 organizations from Canada, the USA and Latin America. It is hosted by Universidad Autonoma de Nuevo Leon and AMPEI, the Mexican association for international education. IAU has agreed to join once again the Advisory Committee for the Conference and to take part in the event which will examine the role of various actors in the processes of internationalization and discuss how best to mobilize and engage them in the interests of strengthening the quality of higher education. A large number of sessions, workshops and networking sessions are being planned. For more information and to get involved in diverse ways in the conference, please visit the new CAIE website: www.caie-caei.org.

IAU NEWS AND ACTIVITIES

NEW SERVICE AT IAU

GAJ/IAU PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

Global Academy Jobs.com

IAU is pleased to announce that it has entered a partnership with Global Academy Jobs (GAJ) – www.globalacademyjobs.com, an academic recruitment service that allow the Association to offer a new benefit to its institutional Members in good standing. Global Academy Jobs offers highly discounted rates to IAU Members when they use this academic jobs board for their recruitment needs and other services offered on the GAJ portal. GAJ’s social mission is to fund academic research and collaboration into major contemporary challenges in part through this partnership with the IAU.

Join this endeavour by:

1. Getting set-up: has your University registered with GAJ? To check please contact: IAU@globalacademyjobs.com

2. Getting on-line: upload your academic vacancies on GAJ now (see: www.iau-aiu.net/node/1085 or http://globalacademyjobs.com/).

3. Spreading the word: GAJ regularly emails academics about opportunities to collaborate and on talent development. Help us create engagement by disseminating information about this job board (thank you for copying GAJ at : talentdevelopment@globalacademyjobs.com).

To get started please contact IAU@globalacademyjobs.com and specify that you are an IAU Member.
also under pressure; calls for greater productivity and accountability challenge traditional work-practices and values.

Many of these challenges were manifest decades ago, but the confluence of factors associated with the Crisis has intensified their impact. It has become commonplace to say that HEIs need to “do more with less” but the changes being experienced now are not transitory modifications. Rather, these developments are combining to bring about a transformation in our broadly-accepted model of mass higher education. There is, however, a lack of deep-level evidence on what is actually happening in higher education: on the extent of change taking place, and on the impact on institutional priorities, quality and educational programmes, student choice and participation, resources and academic work.

An on-going study by the Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT), in association with the International Association of Universities (IAU), aims to fill this gap in the knowledge of leaders, policy-makers and researchers. Using data on 34 institutions from 29 different countries, the study focuses on five key themes: mission, strategy, finance, quality and work practices. Institutions completed a web-based self-study between August 2012 and May 2013. Every continental region is represented at least once, although the majority of institutions are from Europe (52.9%); 80% are based in metropolitan areas with populations of over 50,000 people and were established from 1900 onwards, with 38% being established since 1970. Fifty per cent of respondents described themselves are research-informed or research-intensive.

Participating institutions gathered for a Roundtable discussion on 10-11 June 2013, hosted by the Irish Higher Education Authority (HEA) to share their experiences, talk about some of the main issues and challenges they face, discuss how these issues can be addressed, and share good practices. These discussions will feed into the final report.

Preliminary results shows that the global economic crisis has affected all types and ages of HEIs with varying degrees of severity (see Figure 1). Almost 77% of respondents said the global crisis had made it more difficult for their institution to achieve its mission and goals. Fifty-six per cent respondents say they have been “quite a lot” or “very much” affected with respect to the income they receive or earn. This affects not only the total income received or earned but the proportion between different sources. HEIs anticipate that the proportion of funding received directly from government will continue to fall over the years to 2015 while the proportion of institutional income constituted by research grants is likely to increase. Interestingly, respondents think that tuition fees are likely to remain relatively static as a proportion of income.

Accordingly, HEIs are making reductions in administration support, faculty recruitment, travel to conferences and meetings, and library budgets (see Figure 2). In an effort to find a sustainable business model, HEIs are looking at making wide ranging changes, including increasing academic workload; increasing class size; reducing or ceasing recruitment of staff; re-structuring institutional departments; improving procurement practices; and reducing salary overheads.

The final report will be made available on the IAU website later in 2013; a notice about this will be included in a later version of this newsletter. In the meantime, if you would like to hear more about this study, please do not hesitate to contact Ellen Hazelkorn (ellen.hazelkorn@dit.ie).
REPORT ON IAU BOARD MEETING

THE IAU BOARD 2012-2016 MEETS IN SALFORD, UK

The IAU Administrative Board whose Members were elected at the IAU 14th General Conference last November in Puerto Rico, for a four year period, met for the first time in Manchester, U.K., just prior to the IAU 5th Global Meeting of Associations.

This meeting gave the Board members an opportunity to take stock of the complex set of issues, projects, and initiatives that have recently been developed by IAU, as well as strategizing about the future activities on the agenda of the Association. Amongst other duties, the Board reviewed the IAU’s budgets, and plan of activities and finalized the membership of the different working groups in which each board Member offered to sit and contribute to, actively. Details of the Members of each of the Working Groups, and the revised Terms of Reference are now available on the IAU website.

The IAU Board Meetings also gave Board Members the opportunity to share their perspectives on the main challenges that their institutions, countries and regions are currently facing. The observations shared in meeting are summarized below, and appear by region and in alphabetical order:

AFRICA

Professor Ambali, VC, University of Ilorin, Nigeria, indicated that due to the overwhelming influx of qualified students into the universities, the government has decided to approve the establishment of 11 new higher education institutions, including two private ones. There are currently 128 higher education institutions total in Nigeria. In addition, Nigeria has implemented entrance examination processes, along with quality assurance mechanisms which aim to assess both programmes and institutions as a whole. A recent Vice Chancellor’s meeting in the country focused on harmonization processes aimed at increasing quality of teaching and research at national level.

Sharon Siverts, VC, National University of Lesotho (NUL), noted that NUL is undergoing restructuring to improve efficiency, effectiveness and improve its programme mix in order to better cater for assisting the country in its economic development. The country has recently set up a Council for Higher Education that is responsible for quality assurance of all institutions of higher education. She mentioned that in Lesotho students receive full bursaries for their education, including tuition, housing, food and books, and this is not sustainable in the longer run, but the government is currently reviewing the situation to move to a needs based funding model for students. The institutions in Lesotho are experiencing reduced budgets due to the economy of the country. This presents many challenges for assuring high quality education.

AMERICAS

Manual Fernos, VP, Inter-American University of Puerto Rico, USA, indicated that since the November change of government, access to the Pell Grants scheme, which is a federal government scheme that distributes funding to students to pay for their university education has been revised. This has resulted in a significant decrease in the number of students. He also stated that Puerto Rico is also suffering from detrimental demographic changes. This in addition to decreasing birth rates, and the effects of brain drain due to the difficult unemployment situation on the island, has had negative impacts on HE.

Stephen Freedman, Provost, Fordham University, USA, raised the issue of affordability, employability and industry-university partnership as key issues being discussed in the US today. He also felt that Massive Open Online Courses (Moocs) were becoming central to changes in HE teaching and research in the USA.

Juan Tobias, Rector, University of Salvador in Argentina, gave a positive overview on developments in higher education in
Argentina today, indicating that there has been increase in research and overall institutional funding. He noted that much of the research funding is allocated towards innovation.

**ASIA & PACIFIC**

Anna Ciccarelli, Deputy VC and VP. University of Queensland, Australia, indicated that Australian higher education, which again suffered considerable budget cuts, is under severe pressure from outside and in. The Australian system needs to become more internationalized, yet the cost of living in Australia is high, and little funding is made available for international students who wish to enrol in Australian universities.

Pornchai Mongkhongvanit, President Siam University, Thailand, questioned the current development of quality assurance agencies and mechanisms, in Thailand, and questioned the bureaucratic impact it has had on the country’s higher education system.

Walid Moussa, President, Notre-Dame University- Louize, Lebanon, explained that the country now has only one state university, in comparison with 44 private not-for-profit higher education institutions that are licensed by the government. He felt that there is an urgent need to develop a strong quality assurance policy, in order to help properly regulate the system.

Khalid Omari, President, Jerash University, Jordan, drew attention to the fact that Jordan is an Arab country, but that it does not have oil resources. He saw the HE system of the country as being stretched because of a lack of financial investment, along with a growing population (including displaced refugees) and widespread brain drain of academic staff to other countries in the region.

Dzulkifli Abdul Razak, VC, Albukhary International University, Malaysia, and IAU President, indicated that the Malaysian government has recently gone through a review of the whole higher education system. He noted that the issue of student fees is often discussed within the country, as is the problems associated with open and unregulated access of international education providers to Malaysia.

Ytaka Tsujinaka, VP, University of Tsukuba, Japan, noted that Japan now counts 86 national Universities, 20 municipal universities and 1000 private higher education institutions. He noted that the great diversity of HE in the country calls for a redefinition of higher education’s vision. In the current globalization context the relatively low internationalization of Japanese higher education institutions is also problematic, and the aging demographic makeup of the country is impacting on HE. New developments are being sought, including an emphasis on increasing the number of foreign students. He then questioned the efficacy of quality assurance agencies, which he felt provided lots of ‘homework’, but had little notable impact on quality. He did note however that the globally competitive nature of higher education, calls for these QA systems, in order to help institutions to raise their standards and profiles by helping to improve the overall quality.

**EUROPE**

Patricia Pol, Policy Advisor for European and International Affairs, Université Paris-Est Créteil, Val de Marne, France, stressed that new reforms are underway and that these are developed through a collaborative approach between all the higher education stakeholders. The process started last autumn. A new law on research and higher education is being debated in parliament; it will call for a stronger positioning/definition of French Institutions by designing a national strategy of higher education and research that would be in line with the European priorities and with Horizon 2020 as far as research is concerned; it would aim at increasing success in the first cycle; it will call for the new “communities of universities” – a new concept that is being developed – to become more involved in innovation and technology transfers, and more attractive to foreign students. The National Agence d’évaluation de la recherche et de l’enseignement supérieur (AERES) is being submitted to change as well.

Howard Newby, VC, University of Liverpool, UK, indicated that the current political context in the UK, whereby the two political parties in the coalition government have diametrically opposed positions on higher education, which has had a detrimental effect on long-term planning on the national system as a whole. HE policy development in the UK is, he stated, currently very much about student financing of HE. Even though tuition fees have gone up to £9000 per annum, and therefore the proportion of public funding will next year be as little as 15% of teaching, politicians still act as if believe they fund 100% of the HE system and, as a result, state regulations have actually increased.
A second trend, he drew attention to was the increased liberalization of the HE system as a whole, with more and more for-profit providers entering the sector, and a rising number of UK universities establishing for-profit campuses elsewhere in the world. Finally Prof Newby indicated how successful the UK has been in research – it is 2nd best worldwide after the US, and attracts a large proportion of the EU funding available for research.

Remus Pricopie, Minister of Education, Former Rector, National university of Political Studies and Public Administration, Romania, drew attention to the impact of the global economic crisis has had on higher education in Romania. He also noted the problems countries in the Eastern Europe are facing with regards to decreasing populations, and the necessary programme merges and restructuring that this is causing.

Angelo Riccaboni, Rector, University of Siena, Italy, highlighted that universities suffered severe budget cuts which have major impacts today and will result in significant institutional changes in the future.

Daniel Hernández Ruipérez, Vice-Chancellor, University of Salamanca, Spain, noted that the country currently has 17 parallel higher education systems administered by 17different regions. He saw lack of funding as being perhaps the most important issue particularly the severe cuts being experienced by the research sector. As a result brain drain has become a very serious concern. A certain number of academics have now moved to institutions in the UK and Germany, leaving the Spanish system in a dire situation, and potentially endangering the future prosperity of the country.

ORGANISATIONS

Marianne Granfelt, Secretary General, Association of Swedish Higher Education, Sweden, underlined there has been a slight decrease in funding of education, approximately corresponding to the number of students that Sweden had from countries outside the EU/EES before the introduction of tuition fees. Research on the other hand has continued to receive increased funding. At the same time, she noted that if, on the one hand, the increased fees in the UK have resulted in more UK students coming to study in Sweden (since they are charged no tuition fees there), on the other hand, the introduction, in 2011, of tuition fees for students from outside of Europe has translated into a worrisome drop of 85% of enrolled of students from outside the EU. This is, she says, a real issue for Sweden and its future. The Government has been called upon to offer more scholarships to international students. The Swedish government is looking at the UK model for funding of research, the REF, because Sweden intends to have a new system by 2018. They – and the HE sector as a whole – also feel that not all HEIs should strive to become world class higher education institutions, and should instead value diversity in order to better serve societal needs.

Etienne Ehile, Secretary-General, Association of African Universities (AAU), indicated that quality assurance, higher education – industry partnerships, and staff exchanges were among the main topics the AAU is working on today.

Roberto Escalante, Secretary-General, Union of Latin American Universities, based in Mexico, stressed the diversity on the continent, and indicated that the main issues at stake included: the challenges of regulations and accreditation; the variety in quality assurance systems and the impact this has on national HE systems, and the creation of a Latin American space for higher education.

Godehard Ruppert, Chairman, Bavarian University Association, Germany, noted that Germany is beginning to question the issue of university autonomy again in the form of a political rollback. He also stressed the importance the German excellence initiative has had on driving change in the country.

Eva Egron-Polak concluded by stating that all governments mimic what is done elsewhere. She noted that the UK seems to
be a very important ‘model’ for others to reflect upon, in that
gear many to shift emphasis towards a funding mechanism
driven systems. She felt that if funding is driving hE systems,
then this may result in HEIs ‘losing control over the steering
wheel’.

IAU would like to again thank Prof. Howard Newby, Vice-
Chancellor University of Liverpool, for having invited the Board
to his University for a visit and a festive dinner.

REPORT ON IAU Vth
GLOBAL MEETING OF
ASSOCIATIONS (GMA V)

SALFORD, UK, 24-26 APRIL 2013

The IAU Vth Global Meeting of Associations (GMA V) was
organized by IAU in collaboration with the Northern
Consortium UK (NCUK) and the University of Salford. It took
place at the impressive “The Lowry” building, in Salford Quays,
Manchester UK.

This edition of the GMA focused on: Institutional Diversity
in Higher Education: Advantage or Threat for Association?
This theme was chosen for the meeting because it is key
challenge for most higher education organisations, networks,
and associations who are all operating in an era of rapidly
increasing numbers and types of HEIs around the world. Indeed,
this phenomenon calls for a deeper reflection on how this trend
will shape higher education globally, and what role higher
education institutions and HEI networks can play in shaping the
future landscape.

Over 70 participants took part in the day-and-a-half long
meeting, including representatives of all the major regional HE
associations: the African Association of Universities (AAU), the
European University Association (EUA), the Arab Association of
Universities (ArAU), the Union of Latin American Universities
(U DulAI), the Association of Universities of Asia and the Pacific
(AUAP), as well as the Agence universitaire de la Francophonie
(AUF), the Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU), the
Inter American Organization of Universities (IOHE) and national
associations and specialized groups from Europe, Africa and
North America and Australia.

The discussions began with a thought-provoking presentation
by Prof. Ellen Hazelkorn, on Re-imaging Higher Education:
Taking a Broader View of Diversity. She defined the concept of
diversity and drew attention to: how core tasks diverge; what
types of institutions there are; what programmes they focus on;
research led or not and how; what student and staff profiles are.
She also noted what kind of internal organizations the HEIs fare
on –, its specific significance / positioning, mission and visions
in the 21st Century; the drivers for the institutional changes
over time; the values of diversity and why it is important to
strengthen it. Her presentation is available online for you to
consult and further reflect on.

Once again the GMA allowed participants from diverse
backgrounds a a unique opportunity to interact in small groups
of peers, to exchange ideas and practices, and to network
closely with each other. There was also opportunity to learn
more about the issues at stake in the British and Irish higher
education sectors.

The report on the GMA V discussions is available online, on the
GMA webpages (www.iau-au.net/content/past-events).

IAU would like to extend special thanks to John MacKenzie,
Policy Officer to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, International, and
University of Salford for his invaluable organisational skills
which contributed greatly to the success of this event.

The IAU as well thanks its partners for its support and
i-graduate for having sponsored
this event.

www.i-graduate.org
REpORTS ON IAU pROJECTS

INTERNATIONALIZATION

IAU 4th Global Survey on Internationalization of Higher Education – now underway!

In May, the IAU launched the IAU 4th Global Survey on the state of internationalization at HEIs around the world. The electronic questionnaire was sent out by e-mail to the head of Institution and/or Head of International Relations in over 9,000 Higher Education Institutions from around the world, and included in the IAU World Higher Education Database (2013).

The Survey is available in: English, French or Spanish.

As detailed in previous issues of IAU Horizons and the IAU E-bulletin, this issue of the IAU Global Survey has benefited from the support and partnership of four organizations: The European Commission, the British Council, NAFSA, and the European Association for International Education (EAIE).

The report of the IAU Global Survey, published in 2010 included analysis of data collected from 745 institutions in 115 different countries. And IAU would like to expand on this success with this new Survey.

Please make sure that your institution takes part! The deadline to complete the Survey is the 30 July 2013.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact Ross Hudson, IAU Programme Officer at: r.hudson@iau-aiu.net

Internationalization Strategies Advisory Service (ISAS)

In early 2013, the IAU launched a call for proposals for and ISAS project with an IAU Member from Africa, which would benefitted from support of the Swedish International Development Cooperation (Sida) agency. After reviewing applications received the IAU selected – the University of Botswana.

The ISAS project is currently being developed, and the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between IAU and the university was signed at the beginning of May. An initial site visit to the University of Botswana will take place in the coming few months.

The ISAS project with University of La Rioja, Argentina has been progressing well over the past few months. Following the initial site visit to the institution by the IAU Expert Panel Chair, Madeleine Green, IAU Senior Fellow, the institution is currently undertaking the Self-Assessment exercise, based on guidelines provided by the IAU. It is expected that the institutional site visit will be taking place in September.

ISAS projects are under negotiations with other institutions in Africa, North America and Asia. Further details on these will be provided in due course.

Contact: Ross Hudson, IAU Programme Officer at: r.hudson@iau-aiu.net

IAU working on Internationalization and Access and Success in Romania

Following the recent higher education reforms in Romania, which involved, among many other initiatives, the development of a three-group classification scheme for Romanian higher education institutions and a ranking of study programs, UEFISCDI (the Executive Agency for Higher Education, Research, Development and Innovation Funding) has been awarded a large scale structural funds project to increase the capacity of public administration for evidence-based policy making: “Higher Education Evidence Based Policy Making: a necessary premise for progress in Romania”.

In order to develop a multi-dimensional analysis of Romanian higher education institutions, the project launched an open call for universities to be part of the exercise and to contribute to the overall objectives based on their institutional experience. Internationalization of higher education, and equity/social cohesion are the two main areas of government and institutional policy analysed within this project.

To implement the project, two working groups, one on internationalization (with five institutions involved) and one
on equity / social cohesion (with four institutions involved) respectively, have been established. They bring together national and international experts such as Patricia Pol (IAU Board Member, working on the internationalization aspect) and Jamil Salmi (Former Tertiary Education Coordinator at the World Bank who was involved in a project the IAU previously conducted in the field of equitable access and success in HE) as well as the institutional and agency representatives. The activity is organised in cooperation with the International Association of Universities (IAU) and is coordinated by Eva Egron-Polak. The carry out analysis and achieve the objectives of the project, a series of three Mutual Learning Workshops (MLW) and institutional study visits have been organised.

The project is highly interactive and follows a bottom-up approach. In this regard, the working groups first analysed the institutional strategies of the Romanian universities, are meeting with representatives of all the universities during individual study visits. They will also analyse the current Romanian policy in these two areas and will end by providing policy recommendations on both levels.

A final conference, which will be organised as a stakeholders’ consultation and dissemination event for this activity. It will be held in Bucharest in mid-November 2013.

**EQUITABLE ACCESS AND SUCCESS**

**IAU Equitable Access and Success Workshop at the World Congress on Access to Post-Secondary Education, European Access Network (EAN), Montreal, QC, Canada, October 7-10, 2013**

The twin goals of providing equitable access and ensuring success in higher education for as many learners as possible require a whole host of policies and actions at many levels. Undeniably, key among these are policies and mechanisms of the State since overcoming the numerous obstacles which stand in the way of various individuals and groups in most countries requires laws, funding and political will.

Yet, IAU is convinced that higher education institutions can and do bring solutions that can go a long way to achieving these goals. For the past few years, working with international experts, the IAU has focused efforts to underline why widening participation and improving the success rate for learners from minority groups (however they may be defined) is important. As well, it has worked with many institutions to examine what policies, programs and services they are putting in place so that students usually under-represented in their classrooms have the opportunity to gain higher education.

The IAU Workshop, being organized as part of the first World Congress on Access to Post-Secondary Education will bring together representatives of some 30 IAU Member institutions from as many countries around the world to share, compare and contrast their policies and approaches to improving equitable access and success. Coming together after having undertaken a structured self-review, they will be invited to analyze the opportunities and challenges they experience at the institutional level and suggest ways to address them through collaboration.

The workshop is coordinated by Eva Egron-Polak, IAU Secretary General and Élodie Boisfer, IAU Programme officer (iau@iau-aiu.net).
DOCTORAL EDUCATION IN AFRICA

The IAU Project and related initiatives

The Project on Doctoral education in Africa is benefitting from renewed commitment from the New Board. The Working Group on Doctoral Education has been renewed and its terms of reference reviewed (WGDE). The Members of the WGDE advises the Administrative Board and the Secretary General on the overall positioning of IAU within this specific but broad theme.

The Members of the Working Group are:

Chair

Ernest Aryeetey, Vice-Chancellor, University of Ghana, Ghana

Members

Abdul Ambali, Vice-Chancellor, University of Ilorin, Nigeria
Olive Mugenda, Vice-Chancellor, Kenyatta University, Kenya
Etienne Ehile, Secretary-General, AAU
Stephen Freedman, Provost, Fordham University, USA
Morshidi Sirat, Expert, University Sains Malaysia, Malaysia
Patricia Pol, Policy Advisor for European and International Affairs, Agence d’évaluation de la Recherche et de l’Enseignement Supérieur (AERES)
Goolam Mohamedbhai, Former Secretary-General AAU, Former President IAU, Former Vice-Chancellor, University of Mauritius
Phyllis Freedman, JD, Professor Emerita, University of Massachusetts, Boston, USA, Co-Editor, Journal of Public Health Policy
Nadja Gmelch, Project Manager, ACUP, Barcelona, Spain
John Ddumba-Ssentamu, Vice Chancellor, Makerere University, Uganda
Yaa Ntiame-Baidu, PhD Coordinator, University of Ghana, Ghana
Inger Lundgren, Research Advisor, Division for Research Cooperation, Dep. for Global Cooperation, Sida, Sweden
Gilles Breton, Graduate School of International and Public Affairs, University of Ottawa, Canada

Secretariat

Hilligje van’t Land, Director Membership and Programme Development, IAU

The topic is subject to a series of new initiatives and publications. One of these being the In Focus section of the issue. A great variety of papers is being published in this current issue for you to read on page 18 to 35.

Upcoming as well is a special issue on Doctoral Education in African of the peer reviewed Journal Higher Education Policy (HEP) to appear in 2014.

Please read more on the work carried out by IAU on the IAU website (www.iau-aiu.net/content/doctoral-programmes) and as well on the dedicated portal: The IAU-ACUP Portal on Innovative Approaches to Doctoral Education – (www-idea-phd.net)

The information and data collected from the institutions that take part in the IAU project on Doctoral Education in Africa have to a large extent helped determine the content and shape the structure of the IAU – ACUP Interactive portal on innovative approaches to doctoral education in Africa. Developed in partnership with them, with ACUP – the Catalan Association of Public Universities and FUOC – the Open University of Catalonia, and thanks to financial support provided by Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) and the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID), the Portal now calls for your full support.

Your institution or organisation is invited to:
1. Navigate the portal and provide IAU with feedback and comments on content and structure;
2. Provide IAU with information and documents, descriptions for inclusion in the various rubrics available; feedback on missing pieces of information, on kinds of additional information required and on new functionalities are welcome.
3. Provide IAU with the contact details of the person in charge of coordinating doctoral education at the institutional level (if such a person is appointed to run the doctoral school for instance) for future reference. Your University will receive full benefit for its contributions and will benefit from visibility online. Participation is free of charge.

Contact: h.vantland@iau-aiu.net

The IAU Project on Doctoral Education is undertaken with financial support from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida).
HIGHER EDUCATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (HESD)

Working Group on Higher Education and Sustainable Development (WG-HESD) renewed

The terms of Reference of the WG-HESD have been reviewed and adopted at the IAU Board Meeting, held in Manchester, in April. Building on the IAU Policy statement entitled: IAU Kyoto Declaration on Sustainable Development and the related activities, the Members of the WG-HESD advises the Administrative Board and the Secretary General on the overall positioning of IAU within this broad theme. More specifically the Working Group provides recommendations on initiatives and strategic partnerships to be pursued by IAU to enhance higher education’s contribution to sustainable development. The Group will also provide advice how to actively engage IAU Members and other experts in the areas as providing strategic direction for the further development of the global IAU portal on HESD (www.iau-hesd.net – see below) and will contribute to defining the IAU 2014 International Conference 2014 on Blending Higher Education and Traditional Knowledge for Sustainable Development.

The Members of the Working Group are:

Chair

Angelo Riccaboni, Rector, University of Siena, Italy

Members

Pam Fredman, Rector, Göteborg University, Sweden
Betsy Boze, President, The College of the Bahamas, USA
Juan Remigio Saldana, Rector, Peruvian Scientific University, Peru
Etienne Ehile, Secretary-General, AAU
Pornchai Mongkhongvanit, President, Siam University, Thailand
Roberto Escalante, Secretary General, UDUAL

Secretariat

Hilligje van’t Land, Director Membership and Programme Development, IAU
For further information, please contact her at: h.vantland@iau-aiu.net

The IAU Global Platform on Higher Education and Sustainable Development (HESD) fosters your actions towards sustainability online.

Our new portal on HESD is a collaborative platform aiming at centralising and disseminating information on activities and actions undertaken all over the world by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and related to higher education and sustainable development.

You can navigate the portal online at: www.iau-hesd.net and provide us with your feedback and comments on any aspect using the following form: www.iau-hesd.net/en/contact

What is available (in English and French)?

- A homepage featuring latest news, actions, projects, or documents relating to HESD; and additions featured;
- A map localising institutions and organisations actively promoting HESD;
- A global calendar listing events related to HESD;
- A database linking key charts, declarations, other key documents on HESD;
- A series of practices describing actions towards sustainability as undertaken by HEIs, organisations and the civil society;
- Research tools.

Why contribute?

- To showcase the wealth of your activities and lead others to develop similar or new innovative approaches to HESD;
- To ensure the information published on the portal to be accurate and up-to-date.
- To improve the existing information fed through desk top research and provided by Member Institutions.

Your University will receive full benefit for actions / documents / etc., submitted and full visibility online. Participation is free of charge and your input will not be re-used without your prior consent.

How can you contribute to the platform?

Everyone can contribute. The HESD Portal will bring together the whole Higher Education Community:

- Global, regional and national stakeholders: intergovernmental organisations, associations, non-governmental and not-for-profit organisations working in the field of Higher Education. Countries Administrations, Ministries of Education, Academia, HE administrators;
- Higher Education Institutions actors: thinkers, administrative staff, teachers, students

Contributions:

You can share information and promote your work by entering related projects and documents, using the submission form: www.iau-hesd.net/en/node/1413

For future reference, thank you for providing IAU with the contact details for the person in charge of sustainable development activities at your institution (if such a person is appointed), including Title, Name, Function, E-mail.

The portal is being presented at different events organised by IAU Secretariat, IAU Members and UNESCO in the context...
of the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (UN-DESD – [www.unesco.org]) and will act as
gauge indicating the involvement of HEIs in the process and adherence to the principles. Milestones to be penned down in
your agendas:

- Iquitos, Peru, March 19-21 2014 – IAU International
  Conference on Blending Higher Education, Sustainable
  Development and Indigenous Knowledge ([www.iau-aiu.
  net/content/international-conferences])
- Aichi-Nagoya, Japan, 10-12 November 2014 – UNESCO
  World Conference on Education for Sustainable Development – Learning Today for a Sustainable Future
  ([www.unesco.org/new/en/education/events/calendar-of-
  events/education-global-conferences/])

Contact: Dr. Hilligje van’t Land ([h.vantland@iau-aiu.net])

The IAU-HESD Project is undertaken with financial support from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida).

IAU PROJECT “HIGHER EDUCATION/RESEARCH FOR EDUCATION FOR ALL (AND MDGS)”

Over the past few months, the IAU Project for better inclusion of higher education (HE) and research for achieving the
Education for All (EFA) Goals, otherwise known as HEEFA, has been actively involved in building commitment within IAU
Membership.

HEEFA in the Global Action Week

In April, IAU participated in the Global Action Week (GAW), seeking support through its Membership. Every year, the
Global Campaign for Education – a civil society movement aiming at helping to
reach the goals set for EFA – launches a
Global Action Week to mobilize local and global mass support for EFA. This year’s theme was Every Child Needs a Teacher. GAW took place from 21 to 27 April 2013, with additional activities carried out until June 2013. Since teacher education often
takes place at the higher education level, IAU took part through the support of Education Departments/Faculties from Member institutions. IAU launched an information campaign through emails, the IAU website and HEEFA Portal, to draw attention to higher education’s contribution through teacher education. Teacher education institutions were invited to send in information about what they were doing to improve child learning through quality teacher education; run a GAW campaign in their faculties; post their activities on the HEEFA Portal. IAU registered this action on the GAW website.

Capacity Building: Call for Participation and new Reports

A call for participation was launched in April inviting IAU Membership to organise one of the four IAU Collaborative Workshops entitled: A three-step activity to envisage Higher Education for Education for All locally. Developed and implemented with the IAU Reference Group on HEEFA, these Workshops bring together high-level representatives from the higher education and research community, the Ministry of Education and other levels/sectors of education, civil society and UNESCO. Challenged to think out of box, participants reflect on their own experience, analyze the local context, and collectively development a concrete plan for a way forward to ensure greater higher education input in achieving EFA. Four Workshops will be held in 2013 and 2014.

The final reports from the collaborative workshops held in Kathmandu, Nepal in December 2012 (host: Tribhuvan University) and Nairobi, Kenya in January 2013 (host: University of Nairobi) are now available on the IAU website.

Want to host a Collaborative Workshop? Contact the HEEFA Team at IAU: Nadja Kymlicka ([n.kymlicka@iau-aiu.net]) and Isabelle Turmaine ([i.turmaine@iau-aiu.net]).

More on the HEEFA Project at: [www.iau-aiu.net/content/efamdgs]

The HEEFA Project is undertaken with financial support from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida).
**IAU PROJECT FOR ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS ON OPEN EDUCATION RESOURCES (OER) USE, REUSE, AND PRODUCTION**

A Call for Participation was launched by the IAU for a Validation Workshop, the first stage of the new IAU Project for Academic Librarians on Open Education Resources (OER) use, reuse, and production. Focusing on Africa, the Validation Workshop is being organised by the IAU and will be held in Accra, Ghana from 12 to 13 September 2013 and will be organised in collaboration with the Association of African Universities (AAU) – an IAU Member organization.

The Validation Workshop aims to obtain feedback from the Academic library community on the IAU OER Project; work on more ways forward towards its’ implementation and to get more OER stakeholders and academic librarians involved in the possible roles that they can play for the development of OER in Africa.

To find out more about the project, see [www.iau-aiu.net/content/oer-project-call-participation](http://www.iau-aiu.net/content/oer-project-call-participation).

**Contact:** Amanda Sudic ([a.sudic@iau-aiu.net](mailto:a.sudic@iau-aiu.net)) and Isabelle Turmaine ([i.turmaine@iau-aiu.net](mailto:i.turmaine@iau-aiu.net)).

The OER Project is undertaken with financial support from the UNESCO participation programme.

---

**LEADHER**

The Selection Committee of the IAU LEADHER programme selected four of the 15 proposals submitted by IAU members. This brings the number of grants allocated for 2013 to a total of six (Please see table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>RESEARCH AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUTUMN 2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Moi University | Kenya | * Research training, in particular innovative approaches to doctoral programmes; * Research capacity building through internationalization.
| Alexandria University | Egypt | |
| University of Salford | United Kingdom | * Research training, in particular innovative approaches to doctoral programmes
| University of Ilorin | Nigeria | |
| **WINTER 2012-2013** | | |
| The National University of Lesotho | Lesotho | * Developing research mission, research policy and research development strategy * Research planning, organization and management * Research training, in particular innovative doctoral programmes * Innovative approaches to research capacity building via cooperation * Research capacity building through internationalization
| Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University | South Africa | |
| Sahlgrenska Academy, University of Gothenburg, Institute of Medicine | Sweden | * Research planning, organization and management * Research training, in particular innovative doctoral programmes
| Institute of Medicine, Tribhuvan University | Nepal | |
| European Humanities University | Lithuania | * Innovative approaches to research capacity building via cooperation * Research capacity building through internationalization
| Moldova State University | Moldova | |
| Open University of Catalunya | Spain | * Research training, in particular innovative doctoral programmes * Collection, maintenance and dissemination of research results (publications, patents, products etc.)
| Kenyatta University | Kenya | |
| ACUP | Spain | |

The next LEADHER competition will be launched in December 2013 for projects to be held in 2014. More information about the grant programme is available online at: [www.iau-aiu.net/content/leadher](http://www.iau-aiu.net/content/leadher).

**Contact:** Elodie Boisfer, IAU Programme Officer at: [e.boisfer@iau-aiu.net](mailto:e.boisfer@iau-aiu.net).
Since the last issue of IAU Horizons went to press, IAU was represented at the following events:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OECD – Measuring Learning Outcomes in Higher Education: Lessons learnt from the AHELO Feasibility Study and next steps</td>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan Student Services Organisation (JASSO) 2013 International symposium – What works: Assessment Tools and Indicators for University Internationalization</td>
<td>Tokyo, Japan</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-DESD Reference Group Meeting – Preparing the global programme framework for ESD after 2014</td>
<td>UNESCO, Paris, France</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUA Annual Conference, European Universities – Global Engagement</td>
<td>Ghent, Belgium</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAHEC’s 15th North American Higher Education Conference on Towards a Sustainable Future: The Role of International Education</td>
<td>Edmondon, Canada</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Assembly Association of Francophone Universities – AUF</td>
<td>Sao Paolo, Brazil</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International GUNI 2013 Conference</td>
<td>Barcelona, Spain</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISIC Conference, Copenhagen</td>
<td>Copenhagen, Denmark</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2nd Annual Global Meeting of the Global Research Council (GRC)</td>
<td>Berlin, Germany</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAN Conference</td>
<td>Strasbourg, France</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Social and Economic Crisis on Higher Education Dublin Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Dublin, Ireland</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Conference on “Sustainable Development Solutions for the Mediterranean Region”</td>
<td>Pontignano, Siena, Italy</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UPCOMING. SHOULD YOU WISH TO MEET WITH IAU REPRESENTATIVES TO TAKE PART IN THE FOLLOWING CONFERENCE PLEASE CONTACT US IN ADVANCE AT: IAU@IAU-AIU.NET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAIE</td>
<td>Istanbul, Turkey</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Access Congress</td>
<td>Montreal, Canada</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKEPT Workshop on internationalisation</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBIE</td>
<td>Vancouver, Canada</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHEF 2013</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IAU is pleased to welcome new Members who joined and re-joined the Association since March 2013.

INSTITUTIONS

Xi’an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, China
www.xjtlu.edu.cn/en

Noorul Islam Centre for Higher Education, India
www.niceindia.com

S.D. Asfendiyarov Kazakh National Medical University, Kazakhstan
www.kaznmu.kz

Rafik Hariri University, Lebanon
www.rhu.edu.lb

Lincoln University College, Malaysia
www.lincoln.edu.my

Greenwich University, Pakistan
www.greenwichuniversity.edu.pk

Universitat de Vic, Spain
www.uvic.cat

Prince Mohammad Bin Fahd University, Saudi Arabia
www.pmu.edu.sa

The University of West London, UK
www.uwl.ac.uk

RE-JOINING INSTITUTIONS

University of Melbourne, Australia
www.unimelb.edu.au

University of Regina, Canada
www.uregina.ca

University of Monterrey, Mexico
www.udem.edu.mx

IAU by numbers
As of 30 May 2013, IAU counts 634 institutions (including 6 observers), 29 Member Organisations; 15 Affiliates and 19 Associates.

OBERVERS

Cyprus university of Technology, Cyprus
www.cut.ac.cy

American University in the Emirates, United Arab Emirates
www.aue.ae

AFFILIATES

Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario, Canada
www.heqco.ca

European Access Network (EAN), www.ean-edu.org

ASSOCIATES

Prof. J.D. Amin, Vice-Chancellor Federal University Dutse, Nigeria

HEP editor on the move!

Jeroen Huisman, Editor, Higher Education Policy (HEP), moves to Ghent, Belgium

After having spent eight years at the University Bath, UK. Prof Huisman takes up a new position at the University of Ghent, starting May 1, 2013. He received an Odysseus grant from the Flemish Research Council, to focus his research on Higher Education Governance. He’ll stay on as editor of the IAU peer reviewed journal Higher Education Policy, for the IAU.

WANT TO ENHANCE YOUR VISIBILITY?

Bring your programs, projects and other activities to the attention of the broader higher education community in IAU Horizons!
For advertising options, please contact r.hudson@iau.aiu.net
Xi’an Jiaotong-Liverpool University

Xi’an Jiaotong-Liverpool University (XJTLU) is an independent Chinese university that fuses best practice in Western and Chinese higher education, to produce graduates who are well placed to succeed in a global economy. XJTLU is the largest international collaborative university of its kind in China and one of the largest branch campuses in the world.

Located within Suzhou Industrial Park, one of the fastest growing industrial zones in the world, XJTLU’s teaching strategy blends the emphasis on personal development and social responsibility that is intrinsic to learning in China with the problem-solving and active learning elements of a Western education.

XJTLU is also unique in having dual degree awarding powers, from the Chinese Ministry of Education and from the University of Liverpool. The university has grown rapidly and now has a total on-campus undergraduate population of nearly 6,000 students, with a further 1,500 studying at the University of Liverpool.

University of Liverpool Vice-Chancellor, Professor Sir Howard Newby, said: “We aim to give Liverpool and XJTLU students the opportunity to become global citizens, benefiting from an international curriculum and experience, as well as enhanced employability in the global market place.”

From the second year of study, all programmes are delivered exclusively in English with the aim of developing international-calibre graduates with an excellent command of English and a high degree of inter-cultural awareness and sensitivity. Students registering at XJTLU have various options for study available to them, and, after two years they are able to transfer to Liverpool to complete their degree, known as a ‘2+2 route’.

Professor Youmin Xi, Executive Vice-President of XJTLU, said: “The University has already gained a high profile across China and it is astonishing how fast the institution is expanding. Our vision is to become a research-led international university in China, with unique features in teaching and learning, research, social service, education and management philosophy.”

As part of an ambitious expansion agenda, the XJTLU is involved in a large-scale campus development programme providing world-class laboratory and teaching facilities. This expansion will accommodate 10,000 students on campus by 2015.

The University recently opened a business school which focuses on accounting and finance; management and business; and economics. The Business School is planning to intensify its research activity and develop greater business engagement.

Crucial to the development of a vigorous research environment is the presence of research students. The first cohort of PhD students is being recruited to research projects across all sectors of activity at XJTLU. Many of these students are co-supervised by staff in Suzhou and Liverpool and, in many cases students have the opportunity to spend research time at Liverpool.

Find out more: www.xjtlu.edu.cn/en/

IAU IS PLEASSED TO ANNOUNCE THAT

on 19 June 2013 the UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG, SWEDEN, has been selected as the winner in the “Building category for the International Sustainable Campus Network Excellence Awards”, and ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY, CHINA received the Excellence in Student Leadership Award from by the International Sustainable Campus Network (ISCN). ISCN “provides a global forum to support leading colleges, universities, and corporate campuses in the exchange of information, ideas, and best practices for achieving sustainable campus operations and integrating sustainability in research and teaching.” The “Excellence in Buildings Award recognizes campus construction projects – single or a series of new or retrofitted buildings – that show outstanding performance in energy efficiency, minimal CO₂ or other environmental impacts and/or other sustainability relevant aspects.” The Excellence in Student Leadership “is given to outstanding student projects or campaigns contributing to the sustainable campus and encouraging other students to start their own initiatives to make a difference.”

The ISCN is supported and directed by École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL) and The Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (ETH Zurich) – both are as well Members of the IAU.

For more information: www.international-sustainable-campus-network.org/
Universities around the world are the “thought leaders and knowledge providers in the required structural transformation process for the economy” (Aryeetey). To live up to this assumption and expectation, higher education institutions need to constantly enhance their teaching and research in order to generate the kind of research required to trigger innovation around the world. The same obviously applies to institutions in Africa.

To contribute significantly to the global debates, to ensure that the African institutions generate the kind of “experts and leaders of solutions” the African continent needs (Lungren), Higher Education leaders in the continent are rethinking African doctoral programmes and their management. The rethinking and reform processes initiated over the last two decades are bearing fruits (Ambali, Malete, Lima Fortes), yet they need to be pursued and developed further.

In order to contribute and stimulate the process, the IAU initiated the www.idea-phd.net Portal on Innovative Approaches to Doctoral Education in Africa (IDEA). Developed in partnership with Association for Catalan Public Universities (ACUP), it provides examples on how to develop and manage a PhD; shares information on very diverse national and international Projects and Initiatives; presents HEI profiles and lists various Funding opportunities. It also lists events relating to the topic and will soon become an exchange platform for leaders, programme managers and researchers administrators.

This In Focus section follows the same ‘logic’ in that it presents a series of papers contributed by experts from around Africa and beyond, in which they share their views on how to foster Capacity building, institutional reform and innovation, address the key challenges institutions face, in particular with regards to supervision, and discusses funding needs.

**Capacity Building**

African HEIs strive to ensure quality teaching and research in order to deliver the number of quality students wishing and capable of undertaking and successfully completing a doctoral programmes in a set time that the continent needs to address the challenges it faces. Some African HEIs need to develop into ‘world class’ universities (Aryeetey) to attract the right professors, researchers and students from the continent and abroad who will jointly generate the kind of research needed locally, regionally and globally. Papers published here stress the importance to further reform and restructure doctoral programmes claiming that they should be
able to perform better. Papers draw attention to the research is being carried out at IAU, EUA, ACU and ACUP projects, and by Cross and Backhouse, to enable institutions to compare, revisit, reform and enhance their doctoral programmes and their management practices strategically (Lundgren, Aryeetey, Lima Fortes, Sy).

**Supervision**

For doctoral students to become true researchers, autonomous critical thinkers, decision makers and innovators, who are able to develop original research questions – and even good communicators and true research ambassadors -, they need to be accompanied, trained and supervised adequately throughout their doctoral studies (Boughey and McKenna, Wainaina Mwaura). This is a challenge in itself since, with the massification of higher education on the one hand and the limited capacity at many institutions and far as academic and administrative staff is concerned, there are not enough supervisors available (see: Wainaina Mwaura). In addition, in order for supervision to be of quality, the authors argue that much attention needs to be devoted to training the trainers and supervisors adequately (Boughey and McKenna, Wainaina Mwaura). E-supervision is one avenue being investigated (see: Gmelch and Vilalta). The further development of solid, open and ‘equitable’ institutional and inter-institutional partnerships locally, regionally and internationally is also being investigated (see: Lima Fortes, Malete, Jorgensen, Aryeetey).

**The role of funding**

Substantial financial support is obviously essential. But funding should not only be sourced from international donors, as was and is often the case. Aryeetey, Ambali and Malete make the case for national university systems and individual institutions to be strengthened by governments to ensure the relevance of teaching and research locally and to ensure financial sustainability and, as a consequence, sustainability of programmes and HE systems as a whole (see: Lima Fortes, Lundgren, Ajai Ajagbe, Matondi and Tibugari).

**Studies**

Examples of exchange platforms offered by international organisations, like the EUA, ACU, ACUP and IAU, to promote inter-institutional dialogue and understanding and help enhance the development of networks, innovative partnerships and new cooperation are being highlighted. The papers give examples of research carried out in close cooperation with local institutions and experts have triggered innovative reform process (Ambali, Wainaina Mwaura, ACUP, ACU for instance). A number of new projects are also presented (ACU, IAU, ACUP, Cross and Backhouse).

To contribute to the discussions and to enhance the portal, please go to the following website www.iau-aiu.net/content/doctoral-programmes or contact the IAU at: h.vantland@iau-aiu.net

---

**Restructuring PhD Programmes at the University of Ghana**

by Ernest Aryeetey, Vice Chancellor, University of Ghana

(aryeetey@ug.edu.gh)

The University of Ghana has recently begun a process of recreating itself with a view to becoming more relevant to society and becoming globally competitive. The mantra is to become world-class. The University, a public university, is currently in negotiations with the education authorities in Ghana, to be classified as a research university. The need to become a research university is driven by the urgency associated with becoming a thought leader and knowledge provider in the required structural transformation process for the economy. A good research university must, necessarily, equip itself with a good graduate training programme.

**Existing PhD Programme**

The 3-year PhD programme that has been run at the University of Ghana for several decades is largely described as being based on research only. It is quite similar to what has obtained in most U.K. universities for many years. It is fairly informal in the sense that requirements for graduation are general with very little indication of what PhD candidates should generally be capable of. As a result of its limited structure, students with weak research backgrounds have always struggled to complete on time. Over the last decade, an average of 12 persons graduated with PhDs annually.

**New PhD Programme**

The new programme is intended to prepare larger numbers of students to undertake independent rigorous research using the best methods offered by a variety of disciplines. It seeks to show the student how to apply and test received knowledge in a rigorous manner, taking into account both global and local conditions. The new programme, which starts from August 2013, seeks to impose a clearly determined structure on what a PhD candidate should generally be capable of. As a result of its limited structure, students with weak research backgrounds have always struggled to complete on time. Over the last decade, an average of 12 persons graduated with PhDs annually.

A major departure from the old programme is that all PhD programmes are now to be done in a minimum of four years. In the first year of the programme, students are required to undertake their planned research. The course work will focus largely on advanced concepts and research methods. They will...
employ the most appropriate pedagogical approaches. This will be comparable to what may be found in many North American universities for example.

In the second year of the programme, students are expected to engage in practical training for research. This is a unique Ghanaian introduction. During that year, PhD students will be expected to join research teams and projects to organize and conduct research. Through this, students engage in a period of ‘apprenticeship’ with their professors and other senior researchers to develop their skills in the conduct of research. The outcomes of their contributions to such projects will be presented at seminars and assessed towards their degree programme. The last two years of the new PhD programme are devoted to the writing of student thesis.

Internationalization and Partnerships

The University of Ghana recognizes the need to establish the credibility and respectability of its new PhD programmes from the beginning. While planning to scale up considerably admissions into PhD programmes, this will not be done at the expense of the quality of the programmes. Each department or unit running such programmes will be required to show that it has the necessary human and other resources to run a high quality programme. Partnerships with well-established universities in other regions are being developed to ensure that the teaching and supervision of students can be done by highly qualified and capable local and international academics. A number of good European and North American universities have agreed to partner with UG in this venture.

It is intended that PhD programmes at the University of Ghana should be available to international students. The new programmes seek to draw students from other African countries as well as from Europe, Asia and Americas. The idea is to offer students as much training, guidance and opportunity as they would have had in Europe or America. As part of this scheme, it is planned that, whenever possible, students will spend part of their training period in other world class institutions for the purpose of giving them adequate exposure to international standards.

The Direction of Doctoral Research in Nigeria

by Abdul Ganiyu Ambali, Vice-Chancellor, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria (aambali076@yahoo.com)

It is incontestable that developmental endeavours without a research-driven strategy would ultimately amount to an exercise in futility. This is evidenced further by the submission of the Committee of Deans of Postgraduate Schools (CDPGS) of Nigerian universities in 2012 that “contrary to leading economies of the world that devote at least 5% of their GDP to research, Nigeria gives only 0.09% for research”. In this type of situation, the need for reboisting research and revolutionising the doctoral programme is considered urgent and Nigeria cannot afford to be left out.

In the realisation of this need, Nigerian universities in recent years began to embark on a number of initiatives to address the situation. The University of Ilorin, rated the best University in Nigeria, took a lead in this dimension when in 2007 it suspended a requirement that expected its academic staff to spend a minimum period of two years within the University before they could embark on further studies, especially PhD. Since then, every academic staff member is encouraged and motivated to pursue doctoral research anywhere in the world without even spending a day in class.

At that time, not many people appreciated the import of that strategy as it was considered odd in some circles that the University would be training people who had not been engaged in teaching. What people did not realised at that point was that good teaching itself is research-impelled, research-compelled and research-driven. In other words, it is research that accords currency and vibrancy to teaching and a strategy to improve teaching itself is to train the academic staff and equip them with higher degrees.

The gains of this initiative would emerge few years later when, in 2012, the regulatory National Universities Commission declared the University of Ilorin as one of the best staffed universities in Nigeria with more than 60% of its academic staff having the highest academic qualification or PhD. Many universities have towed a similar line as the compelling truth becomes obvious that without investment in research which takes place at the postgraduate level, the quest for development would remain a mirage.

While encouraging postgraduate training abroad, the Nigerian universities, especially the University of Ilorin, are also increasing the capacity for doctoral training at home. In what has been considered as “the PhD revolution” (Unilorin Bulletin, January 28, 2013, p.3), the University of Ilorin has tapped various opportunities it purposefully attracted to reboot its PhD programmes. The University hosted a study and research seminar of the International Association of Universities (IAU) on the theme of “The Changing Nature of Doctoral Programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa” in 2010 where, besides the six pilot institutions from Kenya, Senegal, Cameroun, Republic of Benin and Nigeria (represented by the host University), in which many Nigerian universities took part.

The inter-university comparative study resulting from the IAU project led the University to appreciate that while the sky remains its beginning, it is flying in the right direction and
IN FOCUS – INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO DOCTORAL EDUCATION IN AFRICA

Gaining altitude. The 2010 IAU seminar was complemented with an Academic Retreat and Postgraduate Research Supervision and Courseware Development that the University held at another university between August 14 and 18, 2011, which provided a comprehensive framework for enhancing the quality and quantity of doctoral programmes. The University also actively participated at the seminar on “Innovative Approaches to Doctoral Education and Research Training in Sub-Saharan Africa”, which was jointly organised by both the IAU and the Association of Catalan Public Universities (ACUP) from July 11 to 13, 2012 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

With the gains and insights from such encounters, the University has been able to combine its keen vision for a globally-competitive standard of doctoral programmes with a sense of mission in actualising it. The result is striking as the University has become a true hub for doctoral research and training. From 19 doctoral graduates produced by the University in 2007, the number increased to 38 in 2008, 80 in 2009 and 83 in 2010. The figure declined a bit to 72 in 2011 but peaked again to 83 in 2012.

03 Innovative Approaches to Doctoral Education in Africa: A Pathway to Economic Development and Social Transformation

by Leopetswe Malete, Associate Professor & Director, Office of International Education & Partnerships, University of Botswana, Gaborone, Botswana (maletel@mopipi.ub.bw)

The call for innovative approaches to doctoral education in Africa couldn’t be more relevant today. It is made even more important by the rapidly changing global economic landscape and heightened competition for resources. Africa’s development potential lies in the continent’s ability to exploit its huge resource endowments to build knowledge economies. This should enhance Africa’s contribution to the global economic debate. Without deliberate plans to improve the capacity and quality of doctoral training, the growth of African higher education will stagnate and Africa will continue to underperform in many key development indicators. But most African higher education institutions and policy makers are yet to make postgraduate education part of the debate on economic development and social transformation.

Training abroad has significant benefits as it offers much needed global perspectives. However, if done in excess it can undermine domestic growth, access and participation in tertiary education. It accounts for Africa’s brain drain. One controversy is the relevance of education acquired abroad to addressing Africa’s peculiar development challenges. This is in light of the number of those in African leadership and educated abroad and the magnitude of the continent’s problems. Growing doctoral education at home should enhance the capacity of higher education institutions. It will have spinoffs across the various levels of education and other sectors of the economy. For this to happen there must be institutional creativity and innovation.

The few known examples of innovative approaches to postgraduate education in Africa show a lot of promise on issues of access, capacity building and sharing of resources. The Masters level programmes that the University of Botswana participates in use such approaches as block release and thesis workshops. These are the Masters in Development Practice and the African Economic Research Consortium. For the purpose of this discussion, notable doctoral level programmes are: the DocLinks programme funded by the European Union; the Leadership Development for Higher Education Reform (LEADHER) project, supported by Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SAREC/Sida) and International Association of Universities; The University Science, Humanities and Engineering Partnerships in Africa (USHEPIA) supported by various donor agencies including the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, the Coca Cola Foundation, the Ridgefield Foundation and Andrew W. Mellon Foundation; and the Partnership for Africa’s Next Generation of Academics (PANGeA).

The main objectives of the DocLinks and LEADHER programmes were to facilitate knowledge sharing between the groups of academic leaders, doctoral candidates and early career researchers from Europe and Africa. Emphases were on innovative approaches to doctoral education, research capacity building through partnerships as well as contextualization of global challenges. The two programmes promoted an ideal where bringing together diverse perspectives and worldviews could be a key to addressing global challenges, especially in the context of limited resources. The Intra-African Caribbean and Pacific Academic Mobility scheme supported by EU promotes the same ideal. African institutions should adapt this approach to build doctoral education even in the absence of support from developed country institutions. This should enhance academic quality and sharing of resources while creating opportunities for joint programmes, strong regional cooperation and international understanding.

The USHEPIA and PANGeA programmes, led by University of Cape Town and Stellenbosch respectively, follow the above stated ideal and are among the few conceived in Africa. They are visionary and very innovative in that they sought to leverage donor funding to support fulltime doctoral studies of staff from partner universities in an African University. The partnerships have a very good regional spread.
The scholarships coming through these programmes are significant, especially considering the limited resources. This also comes with huge benefits to the capacity of the host institution’s postgraduate education. This should be true for the USHEPIA programme which ran for over 15 years. African higher education needs many of these kinds of examples. The major weakness of the USHEPIA programme was in offering programmes at only one institution given the level of donor support and the potential multiplier effect of multisite training on the capacity of graduate education at other partner institutions. The approach also raises questions about equity and fairness in the implementation of multilateral partnerships. The PANGeA programme had some teething challenges but is currently ensuring that equity and reciprocity are at the centre of programme implementation.

In conclusion, the success of African higher education will depend largely on targeted innovative approaches and commitment to the development of high quality doctoral education at both national and regional level. To achieve this, institutions in collaboration with policy makers could take the following steps:

1. Dedicate internal resources to the development of doctoral education to support scholarships, research, and research infrastructure and faculty incentives.
2. Forge strong collaborative partnerships with industry for skills transfer and funding.
3. Forge smart regional and international partnerships for student and staff exchanges, research and curriculum development and resource mobilisation.
4. Ensure reciprocity, respect, and fairness are built into international partnerships.
5. Be proactive in the development of doctoral training needs and use models that are relevant to African contexts.
6. Carry out continuous assessments of programme quality, relevance and possible career paths of doctoral candidates.
7. Promote creativity and entrepreneurship in programme development and delivery.

**Research & doctorate programs in Africa: the need for genuine approaches**

by Paulino Lima Fortes,
Professor of Mathematics,
University of Cape Verde (Paulino.
fortes@docente.
univ.cupev.cu)

The UNESCO data on higher education and science all over the world shows that there is an imbalance in terms of research conditions when comparing sub-Saharan African countries with American, European or Asian countries. It is an imbalance that has no immediate resolution, but medium and long-term strategies must be developed in order to address the issues at stake. In this globalization era, the demand for balances has become one of the main objectives of global and local politics for the harmonious development of humankind.

Doctoral programs in Africa should aim to train research and development and to foster innovation (R + D + I) leaders, man and women, as a policy to secure sustainable development. Although the *Human Development Report 2013* (UNDP 2013) presents a great ascent of the South, 33 countries among the 42 of the countries listed with very low human development are located in sub-Saharan Africa.

**Is there specific research in Africa?**

Sub-Saharan Africa is a part of the continent with much specifics: (a) Low human development index (0.475 according to UNDP 2013) – which indicates low education, deficient health care, gender inequality; (b) Existence of vast untapped natural resources and territories; (c) Unstudied socio-cultural niches; (d) Very young population.

The hope for sustainable development of Africa lies in the systems of research and higher education. For research to contribute to sustainable development and to innovation in sub-Saharan Africa, it must have local roots, which should give specifiers and embasement features. The upstream beyond the universal knowledge base should take into account: (a) Local scientific and cultural knowledge; (b) The working conditions and availability of researchers (usually very weak because of too much occupation with classes, low salaries, large families); (c) Local means of communication (usually insufficient).

Downstream research should aim at: (a) Local people and the country, the region and the continent; (b) The human capacity and enterprise and industrial applications (including crafts), with a strong penchant for solving local socio-economic problems; (c) The contribution to social progress of mankind as a whole.

**Will there be an African science?**

Science is knowledge shared and accepted by peers. Who are the Africans experts and peers? Will there be an African science?

Due to the undeveloped state of research in Africa, the scientists on the continent look for peers in developed countries in the North. This parity tends to be deficient because it can only give effect in relation to the characteristics of science, technology and research, prevalent in North developed countries. It is unlikely that this will lead to sustainable development and innovation in Africa. Hence the need for African scientists to create African network parity and
to foster ‘African validation of knowledge’. The establishment of multilateral partnerships between universities, mobility between African scientists and the creation of common doctoral and post-doctoral programs are strategies that ultimately will foster the consolidation of African science.

Fundamentals of doctoral programs in Africa

The innovative doctoral programs in Africa should be based on the production of staff capable of directing research programs that aim at development and innovation of use in African realities, i.e., considering the specificities of Africa. Innovative doctoral programmes should also provide scientific and technological South-South parities for the validation of the knowledge produced in the South. This strategy, in addition to contributing directly to reducing the brain drain, allows counterbalancing European, American or Asian standards, with African ones, of equal quality. Strong doctoral programs with empowerment of science and scientists in the South are advantageous for North scientists too since it will allow to tackle African issue and research topics which may be very different yet rich and of use to the North as well. A strong African system of science is a need worldwide.

Africa Science financing Quo Vadis

African parity has Africans costs. There are several African university networks, thematic networks, networks of academies, many of which are funded by international and Northern and Nordic organizations. Few African countries fund research systems in a regular and on a consistent basis, say a fixed percentage of GDP. Peering demands communication and mobility. As long as it will be easier for an African researcher to secure funding to move away and out of Africa then to another African country, the African parity will not be achieved. Also, while it is easier for an African to get a doctoral scholarship for non-African countries then for African ones, the critical number of scientific researchers with African cultural roots, required for a new world order will not be attained. Changing this dynamic is essential and even crucial; generating a strong African network of higher education, science and innovation is essential for all and will require African governments to commit and provide the adequate funding required.

Meeting the Challenges of Changing needs in Postgraduate Education and Research Training: The Case of Kenyatta University

The University

Kenyatta University is the second largest public university in Kenya that dates back to 1965 when the British Government handed over the then Templar Barracks to the new government of Kenya. The Barracks were converted into a college, then known as Kenyatta College, which has from then grown to the present day Kenyatta University offering certificates, diplomas and degrees in disciplines ranging from medicine, law, engineering, pure and applied sciences, humanities and social sciences to education.

Objectives and Target in Postgraduate Training

In her 2005 – 2015 Strategic and Vision Plan, Kenyatta University identified the increase of postgraduate students and programmes as one of its strategic objectives under the teaching and learning key priority area. Also, to enhance teaching, learning and research, the University identified the increase of staff with PhDs as one of the strategies to be applied. In order to create an institutional framework which would support and facilitate these objectives, the university established the Graduate School with administrative, oversight and advisory functions in the execution of its mandate towards the attainment of these objectives.

Due partly to the role played by the Graduate School and the expansion of the University through increased number of Schools (from 6 Schools in 2006 to 14 Schools in 2013) and programmes and, increased access through diversification of modes of delivery, (from regular residential mode to Open, Distance and e-Learning and continuing education through the Institutional Based Programmes) the strategic objective to increase postgraduate student population has been met with over 7,147 students being currently enrolled in various Masters programmes in the University. Additionally, 314 PhD candidates are currently enrolled. In relation to increasing the number of teaching staff with PhDs, the University has over the last 6 years increased that number from less than 30% to 55% with a target of raising that percentage to 70% in the next three years. Notably, the University has graduated over 300 PhDs over the last seven years. This rapid expansion has brought with it certain supervision challenges.

Supervision Challenges and proposed solutions

The rapid expansion of University programmes has had a strain on the supervising staff. The University policy on supervision
is that only staff with PhDs can supervise Masters and PhD students and that Masters students must be supervised by at most two supervisors (Graduate School Board can approve a third supervisor under special and specified circumstances) and, at most three supervisors for the PhD. With the glut of postgraduate students, teaching departments have found it increasingly hard to meet this requirement of supervision per student. The University has therefore adopted intervention measures to address this challenge. The Graduate School has developed and adopted an e-Supervision policy. This policy is meant to tap into supervisory competencies that exist outside the University. With this policy, departments are allowed to identify potential supervisors in other Universities and have them supervise Kenyatta University postgraduate students online. The implementation of the policy however requires the establishment of a database of potential supervisors from other institutions. To ensure the successful implementation of the policy, the Graduate School has been reaching out to regional and international higher education organizations and institutions like IAU in order to build a database of supervisors in different disciplines from which the departments can choose from.

Another challenge in relation to supervision is ‘rookie’ supervisors due to the pressure to supervise that is put on new PhD holders. Because of the need to increase the number of supervisors, departments are only too eager to assign supervision to newly graduated students. The Graduate School appreciates that such newly graduated students would need a reasonable period of apprenticeship to become competent supervisors. In the past, the Graduate School has been giving orientation to these newly graduated PhDs. It has however become increasingly clear that more needs to be done especially in the area of policy since the decision of who should supervise and when, was largely left to the teaching departments. The Graduate School has therefore developed a policy document on supervision with a view to ensuring that the newly graduated PhDs get sufficient training and support to develop their supervision skills before they are given substantial supervisory responsibilities.

As the postgraduate education and training landscape changes, institutions are being forced to adopt new policies, practices, etc. Kenyatta University has been responsive to the changing environment through institutional structures and policies. The Graduate School has been in the forefront of guiding the University in this regard through administration, policy formulation, resource mobilization and networking.

Introduction

Access to quality education is a critical component that can foster economic development. At independence education was declared a basic human right in Zimbabwe and a non-racial system pursued (SACMEQ, 2010). Progress made in the education sector in the 1980s and 1990s was eroded during the decade long socio-economic crisis in Zimbabwe. Doctoral training in the country was severely affected. This paper discusses possible innovative strategies that could be adopted in the provision of doctoral education in Zimbabwe so that higher education and the economy as a whole would be revitalised.

Chetsanga (2010) reported that the Zimbabwe Council on Higher Education (ZIMCHE) was concerned about the negative impact that the high vacancy rates registered in state universities. The problem is not limited to state universities only. Women’s University in Africa (WUA) was founded in 2002, when the socio-economic crisis was gaining momentum, hence attracting and retaining qualified staff was a challenge, more so Ph.D. holders. Gurira (2011) noted that the major challenge facing higher education in Zimbabwe is how to provide quality education.

Status of doctoral training in Zimbabwe

Since year 2009, Zimbabwean economy has been on the socio-economic and political recovery path following formation of the Government of National Unity. However, challenges of the past still persist. Teferra (2000) observed that despite some economic and social success stories, most African countries constantly face economic hardships making it difficult for scholars to return home. Most aspiring doctoral students are constantly facing economic hardships making it difficult for scholars to return home. Most aspiring doctoral students are pursuing their studies outside Zimbabwe and largely at South African Universities.

The challenges that are driving students to move outside Zimbabwe for doctoral training include:

Lack of local financial resources to fund research. This has to be addressed. universities are also contributing to national development.

The State only funds public universities, yet private run universities are also contributing to national development. This has to be addressed.

WUA doctoral fellowship programme

The Women’s University in Africa (WUA) has developed its own strategy of fostering PhD training and increasing PhD lecturers, in partnership the African capacity building foundation (ACBF). The university recruits lecturers with master’s degrees to take up lecturing in various disciplines, but with potential to do doctoral studies locally on within the Southern African Development Community (SADC) region.

Appointment to the programme is gender sensitive. ACBF will provide resources for tuition, travel and subsistence and research to the successful candidate. WUA staff can also access the same facility on a competitive basis, but should have served the university for at least two years. WUA builds the capacity of the doctoral students through capacity building workshops and organising regular seminar presentation to students.

By the end of the year WUA will have at least 25 doctoral candidates under this programme, eight have already started their studies. On completion staff members are expected to serve WUA as members of the academic staff for at least half the duration of their studies, with the option of getting tenure.

Conclusion

As we strive to revitalise doctoral education in Zimbabwe, and Africa at large, it is critical to bear in mind that universities are critical to the development of any nation, through development of high-skilled manpower, technology transfer. The quality of higher education depends on among other factors, the quality of staff, infrastructure and research activities. In terms of staff quality, doctoral holders have better capacity to teach and conduct research. At the national level, there is need to have a policy meant to revitalise doctoral training locally. National budgetary support should be extended to privately run universities, and resources mobilisation for doctoral training should be locally grounded tapping on the vast natural resources.

Innovative Reforms for PhD programs and mobility initiatives at the UGB

by Mamadou Sy, Director of Research, Innovation and Scientific Cooperation, Université Gaston Berger de Saint-Louis, Senegal (mamadou.sy@ugb.edu.sn)

For more than five years Université Gaston Berger (UGB) has been toiling to change its training programs, at different paces in its various Academic and Research Units (ARU) (Unités de formation et de recherche – UFR), in order to adopt the LMD (Licence – Master – Doctorat) system. The start of the 2012-2013 academic year marked the end of the changeover in the system at the undergraduate level (Licence). This modification of the system was accomplished through the Network for the Excellence of Higher Education in West Africa (NEWS) (Réseau pour l’excellence de l’Enseignement Supérieur en Afrique de l’Ouest – REESAO). Six semesters are now planned for the doctorate (PhD) programs.

With the absence of a national policy or procedure concerning the LMD system and especially the establishment of graduate schools, UGB foresaw this state of affairs and chose to set-up and implement its own strategy in order to ensure a more efficient administration of its doctorate (PhD) programs. The chosen option was to create two inter-ARU graduate schools. On the basis of this strategy, the election of a Director for each of the two graduate schools was held on June 27, 2012.

With the signing of the Decree concerning PhD programs on October 12, 2012⁶, the Directorate of Research, Innovation and Scientific Cooperation and the Scientific Council are making every effort to ensure the implementation of the new decree, particularly Article 13, which determines the composition of the Scientific and Academic Council, which must include 20 to 30 members from its various Academic and Research Units (ARU).


6. The Decree was signed by the President of the Republic and by the Prime Minister of Senegal. It applies to all HEIs in Senegal.
A strategy that covers the establishment of laboratories and another the creation of research institutes are presently being adopted pending the structure that will be proposed at the national level. This, in order to avoid the fragmentation of laboratories, which each professor, who is qualified to conduct research without a critical mass of collaborators, tends to generate.

In order to ensure that all these structures are functional, the authorities of UGB wish to establish a research entity that would allow for a concerted effort in the implementation of resources and a better functionality.

The student-teacher ratio is very low (1 professor for 15 students in 2011-2012). In order to deal with the shortage of professors who are qualified to supervise PhD students (41 in 2011-2012) and to reach the required critical mass in each discipline, with a very large number of PhD students (615 for the 2011-2012 academic year), for several years, through the Agence universitaire de la francophonie and the cooperation of France, the various Academic and Research Units (UFR) have received visiting professors to teach Master II level courses and provide mentoring or co-supervision of thesis through cotutelle (joint supervision) agreements.

Since the 2011-2012 academic year, with PhD students contributing more to the real cost of their training (35 000 FCFA for registration to a PhD program instead of the traditional 4 340 FCFA), the university can now finance the mobility of its PhD students and better support its doctoral programs.

The support programme for the promotion of teaching and research staff (SP2TRS) (PA2PER) is another mechanism, which supports the mobility of research-professors, especially for PhD research and/or the emancipation of doctoral programs.

At the national level, under the auspices of the Ministry of Higher Education and Research, a nation-wide consultation was held from April 6 to 9, 2013. Seventy-eight (78) recommendations were made. The following caught my attention and, to me, seem most relevant to stimulate and revitalize research and innovation. These are:

- Adopt legislation concerning the orientation of research and innovation.
- Create a National Council for Research and Innovation.
- Replace the Incentive Fund for Scientific and Technical Research (IFSTR) (FIRST) with a National Fund for Research and Innovation (NFRI) (FNRI).
- Develop strategic plans for research and innovation.
- Establish a research-professor status.
- Optimize the operation of graduate schools.
- Establish a Professor Emeritus status.
- Develop structures for public-private innovation and research partnerships.
- Strengthen national, regional and international scientific cooperation.

Work on the creation of African Networks for the Development of Sciences, Technologies and Innovations (ANDSTI) (RADSTI).

I hope that the guidelines for the Presidential Council, which is scheduled after this meeting, will place research at the centre of public policies and will not consider research only for promotion at the university level.

### 08 Enhancing Doctoral Supervision in a Diverse Higher Education System, Rhodes University

Since 1994, the focus in South African higher education has been on the need to transform the fractured, unequal system of apartheid into a single coherent system that would serve all South Africans equally. In spite of the enormous amount of work which has gone into developing and implementing policies since that time, many of the old divides still remain, one of which relates to the capacity to produce research.

A small number of universities continue to produce the great majority of research outputs. These universities (Cape Town, Stellenbosch, the Witwatersrand, Pretoria and KwaZulu-Natal) produce more than 60% of articles published in accredited journals. The three most productive universities on a per capita basis are Cape Town, Stellenbosch and Rhodes. These also happen to be the universities with the highest proportion of doctoral graduates on their staff. All these research productive universities are historically white and have benefitted from the resourcing and prestige afforded to them under apartheid.

A report produced in 2010 by the Academy of Science of South Africa (ASSAf) makes a compelling case for increasing the number of doctoral graduates in the country if South Africa is to be able to compete meaningfully in a globalised economy. South Africa needs more doctoral graduates if it is to be able to compete yet, in a country striving for more equality, where are these graduates going to come from given that old divides of privilege appear to continue? Clearly the production of doctoral graduations needs to be increased and, importantly, evened out across the higher education system. The ASSAf report mentioned...
above, shows traditional universities (as opposed to universities of technology or ‘comprehensive’ universities – institutions offering a mix of vocational and disciplinary based programmes) as producing 80% of all doctoral graduates in the country.

Over the years, a number of alternative models of doctoral training have been developed in addition to the traditional one-on-one supervision of a piece of original research. These include doctorates by publication, taught doctoral programmes and the ‘professional’ doctorate which usually has specific outcomes. All require supervision of the doctoral candidate in some form, however, and it is here that the system often falls down.

Many supervisors supervise on the basis of their own experience of being supervised omitting to consider that the students they are now working with are very different to those who worked beside them in the past. In South Africa especially, the notion of ‘under preparedness’ continues right up to doctoral level and supervisors may be challenged by their students’ ability to work independently or even to write at an appropriate level. Students may also be more likely to pursue doctoral study on a part time basis and will need to juggle multiple demands in addition to those imposed by their research. What does all this mean for supervision and the supervisor who needs to guide her student?

It is not only ‘new’ students who have challenged supervision, however. New orientations to knowledge production along with an increased interest in interdisciplinarity may mean that supervisors are challenged at a methodological level by the projects their students want to pursue.

Given these considerations, it is clear that an intervention with supervisors offers the promise of meeting many of the challenges involved in producing more doctoral graduates in South Africa. It is here that a recently developed course on doctoral supervision aims to play a role.

The course has been developed by a consortium of South African universities (Rhodes, Stellenbosch, Cape Town and Fort Hare) along with Dutch partners from the Vrije University of Amsterdam, the African Studies Centre in Leiden and the International Institute of Social Studies in The Hague. The development and roll out of the course has been funded by the Dutch government under the auspices of NUFFIC. Rhodes University is the lead partner in the project.

The course, which comprises three phases – an initial four day face to face workshop, a six week period of online engagement and a further three days of face to face teaching, has been piloted at three universities. Feedback from the pilots will be used to revise materials whereafter the roll out to other universities will commence. Dutch funding currently allows for the course to be offered free of charge to 18 of the 23 South African universities although attempts are now in progress to raise funding for all institutions to have the opportunity of the course being offered on their campus under the auspices of the project.

Significantly, the course carries a Creative Commons license which means that any university will be able to use the materials on a non-profit basis to benefit its own staff in the future.

Response at the launch of the course at the National Research Foundation in Pretoria in November 2012 was extremely positive. Interest has also been indicated from universities beyond the borders of South Africa and, if funding becomes available, the consortium will be glad to respond.

**Programme approaches to doctoral education in Humanities and Social Sciences**

by Chrissie Boughey and Sioux McKenna, Rhodes University, South Africa (c.Boughey@ru.ac.za)

Participation rates and dropout rates for doctoral education are of concern globally but they are particularly dismal on the continent of Africa where the need for economic development and knowledge production is acute. These demands require that we scrutinise the challenges facing doctoral education and reconsider some of our established practices.

In South Africa, two recent publications have put the issue of doctoral education squarely on the higher education agenda. The CHE/CREST report on postgraduate study (2009) and the ASSAf report entitled *The PhD Study* (2010) both highlighted concerns about the way in which doctoral education is approached in the country.

In particular, these reports suggested the need for serious reflection on the ways in which doctoral education is undertaken in the broad areas of humanities and social sciences (HSS). One of the findings was that the traditional apprenticeship model, favoured in HSS, might not be the most efficient way to approach supervision. The traditional model relies on the relationship between the doctoral candidate and her supervisor as the main, or only, structure within which the research work is undertaken.

Such reliance assumes a level of experience and broad range of expertise in the supervisor that many novice supervisors may not have. It also assumes that the supervisor has access to a supportive disciplinary network with whom she/he can share her/his concerns and that the PhD student has a similar environment in which she/he can test out her/his ideas and develop her/his doctoral voice. The CHE/CREST report and the ASSAf report, along with a number of other similar reports, suggest that such assumptions are misplaced.

Furthermore, where the entire PhD journey is a private one between student and supervisor or supervisors, there is little
opportunity for the student to be exposed to disciplinary concerns or to research approaches beyond those of her own study. The assumption that students will be exposed to such matters through the wider intellectual environment of the university or by attending conferences relies on the concept of full-time students with access to funding.

One newly established doctoral programme in Higher Education Studies at Rhodes University has been developed with these concerns in mind. While the PhD is, by its very nature, a single-authored piece of work whereby the individual student is examined by her/his peers, there are multiple benefits to undertaking such work within a community with shared interests. A community allows for deeper knowledge through shared endeavours. It provides a space for scholars to participate legitimately in conversations with others who are similarly engaged as well as with those who are already members of the disciplinary community and are now experienced researchers and supervisors.

The Doctoral Programme in Higher Education Studies was launched in January 2010. In 2013, the programme comprises 29 PhD scholars and 8 ‘Pre-Docs’ – candidates judged not to be ready for full registration at doctoral level and who are given the opportunity of engaging with structured reading and writing within the Programme overall. All candidates are, with just one exception, full-time academics at universities and are undertaking their doctoral studies on a part-time basis. Ten of the 23 public South African universities are represented in the student body as well as one academic from the private sector. There are also scholars from Malawi, Rwanda, Zimbabwe and the United Arab Emirates. Co-supervisors on the programme come from seven South African universities beyond Rhodes University where the programme is housed. This diversity enhances the potential for engagement and for research that moves beyond the narrow confines of each scholar’s own context of practice.

The development of the programme is in part a response to the national need for more doctoral graduates, which has resulted in targeted outputs being set by the government and the National Research Foundation. It is also in response to the concerns about low doctoral participation rates. But alongside these and other driving forces, the key push behind the development of the programme has been the provision of a community of practice that works against the ‘lonely space’ of the doctoral journey.

In South Africa, the doctorate is by full thesis only and no coursework can provide credits towards the qualification. The structures of the programme are thus not about accumulating credits but rather are about supporting the development of the research design, undertaking the research and writing the thesis. These structures include three ‘Doc Weeks’ a year that include guest seminars, debates, panel discussions, student presentations, workshops and so on. There is also a vibrant online classroom where academic readings are shared, controversial news items are deliberated upon, questions are asked and support is provided. Advisory panels, online meetings and other structures augment traditional supervision relationships and are all developed to give the scholars and supervisors a sense of belonging to a broader community.

Participation in these structures is voluntary. The excellent attendance at ‘Doc Weeks’, despite the financial implications of travelling long distances and taking leave from work, indicates that scholars are finding the support useful. Evaluations speak to a sense of ‘being part of a group’ and ‘all being in this together, looking out for one another’.

Such structures require that the supervisors see the benefits of working with students within a community and are willing to participate to this community beyond their own individual supervision responsibilities. They benefit from having a whole network of people supporting and encouraging their students.

Tackling problems in doctoral education in South Africa will require a multi-pronged engagement but we believe that reconsidering the structure of the relationships of those involved is a good starting point.

**Support to Research Training within Swedish Development Cooperation – a System Approach**

by Inger Lundgren, Swedish International Development and Cooperation Agency (Sida), Sweden (Inger.Lundgren@sida.se)

Sweden has supported research capacity in low-income countries since 1975. It was then a new, innovative and quite controversial approach within the area of development cooperation. As many low income countries lacked sustainable systems to generate evidence based knowledge, the support to research was seen as key to address many of the problems these countries grappled with and that affected poor people the most. It was argued that also low-income countries needed their own experts and leaders if solutions were to be produced in a more sustainable way. These arguments are still valid.

**A system approach to capacity building in the fight against poverty**

The modality of the Swedish support has not been static; it has rather developed organically in time. It started with
support to research projects, and by adding bits and pieces that the partners required for their research, it has developed to an almost complete model for support to research and innovation system in low-income countries. Creating capacity through doctoral training is at the core of the support. The focus, however, is not on individual research capacity but on institutional research capacity. Most often the supported institution is a public university. At the same time, as doctoral students are trained abroad, funding is provided to establish research environments at their home university i.e. research infrastructure (ICT, laboratory facilities, access to scientific journals, etc.), research management (research policies, research structures, research grants), university reform (administration & finance). These are among the key areas necessary to establish sustainable research platforms.

As evidence is generated, support is also provided to promote the use and application of research results and to strengthen a country’s innovation system for more directed interventions to issues of poverty and wellbeing.

This system approach is the foundation for the Swedish support to research training.

Example of Swedish Support to National Research and Innovation Systems

Research training models – from sandwich to in-house doctoral programs.

The sandwich model has for many years been the modus operandi of Swedish research cooperation. Universities in partner countries find the model highly valuable. Firstly, research training at a Swedish university offers an international research environment, with opportunities for networking, access to well-equipped labs and literature. Other opportunities are participation in international conferences, publishing in international journals and obtaining a worldwide recognized doctoral degree. Secondly, since the students are recruited among university staff at partner universities and data collection is carried out at their home institution, the sandwich model contributes to retain staff and diminishes the risk of losing human capital to foreign countries.

Currently, Sweden is shifting focus from the sandwich doctoral training to in-house doctoral training. But, why change a successful concept if it works well? What occurs is not really a change in the nature of support, but rather a change based on the progress of the research capacity within a country. The sandwich modality serves its purpose well at a given point in the development of a country’s research system where such did not exist before. Its purpose is to create a critical mass of researchers for a partner university in selected disciplines. When achieved, the critical mass of trained researchers can create, manage and sustain in-house PhD-programs.

Many countries involved in Swedish research cooperation now have the capacity and the conditions to develop their own doctoral programs. While the sandwich model was directed to university staff the in-house model can increase in scale and offer training to larger number of doctoral students and respond better to national demands. It is also a further step towards sustainability.

Even though the focus is on in-house doctoral programs, the “spirit” of the sandwich model will be maintained. “Sandwich” in the new context implies that the PhD candidates will have access to a research environment in an international setting. National and international networking and exchange are crucial to all researchers. It is therefore important that in-house PhD-students are offered the possibility to take part in international exchange through short visits (for courses, meeting and collaboration) to other researching institutions.

Ensuring international quality of doctoral training in low-income countries

For Sandwich PhD-students trained and graduated at Swedish accredited universities, quality of the training has not been an issue. Quality became a concern when the idea of supporting in-house PhD-training emerged. Most of our partner countries had weak or lacked mechanisms to ensure quality of higher education and MSc- and PhD programs. Thus, an additional component needed to be included in the support to national research systems. Baseline was that all students would receive training of equal quality irrespective where training and graduation took place. A minimum requirement for PhD-training programs was set to five years.

To further ensuring quality of doctoral programs three different criteria were identified, not as optional choices, but as complementary methods. The first was to start the programs with support of accredited universities or to create joint programs where each university agreed on a common standard accepted at both universities. The second was directed to increase the competence of PhD-holders through postgraduate supervision training courses. Third, and most important, was that lecturers/ supervisors on the programs were active.

7. The Council for University and HE ensures the quality of the HE in Sweden.
8. 2 yrs MSc + 3 yrs PhD or 1 yr MSc + 4 yrs PhD
researchers in order to ensure that the knowledge offered by universities is the most recent.

Requirements for quality as well as measuring scientific quality of doctoral training programs are highly important. To support these areas three methods were anticipated, the first is through external evaluations of doctoral programs carried out through external on-going evaluations. This would be a short-term solution. A medium term solution would be support partners to develop quality indicators for research at university level as well as national level. The third consists of support to develop national mechanisms for accreditation and quality assurance of doctoral programs. In view of Swedish support this could also be carried out through collaboration or twinning with an established institutions in Sweden.

Conclusion

It is considered that the greatest challenge for the Swedish partner countries to achieve sustainable research systems is after the doctoral training – to retain and maintain active researchers, to ensure an attractive research environment and provide national funding for research. It really does not matter how many research institutions or PhD holders that a university have – if high quality scientific research is not carried out, subsequently the quality of doctoral training and higher education will diminish, and they will not be able to produce the knowledge required to reduce poverty and create wellbeing for its people, let alone having a fair chance to compete on the global knowledge market and contribute to the global knowledge production.

It is therefore very promising that many governments in low-income countries is taking this challenge seriously and increasingly include research, technology and innovation in government expenditure.

Innovative approaches to doctoral education – Sharing as an Instrument for Developing Institutions

by Dr. Thomas Ekman Jørgensen, Head of Unit, European University Association – Council for Doctoral Education (Thomas.jørgensen@eua.be)

Doctoral education had been moving rapidly up the higher education and research policy agendas during the last decade. Graduations have risen uniformly across the globe, and a there is a highly visible set of converging developments in doctoral education.

From 2010 to 2012, the European University Association (EUA) led a the CODOC project on doctoral education in East Asia, Southern Africa, Latin America and Europe, comparing developments and promoting collaborations. This project identified three common trends: 1) A global discourse on the knowledge society, that challenges – regardless of the level of development – should be met by innovation through knowledge creation; 2) as a consequence, research training has become a priority and numbers of doctorate holders have been rising; 3) in order to attain the research capacity needed for good research training, the interest in collaborations (North-South and South-South) has increased likewise.

The CODOC project also identified a common challenge in training a sufficient number of researchers: Expanding university sectors are looking to increase the number of staff with a doctorate and emerging and developed economies seek to involve more doctorate holders in the private sector; there is a real risk of not having enough people with a doctorate on the global level. In the survey that was done as a part of the project, 24% responded that they had difficulties to recruit and retain doctorate holders for their own institution.

Southern Africa might have particular challenges in this regard. Only about half of the African respondents managed to recruit and retain a sufficient number of doctorate holders – much less than in Latin America and East Asia. Well-known problems such as brain drain and lacking infrastructure contribute to this, and it would be likely that emerging research centres needing more doctorate holders in countries like China, Brazil or – importantly – South Africa is aggravating the problem in many places. These research centres tend to be highly geographically concentrated in areas such as the State of Sao Paulo in Brazil or Shanghai in China, and the research-intensive institutions in these areas work in a highly competitive global environment. It is quite possible to envisage an increased ‘scramble for talent’, where research-intensive universities and companies will be competing for the top doctorate holders. African universities would be vulnerable in such a scenario unless institutions develop to meet the challenges of building research capacity.

Universities that do not act to define their role in the increasingly globalised research community risk being marginalised. This goes for any continent and any country. Universities must engage in institutional development and professional management to avoid this. The challenge for many universities would be to attain enough research capacity not necessarily to compete for the top positions in the rankings, but to become palatable partners for research collaborations that would give access to the international research environment.

There is no single solution to attain this goal. In Europe, much attention has been given to governance reform and professionalization of the management of doctoral education. Across

9. The report of the project can be downloaded at: www.eua.be/Libraries/Publications_homepage_list/EUA_CODOC_web.sflb.ashx
the European continent, universities have set up independent management units, doctoral schools in order to be able to make strategic decisions, assure quality and develop capacity of doctoral education. This investment in governance reform has allowed Europe as a whole to increase the number of doctoral candidates while retaining reasonable completion rates and times to degree. Part of this development has been marked by a willingness to share best practices and collaborate among universities.

Formal collaborations can for example be found in the Northern Countries, where funding has been available for cross-border doctoral programmes. In Scotland, universities have had strong incentives to pool their resources for doctoral training and thus boosting research capacity while assuring access to good research environments also in peripheral universities.

In terms of sharing best practices, university networks have played a substantial role. The biggest network, the EUA Council for Doctoral Education brings together more than 220 universities for discussions of professional management of doctoral education. This is notably a very cost-efficient way of developing institutions, as individual universities pay a modest fee to sustain the secretariat of the network. In return, members have access to a number of services such as publications and venues for sharing of good practices.

Such networks are known elsewhere in the world, notably SARUA in the SADC countries or AUN in South East Asia. Nurturing these networks as a forum for institutional development could prove a way to strengthen universities on all continents. Facing the challenges of providing doctoral education, universities do well to look at ways to share resources, but also importantly share ideas to build capacity together.

To learn more about initiatives developed in the context of the EUA – CDE: www.eua.be/cde

12 Fostering knowledge and exchange on doctoral education in Africa – the work of ACUP

by Josep M Vilalet and Nadja Gmelch, Associació Catalana d’Universitats Públiques (ACUP), Spain

The main goal of the Catalan Association of Public Universities (Associació Catalana d'Universitats Públiques – ACUP – www.acup.cat), formed by the Universitat de Barcelona (UB), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB), Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC), Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF), Universitat de Girona (UdG), Universitat de Lleida (UdL), Universitat Rovira i Virgili (URV) and Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC), is to sum up the forces of the public Catalan universities to promote joint initiatives, programs and projects with the aim of improving higher education both inside and outside Catalonia. One central working area of the Association is university development cooperation where ACUP is developing various initiatives on doctoral education in Africa.

Two and a half years ago ACUP created the African-Spanish Higher Education Management Platform, initiative that received funding from the Spanish Cooperation Agency (AECID), and that aims at being a permanent forum of exchange in the field of university management, involving European and African universities and thereby strengthening the role of universities as essential agents for social and economic development. The first phase of the African-Spanish Higher Education Management Platform focused on doctoral education in sub-Saharan Africa. Working in collaboration with nine higher education institutions from different African countries (Universidade Eduardo Mondlane, Universidad Nacional de Guinea Ecuatorial, Addis Ababa University, Universidade Agostinho Neto, Université Abdou Moumouni, Université de Bamako), ACUP undertook research on the current situation of doctoral education at these institutions and published a report on the “Challenges of Doctoral Programmes and Research Training in sub-Saharan Africa”.

Shared goals and research values in the work on doctoral education brought IAU and ACUP to collaborate in this project and jointly organize an international seminar on “Innovative Approaches to Doctoral Education and Research Training in sub-Saharan Africa” which took place in July 2012 in Addis Ababa. (More information on the seminar and the principal outcomes can be found at the ACUP and IAU websites.) In addition, IAU and ACUP developed, in close collaboration with the Open University of Catalonia (UOC) the online portal IDEA – www.idea-phd.net, a virtual forum that fosters exchange and knowledge on doctoral education.

Currently, ACUP is working together with UOC and Kenyatta University on a project that has received a grant from the IAU LEADHER programme, analyzing the use of digital technologies, more specifically the web 2.0 tools in order to respond to main needs identified in doctoral education in sub-Saharan Africa, namely: (1) supervision of doctoral students and (2) the visibility and use of research. Through the use of Personal Learning Environments for Doctoral Students (PLEDS), a lifetime personal web space equipped with software, communication, search, social and multimedia tools that allow students to gather and organize relevant learning information from the net and to disseminate their own material, new models of effective e-supervision are explored. In this sense, PLEDS can be used
as a means to create a digital identity for doctoral students, serving as a digital public notebook and personal repository, facilitating the establishment of a virtual network between colleagues working in the same field, including mentors and tutors.

More on the outcomes of the IAU LEADhER programme sponsored event in the Fall.

13 Research Management in African Universities

by Patrice Ajai-Ajagbe, Programme Officer, Association of Commonwealth Universities, UK (Patrice.Ajai-Ajagbe@acu.ac.uk)

Governments are demanding more from universities – for universities to be agents of change; to contribute to the economy; to compete for decreasing pools of funds; to account better for university income; to take on more applied research etc. In the case of African universities, they are also expected to be primary tools for the continent’s development in the 21st century, contributing to the delivery of the Millennium Development Goals. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of research in Africa takes place in universities – as there is no substantial home-grown commercial sector conducting research in Africa – thus the management of such activity becomes even more critical.

Research Management (RM) can be defined as any action that a university takes to improve the effectiveness of its researchers, but which is not part of the research process itself. The Association of Commonwealth Universities’ (ACU), well-established RM programme focuses on sharing best practices between universities, encouraging better communication between higher education and funding bodies, and providing basic materials for those with little or no tradition of research management to develop at least a basic capacity.

Key RM issues in the region include the following:

- **Human Resources** – Universities report difficulty in staffing the RM function – i.e. finding the right people with the right skills-set and determining whether these people should come from an academic or administrative background. In addition, universities report difficulty in obtaining buy-in from key university staff like the Bursar and the Registrar – so that RM offices can implement the necessary finance and HR structures to deal with externally funded activities.

- **Consultancies** – High levels of individual consultancies unregistered with the university. Contributing factors include low academic salaries, and the practice of research commissioners forming contracts with individuals.11

- **ICT infrastructure** – affects universities’ ability to develop and use information databases and to capitalize on research information as a resource. However, growing internet connectivity, the move to digital publishing and increasingly sophisticated tools for capturing information means that research information management is gaining importance.

- **Research uptake** – Universities report relatively low uptake (by policy-makers) and commercialisation (by the industry sector) of their research.

- **The wider national/regional environment** – can serve to keep universities as ivory towers. For example, it can be difficult to implement certain standards in some areas – like research ethics in animal welfare – when working in a wider environment with lax rules in the same area.

Through our activities, the ACU has identified three phases in the strengthening of RM in universities:

1. **Awareness raising**: measures to ensure that practitioners and university leaders recognise the importance of research management
2. **The conversion of such awareness into organisational structures** (such as RM Offices, Grants and Contracts Offices etc.) to enable this awareness to be transformed into practice
3. **The development of the external environment** to support these structures and to help ensure their sustainability.

These phases are not discrete and work best when considered simultaneously. For example the strategic establishment of professional Research and Innovation Management Associations – initially supported by ACU now led by universities themselves – in the Southern, Central, West and East Africa regions, has served as a conduit for both awareness-raising and the development of a supportive external environment for university research management.

Experience from ACU work in this area12 indicates that there is no one-fit model or timescale for developing RM structures within universities. However, universities agree that creating an RM office or function distinct from the graduate school is a critical step in articulating an institution’s thinking and processes. It reflects the fact that universities require support services for research management (administration of externally funded research activities) above and beyond the academic management of research projects.


ACU RM capacity-building activities with African universities are largely supported by funders (like the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the UK Department for International Development and the EU ACP Science and Technology Programme).

Funders are increasingly considering the wider institutional context in which research and research management takes place (and how this impacts on ‘their’ respective projects). The 2010 forum of Funders and African universities13 (facilitated by the ACU and sponsored by the Wellcome Trust) demonstrated the willingness of funders to work together towards a more efficient delivery of their programmes. There was agreement from funders that they could play their part by ensuring that all consultancies are processed through a central university office. Some of the funders represented at the event have since formed a working group to establish coherence in the area of costing14 (including policies on overhead costs) for their research programmes in developing countries.

The ability of African universities to develop clear research management structures will depend on many factors, some outside their direct control. The ACU experience suggests that much progress is being made, and that this is having a critical impact on the ability of the region to play a full role in international research.

14 Evaluating Models of Doctoral Education in Africa: Context, Practices and Tools

The purpose of doctoral education is for the student to make an original contribution to knowledge in a chosen field of studies through research (usually supervised). Generally, doctoral programmes incorporate ethical, epistemological, conceptual/theoretical, and practical experiences that enable the candidates: (i) to undertake independent and original research; (ii) to develop highly specialized, authoritative knowledge and competence to apply that knowledge to solution of problems; and (iii) to be self-directed and self-critical. Universities in Africa face the challenge of achieving these goals in a sustainable manner under considerable constraints in terms of resources, supervision capacity and preparedness of doctoral candidates.

In this regard, several models of doctoral education have been attempted, with varying levels of success. The most well established is the master-apprentice model of an individual student working with a single supervisor. Szanton and Manyika (2002) argued that this model is not only predominant in Sub-Saharan Africa but it is also a cost-effective way to deliver doctoral education where there is limited supervision capacity.

Going elsewhere for doctoral studies has, since the colonial era, been one option for Africans, and some countries support this with funding, particularly in identified areas of scarce skills.

The recognition of the benefits of joining efforts and resources in doctoral education has led to a proliferation of programmes based on inter-institutional linkages or partnerships. Many of these programmes also responded to the problem of under-preparedness of doctoral candidates, and faculty, by including integrated elements of coursework and strategies designed to develop foundational and reflexive abilities in doctoral students. Yet many of these programmes rely on donor funding, and so they remain unsustainable in the long run.

Within Africa, the benefits of collaboration have also been recognised. University research consortia foster resources and supervision capacity sharing between the African universities, sometimes including faculty from outside Africa. The models of doctoral education that have been attempted in Africa, place different emphases on sharing resources, international exposure and funding, support for students, and faculty development. They have focused on different elements and approaches to strengthening doctoral education in Africa, and with varying degrees of success.

We propose developing a framework for evaluating such models, which speaks to the African context. It will provide a basis for a nuanced understanding of the differences between models of doctoral education and their strengths and weaknesses, in the African context. It will also serve as a tool for academic departments, institutions and policy makers to judge what models might work for them.

For further information on this project please contact: Michael Cross at: mcross@uj.ac.za and Judy Backhouse at: judyback@telkomsa.net

14. Five keys to improving research costing in low- and middle-income countries – is a good practice document on research costing (in low- to medium-income countries). This good practice document was developed by members of ESSENCE on Health Research www.who.int/tdr/publications/five_knov/em/.
Monographs


This report presents results of a survey of doctoral education trends in Africa, Asia and Latin America, to gain a better overview of doctoral education in these regions and to compare these trends with those in Europe. Regional and country reports are also provided.


Content: Introduction: Strengthening higher education capacity and doctoral education in Southern Africa (Piyushi Kotecha); Renewing the academy: Challenges facing Southern African universities (Rwekaza S Mukandala); Renewing and growing the academy: Redefining global relationships (Jimmi O Adesina); The status quo of doctoral education in these regions and to compare these trends with those in Europe. Regional and country reports are also provided.

www.sarua.org/files/publications/


This report is a follow-up to The Nairobi Report, published by the British Academy and the Association of Commonwealth Universities in 2009. It offers an analysis of the challenges facing early career researchers in African universities, drawing on the discussions which led to the earlier Nairobi study, subsequent consultations, and on parallel work by other organisations. It identifies the key areas in which further support needs to be provided, and suggests ways in which new collaborative mechanisms might be designed in order to do this. The focus of this and the earlier Nairobi Report is on relationships between Africa and the UK, but much of what we discuss is undoubtedly relevant to research links within the African continent, as well as between Africa and other regions.

www.acu.ac.uk/publications/search


This report contains detailed summaries of session presentations and discussions from the two-day eponymous seminar, including general comments by various participants during the open discussion. They present the main outcomes of the seminar and provide an idea of the priorities for stakeholders in African doctoral education and of some of the innovative ways in which African universities are addressing various challenges. www.iau-aiu.net/content/idea-phd-portal-and-activities

Improving the quality and relevance of university research in the context of national innovation systems in West and Central Africa / Améliorer la qualité et la pertinence de la recherche universitaire dans le cadre de Systèmes nationaux d’innovation en Afrique de l’Ouest et du Centre, Educational Research Network for West and Central Africa (2012), Abidjan : Rocare

This report is of the Workshop held in October 2012 in Côte d’Ivoire on the governance of University Research and the National Innovation System.


L’Université Cheikh Anta Diop (UCAD) au Sénégal a élaboré une vision-action articulée autour de six paramètres (la qualité, la pertinence, la coopération, les finance et la gestion des finances, l’informatique, Internet et la communication et les étudiants) et soutenue par dix grands projets qui en sont les piliers. Cet ouvrage montrons comment les paradigmes partagés au niveau international ont été mis en œuvre localement par le dialogue, la discussion, la persévérance et l’innovation créatrice.

Kirkland J. Ajai-Ajabe P. (2013), Research management in African universities: from awareness raising to developing structures, Association of Commonwealth Universities [ACU], London: ACU, This report details the implementation and the results of a ACU project with five African universities in Uganda, Tanzania, Ghana and Nigeria, to develop their organisational structures for research management, including supporting the establishment of a central facility with oversight of research management and forming or revising institutional research policies and strategies.

www.acu.ac.uk/publications/


Within the context of increasing numbers of doctoral students worldwide this book examines the new doctorate environment and the challenges it is starting to face. Drawing on international research the individual authors contribute to a previously under-represented focus of theorising the emerging practices of doctoral education and the shape of change in this arena. Key aspects are discussed by contributors from the UK, USA, Australia, New Zealand, China, South Africa, Sweden and Denmark. These include: the changing nature of doctoral education; the need for systematic and principled accounts of doctoral pedagogies; the importance of disciplinary specificity; the relationship between pedagogy and knowledge generation; and issues of transdisciplinarity.

Periodical articles

On doctoral education: How to supervise a Ph.D., 1985-2011 (Raewyn Connell); Addressing the curriculum problem in doctoral education (Bill Green); Researching doctoral pedagogy close up: Design and action in two doctoral programmes (Susan Danby & Alison Lee); Supervisors watching supervisors (Catherine Manathunga); Identity-trajectories (Lynn McAlpine); What constitutes doctoral knowledge? (Anita Devos & Margaret Somerville); Internationalisation of doctoral education (Janette Ryan); Up and coming? Doctoral education in China (Rui Yang); Assessing International (post) graduate education: A research agenda (Tami Blumenthal & Maresi Nerad); A new era for research education in Australia? (Helene Marsh, Bradley Smith, Max King & Terry Evans); PhDs in Australia, from the beginning (Ian R Dobson).

This article is an attempt to improve the postgraduate students’ service experience through an improved understanding of the role of the postgraduate research supervisor as it is influenced by or impacted upon by the postgraduate research (organizational) climate and the process of organizational socialization. If the conceptual model can be validated through empirical studies, then higher education institutions could use it to improve the postgraduate students’ research experience and by implication increase the number of postgraduate students and throughput (Publisher).

This paper examines the growth of postgraduate education in Sub-Saharan Africa, describing the current situation and including financial, quality and policy aspects, as well as access for women postgraduate students.

Herman C., *The purpose of the Ph.D: A South African perspective*, International Association of Universities (IAU), Higher Education Policy, v. 25, no. 1-18, pp. 1-, March 2012, ISSN 0952-8733
The article sets out to explore how Ph.D. programme leaders in South Africa view the purpose of the Ph.D., and how their views shape their responses to recent policies with regard to the Ph.D. It refers in particular to the vision of the Department of Science and Technology for a five-fold increase in the number of Ph.D. graduates by 2018, and to the drive to achieve racial and gender equity as part of the transition to democracy. The article is based on interviews with leaders of 16 doctoral programmes in nine top Ph.D.-awarding South African universities, representing a range of disciplines. The data indicate that there is a strong predisposition among Ph.D. programme leaders to perceive the doctorate largely as an academic pursuit. At the same time, some tentative changes are being seen ‘on the ground’ in response to the needs of industry and business, to the various policies, and to a diverse student cohort. It seems that the Ph.D. attempts to serve several purposes within the single structure provided by the Higher Education Qualification Framework, sometimes in tense associations. Going forward, the article discusses two policy options available to South Africa.

This report analyses the postgraduate landscape, its economic and international dimensions, access to and funding of postgraduate education and the expectations, quality and structure related to research degrees.

National Commission for Academic Accreditation and Assessment (2012), *Standards for quality assurance and accreditation of postgraduate programs*, Riyadh: NACAA
This draft report outlines best practice-based standards for the accreditation of programmes offered by all public and private higher education. It looks at: Mission goals and objectives; Programme administration; Management of programme quality assurance; Learning and teaching; Student administration and support services; Learning resources; Facilities and equipment; Financial planning and management; Employment processes; Research; Relationships with the community.

Prof. N. V. Varghese (2013), *Governance Reforms In African Higher Education: The Missing Link*. Chronicle of African Higher Education (March 2013). This paper focuses on governance reforms in African higher education. Prof. Varghese argues that leadership at the institutional level is challenged to find an appropriate balance between expansion and quality improvement, between academic priorities and financial considerations, between efficiency and equity concerns, between local relevance, global standards and rankings, among others. By all accounts, the quality of leadership has been emerging as the missing link in ensuring effective governance in higher education in Africa. It was published in the *International Journal of African Higher Education*, a joint collaboration between the *International Network for Higher Education in Africa* (hosted at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa) and the *Association of African Universities* (AAU), which has been officially launched on 30 May 2013 at the 13th AAU General Conference, held in Libreville, Gabon. IAU is pleased to announce that Eva Egon-Rolak, IAU Secretary General sits on the Institutional Editorial Board. More on the Journal at: teferra@ukzn.ac.za and at www.bc.edu/ihnea.


https://www.ncaaa.org.sa/siteimages/ID:116565

www.ncaaa.org.sa/siteimages/
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GUIDE TO HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA (GHEA): 6th EDITION HAS JUST BEEN RELEASED!

The 6th edition of the Guide contains details on 52 educational systems and 1,200 higher education institutions in Africa. This publication is the result of a partnership between the International Association of Universities (IAU) and the Association of African Universities (AAU) to jointly collect and disseminate information on higher education on the African continent. A copy of the Guide is sent free of charge to all IAU Members in Africa.

HEP 26/1 MARCH 2013

The first issue of HEP in 2013, the 25th year of the journal, is a multi-themed issue. Alberto Amaral et al look at the new legal framework in Portuguese higher education, and assess how this can be seen as an application of New Public Management; Daniel Levy analyses the declines in the private share of higher education; Ishmael Munene looks at the development of higher education in Kenya along ethnic lines; Jan Currie and Beverley Hill look at pay equality policies at the University of Western Australia; Milton Obamba looks at the World Bank’s policy in Africa; Sewale Abate Ayalew*, looks at cost-sharing in Ethiopia; and Ossi Piironen looks at the new Finish Universities Act 2009 that aimed to strengthen the institutional autonomy of the country’s universities. For more information, please go to www.palgrave-journals.com/hep/journal/v26/n1/index.html

HEP 26/2 JUNE 2013

The second issue of HEP is another multi-themed issue, with Jason Lane et al giving us a case study of how cross-border higher education in regulated in the US; Didi Griffioen and Uulikje de Jong look at academic drift in Dutch non-university institutions; Tebeje Molla looks at gender inequality and policy reform in Ethiopia; Sebastian Pfothenauer et al look at international university partnerships; António Magalhães et al look at governance and autonomy in Portugal; and Henning Kroll et al look at the ‘third role’ of higher education institutions in Germany. This issue also features two book reviews: Student Mobilities, Migration and the Internationalization of Higher Education, by Rachel Brooks and Johanna Waters; and The Evaluative State, Institutional Autonomy and Re-engineering Higher Education in Western Europe: The Prince and His Pleasure, by Guy Neave. For more information, please go to www.palgrave-journals.com/hep/journal/v26/n2/index.html

IAU ANNUAL REPORT 2012 – now available online (www.iau-aiu.net)

The Report profiles IAU work and achievements over the past year, carried out under each of the priority themes and special projects. It includes details of the new IAU Administrative Board (2012-2016) as well as details on IAU membership and finances.

IAU HORIZONS

IAU Horizons, vol 18.3 & 19.1 focusing in on the outcomes of the IAU 14th General Conference is now available online www.iau-aiu.net/content/iau-horizons

WORLD HIGHER EDUCATION DATABASE (WHED) 2013 – www.iau-aiu.net/content/reference-publications.

REIMAGINING DEMOCRATIC SOCIETIES: A NEW ERA OF PERSONAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

IAU Members are welcome to order a free copy of this book (Council of Europe higher education series No. 18) (2013) by Sjur Bergan, Ira Harkavy and Hilligje van’t Land (eds). They can write to Hilligje van’t Land. For more information on the book: http://book.coe.int/EN/ficheouvrage.php?PAGEID=36&lang=EN&produit_aliasid=2753

* Please note that the editor and publisher of Higher Education Policy have since retracted the article ‘Financing Higher Education in Ethiopia: Analysis of Cost-Sharing Policy and its Implementation’ by Sewale Abate Ayalew (2012) www.palgrave-journals.com/hep/journal/v26/n1/full/hep201221a.html, published in Volume 26 Issue 4 of the journal, following an investigation into possible ethical misconduct. It has been concluded that portions of text in the article are either unoriginal or incorrectly cited and so the decision has been taken to remove this article from the scholarly field. It should no longer be cited from the print or online version of Higher Education Policy.
brings to light the creation of the Market University. More specifically, three case studies are conducted that focus on the development of entrepreneurship by professors in the biosciences, the new development and management of patents by universities and finally, the study of the creation of industry-university research centres. These three case studies are conducted in light of the concept of institutional logic. The author shows how tensions evolved between market institutional logic (or capitalism), which evaluates the relevance of science by the value of its production on the market on the one hand, and scientific institutional logic, for which it is in the search for truth and the production of new knowledge that lies its intrinsic value on the other hand.

In her analysis, it appears that political decisions specific to each of the three cases studied were the main factors in the transition to the Market University; that these decisions were taken in a rather short period of time, from the end of the 1970s to the beginning of the 1980s; that it was mainly university teaching staff and middle managers, not senior management, who were initially the main agents of this transformation and finally, that the concept of the Market University, if it falls within the neo-liberal project in the sense that all human activity is reduced to creating economic value, also fits into an economic rationalization project (in the Weberian sense) that aims to place universities in the dominant economic rationality of the moment, that of growth through innovation, in which the universities become one of the main drivers.

Creating the Market University is an important book that enables us to understand how the conflict at the heart of academia came about, and which compares two opposing university projects: university and science for public good versus university and science for the market. In addition, if the proposed analysis of this migration to the Market University opens research perspectives and avenues of comparison which are extremely stimulating and challenging, it also confirms that it is not enough to turn the Market University into a neo-liberal politico-ideological project in order to understand how it is implemented and becomes established in our institutions. With drawing from the Market University, or simply going beyond the science-market conflict, requires a thorough understanding of the current situation if we want to develop something new in the academic world, based on solid evidence. Elizabeth Popp Berman’s book can surely help.

In what conditions were Market Universities* created? How is it that, even in the academic world, market logic has managed to stand out despite the presence of a strong institutional logic, that of science? There are two main types of responses to these questions. The first one provides general answers, which still embrace either globalization or the rise of neo-liberalism. The other type of response, more empirical in nature, considers the search for additional revenue by higher education institutions and the demands of industry for university research that better meets its needs as the two major factors that have led universities to increasingly integrate the market logic.

The work of Elizabeth Popp Berman offers – from the American perspective – an original response, more political and institutional in nature, to the involvement of universities in economic activities through market logic. The thesis defended in this book is based on the following main arguments: it is the American Government which, in the middle of the 1970s, encourages universities to consider scientific research as a product that may prove to be economically viable while, at the same time, the idea of making scientific and technological innovation the vector of economic activity becomes the new project of political, economic and academic decision-makers, thus bringing the universities to redefine their mission and especially their involvement in the economy.

This translates, within academic institutions, by the passage of “science as a resource” to “science as a driver of economic activity”. That is to say that universities have abandoned the model which dominated until the 1970s, where their involvement in the economic activity was limited to providing basic research from which industries solved their problems and advanced technologically, to adopt a new model where science and research can now be used as an engine of the economy through a scientific production that pulls the innovation from which new areas of economic activities can be created or existing sectors may be transformed.

It is by relying on solid empirical research that the author brings to light the creation of the Market University. More specifically, three case studies are conducted that focus on the development of entrepreneurship by professors in the biosciences, the new development and management of patents by universities and finally, the study of the creation of industry-university research centres. These three case studies are conducted in light of the concept of institutional logic. The author shows how tensions evolved between market institutional logic (or capitalism), which evaluates the relevance of science by the value of its production on the market on the one hand, and scientific institutional logic, for which it is in the search for truth and the production of new knowledge that lies its intrinsic value on the other hand.

In her analysis, it appears that political decisions specific to each of the three cases studied were the main factors in the transition to the Market University; that these decisions were taken in a rather short period of time, from the end of the 1970s to the beginning of the 1980s; that it was mainly university teaching staff and middle managers, not senior management, who were initially the main agents of this transformation and finally, that the concept of the Market University, if it falls within the neo-liberal project in the sense that all human activity is reduced to creating economic value, also fits into an economic rationalization project (in the Weberian sense) that aims to place universities in the dominant economic rationality of the moment, that of growth through innovation, in which the universities become one of the main drivers.

Creating the Market University is an important book that enables us to understand how the conflict at the heart of academia came about, and which compares two opposing university projects: university and science for public good versus university and science for the market. In addition, if the proposed analysis of this migration to the Market University opens research perspectives and avenues of comparison which are extremely stimulating and challenging, it also confirms that it is not enough to turn the Market University into a neo-liberal politico-ideological project in order to understand how it is implemented and becomes established in our institutions. With drawing from the Market University, or simply going beyond the science-market conflict, requires a thorough understanding of the current situation if we want to develop something new in the academic world, based on solid evidence. Elizabeth Popp Berman’s book can surely help.
Towards the sustainable university,

‘Will universities offer the intellectual leadership needed to shift our civilisation off its self-destructive course and on track for a sustainable future? Obviously they can, if they so choose.' So says Sara Parkin, the founder Director of UK-based leading NGO Forum for the Future, in her Foreword to a new book: The Sustainable University – progress and prospects. This book springs from the recognition that the world that today’s graduates are entering is already – and will be increasingly – very different from that inherited by previous generations. Its fundamental argument is that there a serious mismatch between the purposive and operational norms of higher education as reflected and practised by most (though not all) higher education institutions across the world, and the conditions of complexity, uncertainty and unsustainability that we as a global society face, and that our graduates will certainly encounter.

Whilst it is true that there is a growing response in higher education to the sustainability agenda, in most cases this is characterised by better environmental standards in campus management and some revision of selected courses and curricula. This is an important but as yet insufficient response measured against a background of mounting and profound sustainability related issues, as laid out in a number of high level international reports timed to coincide with last year’s Rio+20 Earth Summit. Rather, an integrative whole institutional response is called for, which offers renewal and direction to both policy and practice in universities – embracing all areas including governance and leadership, research, learning and teaching, campus operations, community relations, wellbeing, student experience, and organisational learning and change. This book seeks to both challenge higher education and inspire positive change through exploration of the rich notion of the sustainable university, and illustrate pathways through which its potential can be realised, based on the experience and journeys to date of ten leading Higher Education institutes in the UK.

The book was developed in the belief that:

- the sustainability agenda was highly important to the purposes, role and operation of universities in the current socio-economic and ecological conditions;
- attention to sustainability might weaken as the sector experienced a range of pressures and change associated with marketisation;
- much of value had been achieved in the UK, experience gained and lessons learnt, which should be documented;
- the book should have strategic, academic, practical and – hopefully – inspirational value.

Written by leading exponents of sustainability and sustainability education, it brings together examples, insight, reflection and strategies from the contributing universities, drawing on a wealth of experience to provide reflective critical analysis of barriers, achievements, strategies and potential.

Whilst based on UK experience, will be relevant to any university internationally that is seeking to respond to the rising agenda of sustainability, as many of the issues, barriers, opportunities and possibilities are common across higher education systems.
constitute the major sections of the book: Advances in understanding in cognitive development and learning; effective teaching and learning practices; approaches to assessment; and the role of university centers in fostering professional learning communities.


This book comprises contributions from academics and practitioners and Ministry officials who aim to develop an understanding of what is happening to education in a range of countries in the broader Middle East. All levels of education are covered the wide range of education 'policy borrowing' and, most importantly, the effects of this exchange are outlined.


This book chronicles the rapid economic growth and social changes that have taken place across Latin America in recent years, and examines these developments through the lens of higher education. In the book, academics and researchers from Latin America and the U.S. explore factors that have been catalysts for higher education reforms in the region such as increased access and equity, emphasis on international study, and investment by foreign universities and corporations. Analyses in the book show how learning, research, institution-building, and community engagement have become top priorities for many governments across Latin America in the past ten years.


This report examines the demographic and professional backgrounds of senior leaders of higher education institutions in the United States, especially those in positions that can lead to a college or university presidency. One concern arising from the study is the extent to which there is a diverse and talented pool of senior administrators to fill vacancies expected in institutional leadership. The research includes trends in characteristics of senior leaders in four-year institutions as well as recommendations.


The last ten years have seen the deepening and expansion of the process of internationalization in relation to higher education. This book is intended to address students' perspectives on the internationalization of higher education. It draws on case studies of mobile students from East Asia, mainland Europe and the UK and explores both the commonalities and differences in the experiences of students from different parts of the world who choose to move abroad to pursue a higher education.


Free resource from the Higher Education Academy, York, United Kingdom; www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/esd/The_Future_Fit_Framework.pdf

This comprehensive ‘what, why and how’ guide was commissioned and is published by the UK’s Higher Education Academy (HEA). Written and compiled by Professor Stephen Sterling, Centre for Sustainable Futures, Plymouth University, the Framework is based on the experience of the HEA’s Education for Sustainable Development Project in supporting the embedding of sustainability in the higher education curriculum. The Framework is designed to help the newly interested academic better understand and engage with sustainability education, and encourage more experienced colleagues to take this work further. Organised into 14 sections plus Appendices, the guide is designed so that users can easily find the information and ideas that are most useful to them without needing to read the whole document. The concepts, ideas and models presented are intended as indicative rather than in any way prescriptive or limiting. They are designed to help, to be used and tried out, amended, critically discussed and adapted as part of the individual and institutional learning process towards quality sustainability education provision. Contents include: 1. Introduction; 2. Why bother?; 3. Graduates fit for the future?; 4. Where to start?; 5. Barriers – and pathways; 6. Objections – and answers; 7. Key concepts and values; 8. ESD pedagogies; 9. ESD in the disciplines; 10. Simple change tools; 11. Teaching/CPD activities; 12. Research and ESD; 13. Resources; References; Appendices.

Whilst UK based, many of the ideas apply elsewhere and very positive feedback has been received from a number of countries.
September 2013

09-11 University of Lausanne, Switzerland
26th CHER Annual Conference – The Roles of Higher Education and Research in the Fabrics of Society
www3.unil.ch/wpmu/cher2013/

10-13 Istanbul Congress Centre Haribye, Turkey
Annual EAIE Conference – Weaving the Future of Global Partnership
IAU co-organises the following panels:
- Dialogue 01: Internationalisation or neo-colonialism?
- IAU invitational Executive Seminar on the policy and the practical side of higher education internationalisation as a tool for soft diplomacy
- EDC Opening event on Research and Innovation for Capacity Building in African Universities
www.eaie.org/home.html

10-13 Başçeşhır University, Turkey
ECER 2013 – Creativity and Innovation on Educational Research
www.eera-ecer.de/ecer2013/

19-20 Observatory Magna Charta Annual Conference
Universities, Students and Societies – Connecting Academic Freedom and Creative Cities
www.magna-charta.org

23-25 University of Albany (SUNY) New York, USA
OBHE 2013 Global Forum – The utility of Global Consortia and Networks of Universities
www.obhe.ac.uk/

October 2013

02-04 Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
5th ANIE Conference – Intra-regional education cooperation: Making internationalization and regionalization work for Africa.
www.anienetwork.org/

07-10 Montreal, Canada
First World Congress on Access to Post-Secondary Education – Connecting the Unconnected
IAU organises a Workshop on Access and Success
www.eanworldcongress.org/

08-11 National Convention Centre Canberra, Australia
AIEC 2013 – Global Imperative, Local Realities

15 Charles Darwin House, London
ACU Publishers for Development 2013 Conference on Forward Thinking: developing a global research cycle which fully engages North and South
www.pubs-for-dev.info/2013/01/publishers-for-development

16-18 Senate House, University of London, UK
ACU Centenary Future forward: taking charge of change
www.acu.ac.uk

16-18 Monterrey, Mexico
CAEI 2013 – Mobilité de la connaissance : Responsabilités et ressources
IAU sits on the Advisory Committee for the Conference
www.caie-caei.org

24-25 Paris, France
EADTU Annual Conference 2013 – Transition to open and on-line education in European Universities
http://conference.eadtu.eu/
This ‘Calendar of events’ is only an extraction of the IAU online Global Calendar of Events. The online version provides an overview of all conferences on HE organized around the world see: www.iau-aiu.net/content/global-calendar. To include other events, please write to: iau@iau-aiu.net
First Announcement

Blending Higher Education and Traditional Knowledge for Sustainable Development

IAU 2014 International Conference

19-21 March 2014
Universidad Científica del Perú (UCP)
Iquitos, Peru

More info on www.iau-aiu.net