CIHE Perspectives No. 7

State of Play:

Higher Education Management Training Schemes in the Field of Development Cooperation

Laura E. Rumbley, Hélène Bernot Ullerö, Edward Choi, Lisa Unangst, Ayenachew Aseffa Woldegiyorgis, Hans de Wit and Philip G. Altbach

A study undertaken by The Boston College Center for International Higher Education on behalf of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the German Rectors' Conference (HRK)

DAAD Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst German Academic Exchange Service

HRK German Rectors' Conference The Voice of the Universities

The Boston College Center *for* International Higher Education

CIHE Perspectives No. 7

State of Play: Higher Education Management Training Schemes in the Field of Development Cooperation

Laura E. Rumbley, Hélène Bernot Ullerö, Edward Choi, Lisa Unangst, Ayenachew Aseffa Woldegiyorgis, Hans de Wit, and Philip G. Altbach

A study undertaken by The Boston College Center for International Higher Education on behalf of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the German Rectors' Conference (HRK)

CIHE Perspectives

This series of studies focuses on aspects of research and analysis undertaken at the Boston College Center for International Higher Education.

The Center brings an international consciousness to the analysis of higher education. We believe that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center produces *International Higher Education* (a quarterly publication), books, and other publications; sponsors conferences; and welcomes visiting scholars. We have a special concern for academic institutions in the Jesuit tradition worldwide and, more broadly, with Catholic universities.

The Center promotes dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions throughout the world. We believe that the future depends on effective collaboration and the creation of an international community focused on the improvement of higher education in the public interest.

Center for International Higher Education
Campion Hall
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467 USA
www.bc.edu/cihe

©2017 Boston College Center for International Higher Education. All Rights Reserved

Table of Contents

DAAD and HRK Foreword 1
CIHE Foreword 2
Executive Summary 5
Introduction 9
Methodology 13
Findings 15
Recommendations 25
Appendix 1. Major Players in the Field of Higher Education Management Training for Development Cooperation 32
Appendix 2a. Detailed Descriptions of Select Main Training Schemes 33
Appendix 2b. Perspectives from Macro-level Organizations 57
Appendix 2c. International Deans' Course (IDC) 63
Appendix 3. List of Interviewees 64
Appendix 4. Interview Questions 66
References 69
About the Authors 72
About the Sponsors 74
About DIES 74
CIHE Publications Series 75

Abbreviations

AAU	**Association of African Universities**
ACBF	**African Capacity Building Foundation**
ACU	**Association of Commonwealth Universities**
AfDB	**African Development Bank**
AUF	**Agence universitaire de la Francophonie**
CCNY	**Carnegie Corporation of New York**
CIHE	**Center for International Higher Education (Boston College)**
CIEP	**Centre International d'Etudes Pédagogiques**
CIRCLE	**Climate Impacts Research Capacity and Leadership Enhancement (ACU)**
DAAD	*Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst* **(German Academic Exchange Service)**
DIES	**Dialogue on Innovative Higher Education Strategies**
EU	**European Union**
HE	**Higher Education**
HEI	**Higher Education Institution**
HRK	*Hochschulrektorenkonferenz* **(German Rectors' Conference)**
ICT	**Information and Communication Technology**
IDC	**International Deans' Course**
IFGU	**Institut de la Francophonie pour la Gouvernance universitaire**
IGLU	*Instituto de Gestión y Liderazgo Universitario* **(Forming University Leaders in Latin American Higher Education)**
IIEP	**International Institute for Educational Planning (UNESCO)**
LASPAU	**Academic and Professional Programs for the Americas**
LEDEV	**Leadership Development workshop (AAU)**
MADEV	**Management Development Training Program (AAU)**
M&E	**Monitoring and evaluation**

NGO	**Nongovernmental organization**
NICHE	**Netherlands Initiative for Capacity Development in Higher Education**
NUEPA	**National University of Educational Planning and Administration (India)**
Nuffic	**Dutch organisation for internationalisation in education**
ODA	**Official Development Assistance**
OUI–OHE	*Organización Universitaria Interamericana*–**Inter-American Organization for Higher Education**
PAP	**Personal action plan (IDC)**
ProGrant	**Proposal Writing for Research Grants (DIES)**
RIHED	**Regional Centre for Higher Education and Development (SEAMEO)**
SAP	**Strategic action plan (IDC)**
SDGs	**Sustainable Development Goals**
SEAMEO RETRAC	**Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Training**
Sida	**Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency**
STARS	**Structured Training for African Researchers (ACU)**
SUMA	**Senior University Management Workshop Series (AAU)**
UB	**United Board (for Christian Higher Education in Asia)**
UNESCO	**United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization**
UN	**United Nations**
UNILEAD	**University Leadership and Management Training Program (DIES)**
USAID	**US Agency for International Development**

DAAD and HRK FOREWORD

Universities throughout the world are operating in an increasingly dynamic environment characterized by global challenges. They face intense competition for highly qualified students and researchers and third-party funding. This holds true for universities all over the world and challenges particularly higher education institutions in developing countries where the demand for tertiary education has been skyrocketing over the last decades. Hence, the professionalization of higher education management is becoming more and more important in the field of international development cooperation.

Since 2001, the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the German Rectors' Conference (HRK) have been jointly coordinating the Dialogue on Innovative Higher Education Strategies (DIES) program, which aims at fostering the competencies of academic leadership staff and contribute to the enhancement of institutional management at universities in its main partner regions Africa, Spanish-speaking Latin America and Southeast Asia.

Within the DIES context, DAAD and HRK offer different components such as training courses and dialogue events and cooperate with foreign partner organizations on current management topics. In 2007, DAAD and HRK implemented the International Deans' Course (IDC), a training course that is designed for newly elected deans and vice-deans from Africa, Southeast Asia and, since 2012, Spanish-speaking Latin America. It deals with the various dimensions of faculty management such as financial management, quality assurance, leadership – supplemented with practice-oriented modules on project management and soft skills.

As many organizations worldwide engage in activities with a similar focus on trainings in the field of higher education management, the DAAD and the HRK commissioned the present background study to get insights into the state of play with regard to higher education management training schemes worldwide. The results of the study conducted by the Boston College Center for International Higher Education have been presented to the public on the occasion of the tenth anniversary conference of the IDC program in Berlin in November 2017.

The purpose of this study is not only to provide an overall picture of the different actors and their offers in this field but also to identify future directions and further needs. In addition, based on the results of the study DAAD and HRK will be able to establish an exchange of experience and good practice with other relevant actors worldwide.

We wish to thank the researchers at the Center for International Higher Education for the impressive work realized during a short time period. We would like to give special thanks to project leader Laura Rumbley and her team colleagues Edward Choi, Hélène Bernot Ullerö, Lisa Unangst, and Ayenachew Woldegiyorgis, for their persistent enthusiasm and engagement, and of course also to CIHE director Hans de Wit and CIHE founding director, Philip Altbach.

Michael Hörig
Head of Section Development Cooperation: Partnership Programmes and Higher Education Management
German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)

Marijke Wahlers
Head of International Department
German Rectors' Conference (HRK)

CIHE FOREWORD

The Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) at Boston College is pleased to present the seventh report in its *CIHE Perspectives* series, this time featuring *State of Play: Higher Education Management Training Schemes in the Field of Development Cooperation*. This report was commissioned by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the German Rectors' Conference (HRK) to gain insights into the nature and scope of the global landscape of higher education management training schemes active in the field of development cooperation.

Since 2007, DAAD and HRK have run the Dialogue on Innovative Higher Education Strategies (DIES) International Deans' Course (IDC), designed for newly elected deans and vice-deans from Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia. On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the IDC program's creation, this study seeks to provide useful insights into the state of play with regard to higher education management training schemes worldwide. The study has placed specific emphasis on those training schemes that share some fundamental characteristics with IDC, such as an international or cross-border dimension; a certain amount of longevity; a cohort model; a focus on management and leadership; and a "public good orientation," rather than an exclusive profit-making agenda.

The objective of this study was to develop a meaningful list of other sector actors with a similar approach and comparable programmatic offerings around the world, to learn more about how these programs undertake their work, and to gain insight into possible future directions for the field of higher education management training schemes in development cooperation. To this end, the study has produced a global "inventory" of training programs that somehow relate to one or more of the key dimensions outlined above, and provides deeper insight into the complexity of profiles and activities demonstrated by a select subset of the training providers identified in the inventory exercise.

Although the study notes that the provision of higher education training schemes in relation to development cooperation touches most world regions in some fashion, and in this sense is a global and emerging phenomenon, it also is a relatively small-scale and diverse phenomenon. Complexity is also a hallmark of the field. There are a multitude of different kinds of actors working in this space, and many individual programs feature multi-layered arrangements, in which a number of different actors are involved and play one or more roles in relation to a given initiative.

The training schemes on offer by the identified group of major players present a diverse picture with respect to matters of format (i.e., program delivery modes), duration, topics or focal points for training content, and target audiences. There is evidence that a variety of efforts are being undertaken to assess effectiveness and impact, but there is great unevenness among the providers when it comes to evaluation activity. Are these findings surprising and do they provide directions for future higher education leadership training in general and for capacity building in particular? There is clearly a great deal of room to develop further knowledge and understanding in this area.

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) takes a special interest in this work. Over the past 20 years, CIHE has itself been involved in a variety of higher education training programs—for senior leadership, middle management, and internationalization officers—in Asia, Africa, Latin America as well as Europe and North America. Our research over the years has noted that massification and the related trends of privatization, internationalization, differentiation, and diversifica-

tion of funding sources, have an enormous impact on governance, leadership, and management in higher education. As Philip Altbach writes in the 2017 study conducted by CIHE for HRK, the Körber Foundation and Universität Hamburg, on *Responding to Massification. Differentiation in Postsecondary Education Worldwide*, "postsecondary education is diversified, but with an anarchy of institutions" (2017, p. 21). Reisberg and de Wit in their concluding chapter in the same study state that "postsecondary education systems everywhere are continuing to expand but without a well-defined strategy to balance competing demands and objectives or to align the growth of a system with the needs of individuals, the labor market, national development or the possibilities of new technologies and new providers" (2017, p. 164).

Related to, and maybe also because of, this diversity, complexity and lack of a systematic approach to planning for higher education, we see that there is no clear academic study path for higher education leaders; their training requires a broad range of (inter) disciplinary skills. This results in a global need for more and higher quality training programs. International, regional, and national organizations around the world are involved in such training schemes. The picture of an emerging, global phenomenon—diverse, complex, and fragmented—is quite recognizable at all levels and in all areas of higher education training. And although elements from leadership training in other fields—such as business and health—can be useful as benchmarks, simply copying such programs is not possible, given the uniqueness of the higher education sector.

With this study, we hope to have provided insight, overview, and critical reflections, which can help DAAD and HRK in the further enhancement of their higher education leadership training efforts. We also hope that the study is relevant not only for consideration at the level of top leadership in higher education, but also for other levels and among other actors within the higher education enterprise. The inventory presented here will require regular updates and analysis. We recommend that every other year such an update and analysis take place to enhance the quality of the trainings on offer and to further knowledge and understanding in the field. We also recommend that the scope of the inventory and analysis be broadened to address other dimensions of training being offered in higher education—for example, not just programs with an international or development cooperation focus. As seen in the case of the *Worldwide inventory of Research Centers, Academic Programs, Journals and Publications*, produced by CIHE in 2014 (as well as in two previous editions), such inventories provide insight into comparative trends, issues, and challenges. And they can easily become—thanks to the Internet—more interactive and timely.

I want to thank my colleagues at the Center for International Higher Education—Lisa Unangst, Ayenachew Woldegiyorgis, Edward Choi, Hélène Bernot Ullerö and project leader Laura Rumbley—for their teamwork on this study, as well as founding director of CIHE, Philip Altbach, for his valuable advice. At HRK, we are indebted to Iris Danowski and Marijke Wahlers, and at DAAD to Tobias Wolf, for the close cooperation and guidance in the preparation and realization of this study.

Hans de Wit

Director, Boston College Center for
International Higher Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This research responds to a call made by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the German Rectors' Conference (HRK), which have been active players in the field of higher education training, and capacity building in developing and emerging economies around the world. In 2001, DAAD and HRK jointly started the higher education management program Dialogue on Innovative Higher Education Strategies (DIES). DIES focuses on two main action lines: training courses and so-called "dialogue events." The training courses "offer practical multi-part continuing education programmes for managerial staff at higher education institutions in developing countries" (DAAD, n.d.a, n.p.), while the dialogue events feature conferences, seminars, and fact-finding missions "that create forums for regional and transregional exchange on current reform topics in university management" (DAAD, n.d.a, n.p.). Aimed principally at institutional managers and academic leaders in Africa, Southeast Asia, and Hispanic America, the DIES approach is both collaborative and practical. Activities under the DIES umbrella are undertaken in cooperation with foreign partner organizations and address themes and issues that are considered fundamental to positive change and reform in the local higher education context.

Since 2007, DAAD and HRK have run the International Deans' Course (IDC) within the framework of DIES. IDC programming is designed for newly elected deans and vice-deans from Africa, Southeast Asia, and Latin America. It deals with various aspects of institutional and academic management and is rooted in an understanding that institutions of higher education throughout the world are operating in an increasingly dynamic environment characterized by global challenges. The IDC program is delivered via blended learning techniques and features a modular approach that addresses key topics of concern, such as strategic planning, financial management, management of research, quality assurance, project management, and internationalization.

On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the initiation of the IDC program, this study seeks to provide useful insight into the state of play with regard to higher education management training schemes worldwide, and aims to address four key questions. The first has to do with gaining a better understanding of exactly who the major players are around the world that are active in higher education training in the field of international development cooperation. Second, the research is interested in making sense of the kinds of management training schemes being offered. Third, the study is concerned with how we might understand matters of effectiveness and impact of these programs. Gaining some insight into the major challenges and opportunities ahead for higher education training for international development cooperation is the final key objective of this study

This analysis places specific emphasis on those training schemes that share some fundamental characteristics with the IDC specifically, as well as other DIES training courses, including such features as: an international or cross-border dimension, rather than exclusive domestic focus or orientation; some longevity (i.e., have operated for a number of years with various iterations of a training course or courses) and are currently operational; and some type of cohort model, ideally of some size (excluding, for example, very small programs or those offered to individuals only, in the absence of a cohort). The study also endeavors to focus on management and leadership in terms of both the content of training programs as well as the target audience for trainings. (As such, our focus is not on programs that are, for example, primarily interested in building capacity with respect to teaching and learning, or on programs supporting entry-level administrative capacity-building.) Importantly, the research is interested in looking at relevant training programs that feature a "public good orientation," rather than an exclusive profit-making orientation.

Finally, this study has specifically chosen to focus on training programs that are not embedded in time-limited projects (often seen, for example, in European Commission or World Bank initiatives). The objective of this study is to develop a meaningful list of other players with a similar approach and comparable programmatic offerings around the world, to learn more about how these programs undertake their work, and to gain insight into possible future directions for the field of higher education management training schemes in development cooperation.

The study produced two key outputs. The first is a global "inventory" of training programs that somehow relate to one or more of the various dimensions above. The second output consists of a set of findings providing deeper insight into the complexity of profiles and activities demonstrated by a select subset of the training providers identified in the inventory exercise.

Data were collected via two main methods: (1) desk research and (2) semi-structured interviews with representatives of several higher education management training programs and major international organizations with broad perspectives on the field of development cooperation, referred to in this report as "macro-level" organizations.

The inventory produced by this study consists of a total of 40 higher education management schemes sharing some of the key characteristics of the IDC program and other DIES training courses. Key findings emerging from an examination of this group of training programs include the following:

- The provision of higher education training schemes in relation to development cooperation touches most world regions in some fashion, whether in terms of being a region of origin for funders or providers, a region of focus for the offer of trainings, or both. Notably absent in this analysis are Central Asia and the Middle East. However, broadly speaking, **this is a global phenomenon**.
- **This is an emerging phenomenon**. A significant number of the programs identified by this study's inventory exercise register initiation dates after 2000.
- **This is a relatively small-scale phenomenon**. Despite the growing interest in, and offer of, higher education management training in connection with development cooperation, it appears there is a disperse offering, with many programs involving relatively small numbers of individuals per training.
- **This is a diverse phenomenon**. There is notable variation in terms of the topics and themes different programs and providers choose to focus on, the target populations and "clientele" they aim to serve, the approaches they take to program design, and the modalities they embrace for program delivery.
- **This is a complex phenomenon**. Complexity is evident in two primary ways. First, there are a multitude of different kinds of actors working in this space. Second, many individual programs feature multilayered arrangements, in which a number of different actors are involved and play one or more roles in relation to the overall initiative.

The most common profiles for the major players identified by this study's inventory exercise include:

- international intergovernmental organizations
- local and international nongovernmental organizations (NGO)
- government ministries
- quasi-governmental agencies
- foundations and other donor or philanthropic organizations
- universities and other higher education institutions
- associations, networks, and consortia of higher education institutions

The training schemes on offer by the identified group of major players present a diverse picture with respect to matters of format (i.e., program delivery modes), duration, topics or focal points for training content, and target audiences.

In terms of the **clientele**, the majority of programs seem to be targeted at either senior leadership (rectors, vice-chancellors, presidents, provosts, vice-rectors, deputy vice-chancellors, and deans), or middle and upper-middle level managers and administrators (i.e., those with director-level responsibilities and above). A smaller subset of programs

has an overt focus on particular populations, for example women or younger academics and emerging leaders.

The duration of the programs on offer can vary from several days to several weeks to several months; it is unusual, though not unknown for training programs to last for one year or more. Meanwhile, many different variations are reported by the major player programs, in terms of program design and delivery. Frequently, an individual program leverages several different approaches to deliver content and facilitate the training experience. Commonly reported formats include workshops, conferences, seminars, and lectures. Both face-to-face and online delivery are also commonly employed. Trainings may be standardized or bespoke; many are supply-driven, some are more demand-driven, while others combine both elements. Common training topics include:

- leadership development
- strategic planning
- gender equity
- change agency
- institutional and system governance
- quality assurance
- fundraising
- management of research and innovation
- university–industry linkages
- university–community/society linkages
- internationalization and global engagement

Matters of effectiveness and impact are very important to higher education training providers. There is evidence that a variety of efforts are being undertaken to assess effectiveness and impact, but there is great unevenness among the providers profiled in this study when it comes to evaluation activity, and a great deal of room to develop further knowledge and understanding in this area.

Key challenges for training providers include:

- improving program evaluation efforts with respect to short-term effects and long-term impact
- ensuring training provision keeps up with the rapid pace of change in higher education around the world
- identifying trainers who are knowledgeable about specific institutional, regional, and national contexts
- identifying and effectively engaging new or underserved populations in need of higher education management capacity-building (for example, women)

We concluded that the existing offer of expertise appears to be dispersed, uncoordinated, territorial, and insufficient. On the basis of these findings, we note three fundamental considerations that should be top-of-mind for the strategic future development of high-quality training schemes in the international development cooperation context:

- **Scaling up and diversifying**. There is considerable demand for management training, yet the existing offer of expertise appears to be dispersed, uncoordinated, territorial, and insufficient. Training providers must consider innovative approaches to leveraging technological tools, expanding their base of trainers, and collaborating with key partners to expand their reach.
- **Providing evidence of impact**. For example, tracking of participant trajectories needs to be improved and systematized, and the cost of maintaining tracer systems and regular contact with alumni needs to be a standard part of operating budgets.
- **Searching for funding**. In a context of limited funds and great need, finding innovative funding sources will remain an ongoing concern. Collaboration among training providers and expansion into new content areas or clientele groups (such as the private higher education sector) may prove fruitful.

INTRODUCTION

This research responds to a call made by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the German Rectors' Conference (HRK) to gain insights into the nature and scope of the global landscape of higher education management training schemes active in the field of development cooperation. DAAD and HRK are both members of this global community given that, since 2007, they have run the International Deans' Course (IDC). The IDC program is one of several dimensions of the work that has been undertaken jointly by DAAD and HRK since 2001 under the umbrella of the higher education management program Dialogue on Innovative Higher Education Strategies (DIES). DIES focuses on two main action lines: training courses and so-called "dialogue events." The training courses "offer practical multipart continuing education programmes for managerial staff at higher education institutions in developing countries" (DAAD, n.d.a, n.p.), while the dialogue events feature conferences, seminars, and fact-finding missions "that create forums for regional and transregional exchange on current reform topics in university management" (DAAD, n.d.a, n.p.). Aimed principally at institutional managers and academic leaders in Africa, Southeast Asia, and Hispanic America, the DIES approach is both collaborative and practical.

DIES activities are undertaken in cooperation with foreign partner organizations and address themes and issues that are considered fundamental to positive change and reform in the local higher education context. Training courses currently focus not only on serving more mid-career individuals (as in the IDC), but also on younger professionals, for example in the context of the DIES University Leadership and Management Training Program (UNILEAD). Cultivation of specific capacities to attract resources in support of research can be identified as another training priority, as seen in the Proposal Writing for Research Grants (ProGrant) initiative.

For its part, the International Deans' Course (IDC) is designed for newly elected deans and vice-deans from Africa, Southeast Asia, and Latin America. It deals with various aspects of institutional and academic management and is rooted in an understanding that institutions of higher education throughout the world are operating in an increasingly dynamic environment characterized by global challenges. The IDC program is delivered via blended learning techniques and features a modular approach that addresses key topics of concern, such as strategic planning, financial management, management of research, quality assurance, project management, and internationalization.

A core element of the IDC is the program's focus on fostering participant empowerment (with respect to knowledge and skills) to bring about needed institutional change. As such, the topics and materials used in the IDC are highly practically oriented; case studies and exercises to promote critical reflection on personal experience with practice are heavily featured. To support development in this area, IDC participants are required to develop a strategic or personal action plan (SAP or PAP, respectively). The goal of this exercise is to provide participants with the opportunity to test out the process of designing and implementing new policies and/or management practices to enhance institutional performance.

This is timely and significant work. Indeed, profound importance of ensuring effective management and administration of higher education systems and institutions has been recognized widely around the world in recent years. The centrality of governance and management was highlighted overtly in the World Bank's landmark 2000 report, *Higher Education in Developing Countries. Peril and Promise*, which noted, "poor management is often the single greatest obstacle to stronger higher education" (p. 95) and "better management will lead to the more effective deployment of limited resources" (p. 11). Nearly two decades later, low-income countries, emerging economies, and societies in transition in all world regions continue to face serious challenges

with respect to leadership, governance, and administration in higher education. These challenges of management play out against a backdrop of rapid and complex change characterized by (among other factors) a fast-evolving knowledge economy, shifting demographics, environmental and political uncertainties, reductions in public financial support for higher education, and especially the pressures of massification.

Countries featuring low-income and emerging economy profiles can be particularly challenged to respond to these developments. This situation stems from the fact that many such countries are also facing rapid increases in student enrollment numbers, while dealing with limited human and financial resources to apply to the higher education enterprise. Many also have shorter higher education traditions (i.e., quite young higher education systems and institutions), and therefore less experience and other reserves to draw on in relation to assessing threats, leveraging opportunities, and managing change.

Into this breach, management development schemes are offered by a range of actors aiming to provide avenues for knowledge sharing and capacity building in a development cooperation context. To be sure, the founding of numerous institutions in lower-income countries throughout the twentieth century has featured active support and collaboration from actors abroad, and has, in many cases, evolved into longer-term relationships in support of the fledgling institutions. But, more specifically targeted, purpose-built, and professionalized higher education management training and development programs, particularly in relation to cooperation for development, seem to be a more recent phenomenon.

Impetus for this activity is directly related to the increasing prominence of higher education as a perceived engine of economic and social prosperity around the world, as well as the rapidly expanding interest in and commitment to different aspects of internationalization as a reference point for quality in higher education. Perhaps most important, the complexities of managing large universities, including accounting for the large budgets of these institutions, have made it clear that professional management training and an understanding of the nature of contemporary higher education for those in academic leadership positions are essential.

On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the IDC program's creation, this study seeks to provide useful insight into the state of play with regard to higher education management training schemes worldwide. This analysis has placed specific emphasis on those training schemes that share some fundamental characteristics with IDC, including such features as: an international or cross-border dimension, rather than exclusive domestic focus or orientation; some longevity (i.e., have operated for a number of years with various iterations of a training course or courses) and being currently operational; and some type of cohort model, ideally of some size (excluding, for example, very small programs or those offered to individuals only, in the absence of a cohort). The study also endeavors to focus on management and leadership in terms of both the content for training programs as well as the target audience for trainings. As such, our focus is not on programs that are, for example, primarily interested in building capacity with respect to teaching and learning, or programs supporting entry-level administrative capacity building. Importantly, the research is interested in looking at relevant training programs that feature a "public good orientation," rather than an exclusive profit-making orientation. Finally, this study has specifically chosen to focus on training programs that are not embedded in time-limited projects (often seen, for example, in European Commission or World Bank initiatives). The objective of this study is to develop a meaningful list of other sector actors with a similar approach and comparable programmatic offerings around the world, to learn more about how these programs undertake their work, and to gain insight into possible future directions for the field of higher education management training schemes in development cooperation.

Our aim in this study is to provide two key outputs. The first is a global "inventory" of training programs that somehow relates to one or more of the various dimensions outlined above. This census of relevant training schemes around the world sheds

important light on the community of organizations active in this space and brings into evidence an entire ecosystem of actors involved in this work. The inventory exercise serves to help answer the first of four fundamental questions at the heart of this study, which is: Who are the major players active in higher education training in the field of international development cooperation?

The second output of this research is to provide deeper insight into the complexity of profiles and activities demonstrated by a select subset of the training providers identified in the inventory exercise. Here, we focus on addressing the three remaining questions driving the study: What kinds of management training schemes are offered? How do we understand matters of effectiveness and impact of these programs? What are the major challenges and opportunities ahead for higher education training in the field of international development cooperation?

This report offers a comprehensive explanation of the methodology undertaken to explore these matters, as well as information on what we learned from the inventory exercise to identify major players in the field. From both the inventory exercise and interviews with representatives of a subset of major player organizations and experts in the field of international development cooperation, we are able to put forward some possible answers to the four research questions guiding this study. Finally, we present a list of recommendations, key insights, and further considerations for DAAD and HRK to ponder, as they consider possible future directions for the IDC program specifically, and other DIES training courses more broadly.

METHODOLOGY

The research for this study was conducted over the period December 2016 to May 2017 and, as indicated in the Introduction, focused on four main questions:

Question 1: Who are the major players active in higher education training in the field of international development cooperation?

Question 2: What kinds of management training schemes are offered?

Question 3: How do we understand matters of effectiveness and impact of these programs?

Question 4: What are the major challenges and opportunities ahead for higher education training in the field of international development cooperation?

Data were collected via two main methods: (1) desk research and (2) semi-structured interviews with representatives of several higher education management training programs and major international organizations with broad perspectives on the field of development cooperation, referred to in this report as "macro-level" organizations.

The desk research began with an examination of the publicly accessible websites of a number of higher education management training programs around the world already known to the research team. In addition, the team worked from a list of over 50 higher education experts around the world to seek advice on additional higher education management training schemes not already known to the research team that could be explored for this project. This work was largely divided geographically, with different members of the research team taking responsibility for gathering information relevant to major world regions: Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe, Oceania, and "international."

A preliminary framework was constructed for data collection related to the inventory, consisting of 15 basic categories of information, such as donors, program providers and managers, target groups/clients, program format, etc. By late December 2016, an initial group of 63 higher education management training schemes was identified.

The initial framework provided a useful starting point, but the research team was not satisfied with the degree of precision inherent in the original 15 basic categories of information. Refining the framework for the inventory was an iterative and collaborative process, closely tied to what the research team was learning about the existing training schemes in the process of their identification for the inventory. That is, as the research team became aware of the characteristics of different training schemes, the sense of the complexity of the global landscape of actors involved in this work evolved, which in turn affected the understanding about the indicators necessary to frame the inventory coherently. As such, a second iteration of the inventory, developed by mid-January 2017, suggested a reduction from 15 to 12 much more highly refined and precise categories of information for each training scheme. The study representatives from DAAD and HRK confirmed the improvements made to the inventory categories in a late January 2017 project workshop and, together with the research team, added five more categories, to allow for the inclusion of several additional key data points (see Appendix 1 for the final version of the inventory framework).

Meanwhile, the criteria for what could be considered a "major player" in this field was similarly jointly refined by representatives from DAAD, HRK, and the research team, again in an iterative process that occurred in tandem with the evolution of the global inventory itself. Ultimately, "major player" status was deemed most applicable to those training schemes sharing some fundamental characteristics with IDC in the areas of:

1. an international or cross-border dimension
2. some longevity (i.e., have operated for a number of years with various iterations of a training course or courses) and are currently operational

3. some type of cohort model, ideally of some size (excluding, for example very small programs or those offered to individuals only, in the absence of a cohort)
4. a focus on management and leadership (rather than, for example, teaching and learning or entry-level administrative capacity-building)
5. a "public good orientation," rather than an exclusive profit-making orientation
6. An existence beyond the particular configuration of a larger time-limited project, which can often been seen in European Union initiatives or World Bank projects.

With an interest in training schemes fitting this type of profile, the next step in the research process was to identify a subset of programs that could be targeted for interviews in order to develop meaningful insights into the issues raised by research questions numbers 2, 3, and 4, outlined above. Again, the research team worked collaboratively with the DAAD and HRK project representatives to identify 10–12 different training schemes to target for these semi-structured interviews. The programs selected were determined to be relevant to the IDC and DIES in one of multiple ways, ranging from similarities of program format and delivery, to offering high potential for insights relevant to the research questions, to providing some geographic and cultural diversity for potential enrichment of the findings. Interviews were ultimately conducted for 10 programs, as the participation of one identified program could not be secured.

In addition, the decision was taken to expand the interview process to include several "macro-level" organizations—these are major international organizations in the field of international higher education and/or development cooperation that, although not necessarily offering training programs themselves (either currently or in the past), do have the potential to provide important insights in relation to key trends and issues relevant to this research. (See Appendix 3 for the full list of organizations targeted for closer inspection and the interviewees who participated in the data collection process.)

The interviews were conducted via telephone, online web conferencing (such as Zoom, Skype or FaceTime), or e-mail, depending on the preference and availability of the interviewees. Those interviewees targeted on the basis of the specific training programs offered by their organizations were asked to respond to 12 distinct questions; those representing "macro-level" organizations were asked to respond to four questions. (See Appendix 4 for a list of the interview questions). Most interviews lasted between 45 minutes and one hour.

The interview responses were recorded, then summarized and discussed by the research team, which teased out indicative findings, explored shared insights, and discussed divergent impressions of the issues emerging from the interview data. The summaries of each interview are provided in Appendix 2a and Appendix 2b. A detailed discussion of the findings based on the data collection and analysis, and the guiding research questions, are presented in the following section.

Much can be gleaned from this exercise to make sense of the global landscape of the offer of higher education management training schemes. At the same time, there are limitations to these insights. First and foremost is the fact that the search for such training schemes was ultimately limited to those programs that displayed a set of characteristics that somehow aligned with those of the DAAD and HRK's IDC program and other DIES training courses. This excludes a significant body of programming, including schemes that do not run repeatedly over time, are situated more in a commercial or profit-making context, are embedded in a more piecemeal fashion in much broader initiatives—such as those of the World Bank, sponsored by the European Union, or official development assistance (ODA) programs—or are no longer operational. Also generally excluded are programs that are focused on other aspects of higher education outside of management, administration, or leadership, strictly speaking—for example those that may be focused on enhancing teaching and learning.

FINDINGS

Providing a global snapshot of higher education management training schemes in the field of development cooperation, and generating meaningful insights into the nature of the work undertaken in this field, is both an important and an exceedingly challenging endeavor.

The importance of this work rests on the fact that the entire global development agenda—encapsulated, for example, in the form of the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (UN, n.d.)—is implicitly (if not explicitly) underpinned by the need for well-educated experts (R. Hopper, personal communication, April 3, 2017). Scientists, judges, teachers, agricultural experts, urban planners, economists, health care professionals, community leaders, and the like are all needed to advance the ambitious targets set for the global community to achieve its sustainable development goals—and, in most cases, individuals in these roles are trained in universities. It is clear from the data collection exercises undertaken in the course of this study that many organizations and individuals feel a pressing need to improve the way that higher education institutions are run, and how they perform, in light of the critical role such institutions play for social and economic development around the world. Higher education *matters*, offering a crucial means to many important societal ends; therefore, improving the management capacity of those responsible for its operation and future development also matters.

Despite a common understanding that there is a need to support and enhance the profile of higher education managers and leaders, particularly in developing and emerging economy contexts, and the fact that many organizations are actively striving to do so in their development cooperation programming, data are difficult to capture and compare. There is no global database of organizations active in this area or programs focused on this work. Key terms such as "management training," "development cooperation," and "major players" are open to broad interpretation. Data can be difficult to obtain and, even when available, may not be easily comparable across programs and contexts.

Furthermore, situating very different training schemes in a common framework of standardized categories or indicators can be a rather artificial exercise, in light of the many unique characteristics and particularities of program design, delivery, focus, intent, and target audience. This study takes as its point of departure that such complexity is a fact of life in any global consideration of higher education management training schemes within the field of development cooperation. No two training schemes are completely alike, therefore comparisons between them are difficult.

Nonetheless, our exploration of this topic leads us to conclude that there are, indeed, a multitude of organizations delivering higher education management training schemes connected to development cooperation. In addition, the data available (however limited and inconsistent) about these organizations and the programs they offer do provide some general indications about this global community of actors that are useful to consider for a better understanding of this important, and seemingly growing, phenomenon.

Key contours of a global landscape

A (nearly) global phenomenon

The inventory exercise conducted for this study (see Appendix 1) makes it possible to say with confidence that the provision of higher education training schemes in relation to development cooperation touches nearly all world regions in some fashion, whether in terms of being a region of origin for funders or providers, a region of focus for the offer of trainings, or both. Notably absent or underrepresented in this analysis are Central Asia and the Middle East. This does not mean that higher education management trainings schemes are not active there. However, the criteria used for this particular a

exercise (see "Methodology" section) did not yield relevant examples for our inventory.

Meanwhile, there are major imbalances in the existing picture. Africa and Oceania, for example, stand out as regions with less representation in the inventory than do the Americas, Asia, and Europe, in relation to the origin of funders and providers of training schemes. Europe is particularly notable for the number of funders and providers hailing from that region of the world. Still, most world regions are represented when it comes to the geographic location of organizations funding or offering training programs, which provides a clear indication of the (nearly) global reach of the higher education training scheme phenomenon.

An emerging phenomenon

A significant number of the programs identified by this study's inventory exercise register initiation dates after 2000. This information can sometimes be difficult to discern accurately, given that some organizations periodically reauthorize or refund longstanding programs, therefore giving the impression that the programs are quite "young" when considering their inception dates. However, even in these instances and in the cases of unquestionably "older" programs included in the inventory, it is rare to find a program start date from before 1990.

The relatively young age of higher education management training schemes speaks clearly to the emergence (particularly over the last two decades) of an overt consensus, in both national and international policy circles, that higher education is key for national development.

A limited phenomenon

Despite the growing interest in, and offer of, higher education management training in connection with development cooperation, it appears that many programs involve relatively small numbers of individuals per training. It can be difficult to gather these data points, but where they are available there is minimal indication that trainings are offered on a particularly large scale. Rather, cohorts of fewer than 50 individuals seem most common in specific training programs offered at any one time. In light of the massive and dramatic growth in higher education systems and instituions in many parts of the developing world, serving such limited numbers of individuals may be inadequate (at least in the short term) to the broader task of addressing major and widespread training needs in these contexts.

There are many providers of training, yet their ability to absorb real demand (setting aside issues of availability of funding for training) appears to be limited.

A diverse phenomenon

A key finding of this research is that there is great variation in terms of the topics and themes different programs and providers choose to focus on, the target populations and "clientele" they aim to serve, the approaches they take to program design, and the modalities they embrace for program delivery. These issues are explored in greater detail below in the subsection "Content and focus." What is crucial to note here is that, when it comes to training schemes for higher education management in the development cooperation context, there are many different manifestations of both "supply" (i.e., what kinds of training are being offered, for which kinds of participants, and for what purpose) and "demand" (i.e., the many unique contexts and populations where the needs for such training exist).

A key example of this notion of diversity of program profiles is evident when considering whether a particular training scheme operates on an ongoing basis and recruits participants into regularly scheduled or somehow standardized program iterations, or if the programming is rather offered in a "one-off" or tailored manner, in response to the call of a particular group seeking out training support. This distinction may be understood broadly as a dynamic between "supply" and "demand," with supply-driven training aiming to draw participants or clientele into pre-existing training initiatives, while demand-driven training actively pursues training expertise to address a given set of needs. Of course, a "pure" distinction between these two poles may not be completely accurate, as demand and supply dynamics may influence one another. However, this is an important distinction, and sets the stage for a

consideration of the many other ways in which different variables play out in the conception, design, and delivery of higher education management training schemes.

In addition, an important distinction is seen in terms of the management training offered in the context of time-bound projects that run for a specified number of years and are the result of calls for tender by a funder—for example, the European Union (EU)—as opposed to training programs that exist on an indefinite basis and are offered by expert organizations or associations. This study has focused on the latter profile, consistent with interests of DAAD and HRK's own programming. Although the European bilateral programs, such as those offered by Sida (the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency) and Nuffic (the Dutch organisation for internationalisation in education), are structured in time-bound projects, they have been consistently refunded and are implemented by a stable group of experts. Due to this stability, their experiences may provide useful insights for this study.

A complex phenomenon

Perhaps the clearest and most important finding from this study is that the global picture of higher education management training schemes in development cooperation is one of significant complexity. This complexity plays out in two primary ways. First, there are a multitude of different kinds of actors working in this space. Second, many individual programs feature multilayered arrangements, in which a number of different actors are involved and play one or more roles in relation to the overall initiative. Both of these dimensions of complexity lead us to conclude that there is a rather extensive "ecosystem" of organizations or stakeholder parties participating in a variety of ways in the design and delivery of higher education management training schemes in the field of development cooperation.

The list of actors involved in higher education management features many different kinds of organizations and entities, including:

- international intergovernmental organizations
- local and international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)
- government ministries
- quasigovernmental agencies
- foundations and other donor or philanthropic organizations
- universities and other higher education institutions
- associations, networks, and consortia of higher education institutions
- consultancy groups
- independent consultants

These entities may operate independently and offer higher education management training schemes in a completely independent or self-sufficient manner. At the same time, there are very frequently training schemes that rely on a "chain" of actors, each playing different roles in the overarching initiative.

For example, a philanthropic foundation may identify a priority area it wishes to support, which features a focus on higher education management training in a particular world region. That foundation may turn for guidance and implementation support to a partner—such as a university consortium or association—that is knowledgeable about, and credible within, that world region. In turn, the university consortium or association may identify a small number of universities to serve as managers of the program, with more hands-on responsibility for providing the framework for the training, for example in relation to offering training space in their classrooms. Finally, experts—either from a specific consultancy, or as independent contractors—may be called upon to deliver some or all of the actual training. Post-training, an education NGO or research center may be asked to conduct a follow-up assessment or tracer study.

The possible arrangements across the roles of funders, managers/providers, and trainers are manifold. This can make it quite complicated to clarify who is actually "offering" or "running" a training program, and may introduce a complex set of political agendas, cultural values, and operational particularities into the design and delivery processes.

Discerning which actors are playing which roles and in what phases of a training program is a chal-

lenging exercise, even more so when the aim is to paint a global picture of this landscape of actors. This research finds that there is significant activity, both among individual organizations and among different actors in tandem with one another, all of which presents a complex global ecosystem of training activity and stakeholders.

Addressing significant questions

Who are the major players?

As indicated previously, this study focuses on identifying major players active in higher education management training schemes in the field of development cooperation that have some synergies with DAAD and HRK's IDC program and other DIES training courses. Key elements that framed the search for major players were whether the programs in question had some of the same fundamental qualities inherent in the IDC offering (as described in both the Introduction and Methodology sections). Based on a region-by-region exploration of organizations focused on development cooperation activities and/or higher education capacity-building, we were able to identify 39 organizations that we feel align reasonably well with one or more of the key elements identified above. As noted above, this exercise identified organizations based in, or focused on, all major world regions, apart from Central Asia and the Middle East.

The most common profiles for the major players identified by this exercise include the following types of organizations:

- university associations
- governmental or quasigovernmental agencies
- intergovernmental organizations
- umbrella organizations (featuring various kinds of organizations, for example, individual universities, university associations, and quality assurance organizations)
- private non-profit organizations, such as foundations
- universities
- university-based centers or institutes

We recognize, however, that the five criteria used for this study are limiting. The existing ecosystem of higher education management schemes clearly features a great deal of activity that is not visible when these five criteria (i.e., a cross-border dimension, some longevity and current activity, a cohort model, a public good orientation, etc.) are applied. Most notably missing are the myriad "pockets" of training related to higher education management capacity-building that exist within much bigger development cooperation initiatives or agendas—for example, those undertaken by foundations such as the Carnegie Corporation, and (inter) governmental organizations like the EU, the World Bank, the US Agency for International Development (USAID), and many other official development assistance (ODA) programs implemented by a number of governments around the world (R. Hopper, personal communication, April 3, 2017).

The major players we have identified are generally quite visible organizations with significant "public profiles" in the spheres of higher education and/or cooperation for development. They are also longstanding organizations, the vast majority having existed as organizations for several decades. This is a notable feature of this "major player" group; despite the fact that many of the training programs on offer have not been around for more than 15 years, the entities providing or supporting them have existed for a significantly longer period of time.

About half of these major player organizations operate out of, or are overtly connected to, one specific national context, in terms of their "origin" or "home base"—for example, Sida in Sweden or Nuffic in the Netherlands. The other half are more fundamentally international organizations at their essence—as seen in such examples as the Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU) and the Inter-American Organization for Higher Education (IOHE). Where there is a connection to one specific national context, there is very little indication that the major player organizations or programs identified there offer much in the way of higher education training courses designed particularly for those domestic audiences. One exception here may be the provider identified in India, the National University

of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA), which does offer limited international programming, as well as offerings targeted specifically at Indian higher education institutions and professionals.

What kinds of training schemes are in evidence?

The training schemes on offer by the identified group of major players present a diverse picture with respect to matters of format (i.e., program delivery modes), duration, topics or focal points for training content, and target audiences.

In terms of the clientele, the majority of programs seem to be targeted at either senior leadership (rectors, vice-chancellors, vice-rectors, deputy vice-chancellors, and deans), or middle and upper-middle level managers and administrators (i.e., those with director-level responsibilities and above). A smaller subset of programs has an overt focus on particular populations, for example women or younger academics and emerging leaders.

The duration of the programs on offer can vary from several days to several weeks to several months. More rarely, programs span one to two years (as seen in the case of the United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia).

In terms of formats for program delivery, many different variations are reported by the major player programs. Frequently, an individual program leverages several different approaches to deliver content and facilitate the training experience. Commonly reported formats include workshops, conferences, seminars, and lectures. Both face-to-face and online delivery are reported. Programs may also employ the use of case studies, site visits, practical experience or internships, group projects, and/or personal projects/independent research to advance participants' learning. Less common but still evident are programs that feature long-term partnerships between institutions as a part of the training framework. Coaching, mentoring, and shadowing, are other techniques that may feature in the training experience.

Some programs include opportunities (or requirements) for participants to travel internationally, while others are offered in the country where the participants live and work. As noted previously (in the section on "A diverse phenomenon"), some trainings may consist of highly standardized programming, while others may feature more tailored approaches, including bespoke consulting and reviews.

The range of issues addressed in training content is extensive. The focal points for the training programs identified in the inventory exercise undertaken for this research include such topics as:

- leadership development
- strategic planning
- gender equity
- change agency
- institutional and system governance
- quality assurance
- fundraising
- management of research and innovation
- university–industry linkages
- university–community/society linkages
- internationalization and global engagement

From our perspective, several content areas are noticeably less prominent in this list—at least in the data reviewed for this project—than might be expected. These are:

- strategic financial management
- institutional research (i.e., the research undertaken by individual institutions to better understand their own performance across a variety of dimensions, including in relation to finances, student success, faculty performance, etc.
- student affairs and activism
- the administrative dimensions of support for teaching and learning

In terms of the position of **strategic financial management** as a focal point for training schemes, there may be a number of reasons why this topic does not stand out in the research. On the one hand, financial autonomy may be limited in many contexts, which may affect the relevance of this issue, if the space to make strategic financial choices is fundamentally constrained. Furthermore, financial con-

siderations may already be embedded in one or more of the top-level topics enumerated above—for example, in relation to fundraising, change agency, or management of research and innovation. Meanwhile, if training schemes bring together international cohorts of participants, it may be difficult to address strategic financial management, if financial decision-making is tied closely to very specific institutional or national contexts. Trainers may therefore opt to forego including this topic on an agenda that must be "translatable" across a variety of different institutional or national realties.

Whatever the reason for its lower visibility in this research exercise, it is interesting to note this gap, given that, around the world, insufficient, unstable, and/or declining public support for higher education is a common and critical trend, with important consequences for higher education institutions and leaders at all levels within them. Privatization and differentiation of resources become ever more important trends for higher education leaders and managers to monitor and understand.

Similarly, skill-building with respect to **institutional research**—which is designed to give leaders and managers crucial intelligence on how their institutions are performing against a set of criteria they deem most important—does not stand out readily on the list of topics covered by the programs identified in this research. Again, this may be a question of semantics or that this kind of focus is actually embedded in other topics addressed by the training schemes in question. However, on the face of it, this is not a priority area of note for many of training initiatives, despite the fact that higher education institutions are increasingly complex organizations. This internal complexity, combined with the complexity and fluidity of external environments, is raising the stakes on good decision-making, which relies on increasing amounts of good quality data about institutional performance. Higher-level institutional managers and leaders may not need to actually undertake institutional research themselves, but they do need know what kinds of data to ask for and to accurately assess the quality and relevance of the data available to them. The limited attention seemingly paid to a focus on institutional research in the identified training schemes is a notable finding.

We note that, in a number of higher education systems around the world—for example in South Africa and earlier in Chile—students have been registering major concern about matters of funding and equity, among other matters. Issues of **student activism and calls for engagement in institutional governance** affect higher education leadership decisions and management practices. An expanding and changing student body profile in many contexts presents new challenges for **student services and support**. We see little evidence of attention to these topics in existing training schemes in our inventory.

Likewise, scant attention seems to be paid in existing training schemes to the **administrative dimensions of support for teaching and learning**, despite great concern around the world for considering student-centered approaches to learning, among other fundamental debates about pedagogy and the relevance of education and training in the 21st century context.

Finally, one item is very present on the agendas of most training schemes, yet it is noticeably not operationalized—or insufficiently addressed when operationalized: **gender equity.** Special attention has been paid by the inventory exercise to how the various training schemes are attending to this topic. The fundamental conclusion is that this is a topic of concern, but most of the existing approaches—particularly in light of their sporadic and short-term nature—are incapable of making a significant difference, in light of the many complex dimensions of this issue.

How may we understand issues of effectiveness and impact?

The question of whether the work done around the world by higher education management training schemes in development cooperation actually makes a difference is a crucial one. However, it is also a question that defies easy answers, given the complexity of the issues involved and the fact that training programs are challenged to make accurate sense of effectiveness and impact on a variety of levels. Key

questions that may be raised in relation to effectiveness and impact may include:

- Which specific skills, knowledge, sensibilities, and/or relationships were acquired or enhanced by participants as a result of the training offered?
- How well or how deeply did the participants learn what they learned, and how effectively did the training experience facilitate that learning?
- Once back in the "real world" of daily professional life, to what extent are participants able to apply the lessons or skills learned as a result of the training experience?
- Are applicants able to apply the learning resulting from the training experience over the short-term only? Or, are longer-term applications of the learning also possible?
- How deeply or how widely is a participant able to effect change in an institution or a system, and what does this say about the impact of the training that this participant applies to his or her "sphere of influence"?
- What is the cumulative effect of various iterations of a training program over a period of time? What kinds of professional or alumni networks emerge from these programs and what is their impact?

The evidence gleaned particularly from the interviews conducted for this study indicates that there are no easy answers to these questions.

Most of the training programs profiled in this study indicate that they are actively concerned about issues of effectiveness and impact with respect to their work, but note that gaining deep insight into these questions remains to be achieved. Nearly all of the training schemes indicate that they administer program evaluations to training participants at one or more points during a given training program. This process yields feedback on a broad set of administrative and logistical details—such as satisfaction levels with accommodation and meals provided as a part of the training experience—but also delves into more substantive issues in relation to perceptions about the quality of the trainers, program content, and the overall learning experience. At the same time, most interviewees for this study note that their specific training schemes do not employ any kind of formal long-term studies designed to assess impact.

An exception to this rule is the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Training (SEAMEO RETRAC), which undertakes impact studies in two-year cycles aimed at gathering data focused on two main questions:

1. How do participants integrate what they took away from the program (knowledge and skills) into daily professional practice?
2. How can future iterations of the trainings offered be improved?

Some career tracking questions are included in the surveys administered for these studies, as a means to gain some insight into possible connections between training efforts and participants' professional trajectories. The United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia (hereafter, the United Board) works to keep in touch with its alumni, whom it requests to report new professional appointments as a way of attempting to track past training participants' career trajectories. The United Board also actively uses alumni in its efforts to identify new program participants. The willing engagement of alumni in this process may be considered an indirect indication of how these alumni value the United Board's training schemes. So might the fact that many past participants of the Forming University Leaders in Latin American Higher Education (IGLU) program, run by the Inter-American Organization for Higher Education, cheerfully refer to themselves as *igluistas*, in appreciation for that experience. Still, the representative of the United Board and others note a keen interest in identifying better ways to produce more concrete and objective data to evaluate impact.

The desire for more objective inputs into the question of effectiveness and impact has led some organizations to seek out external reviews of their work. This applies to the Nuffic-run Netherlands Initiative for Capacity Development in Higher Education (NICHE), which points to several external reviews that have been conducted on their efforts. Nuffic takes the positive findings of these reviews as an indication, in particular, of the ability of its proj-

ects to strengthen capacity among its partner institutions in a sustainable way.

The United Board and Nuffic are unique among the organizations featured in the more detailed data collection part of this study in that they endeavor to conduct pre- and postexperience measurements of participants' performance. For example, baseline information is recorded on participants as they leave the United Board Fellows Program and efforts are made to track alumni with respect to such matters as career advancement or organizational change, as a result of integration of training principles (see Appendix 2a). Meanwhile, in the NICHE program, partner institutions are required to make a baseline analysis of their organizational capacities when requesting a project. During the project, progress is constantly measured against the baseline using a patented approach: the "5 capabilities approach" (Nuffic, n.d.b).

Of course, measuring change, enhanced performance, or "success" is one thing. Determining if the training schemes in question are responsible for the achievement of that change, or are somehow a significant factor in relation to progress toward positive outcomes, is very difficult to assess. This is particularly so when the evidence of change or improvement may not be fully visible for some years, maybe even decades. Sida assumes that its work to help universities build up their research capacity is a 20– to 30–year proposition. The element of time is an important one. Different elements of effectiveness and impact of higher education management training schemes may be apparent only at particular stages in the arc of the professional life of a program participant. The training experience itself is one thing; the immediate post-training experience, when participants are just moving away from the training experience is another, as is the reflection on the training that may be undertaken at different intervals well beyond the experience (two years, five years, ten years, etc.). Gaining a true understanding of effectiveness and impact may only be possible after a significant period of time has passed. Meanwhile, the element of time is notable in another sense. Specifically, some programs perceive that their longevity (as training schemes or by way of their parent organizations) contributes to their ongoing success, given that this longevity has provided an existing network from which to draw participants, expert trainers, as well as political buy-in and support. SEAMEO and the United Board serve as examples of this point (see Appendix 2a).

Ultimately, there is evidence that a variety of efforts are being undertaken to assess the effectiveness and impact of training schemes, but there is great unevenness among the providers profiled in this study, and a great deal of room to develop further knowledge and understanding in this area.

What are the major challenges and opportunities ahead?

The information gleaned from this study points toward an interesting array of possibilities and potential challenges for higher education management training schemes in the field of development cooperation. As with many analytical exercises, it can be difficult to define a clear line between these two categories of consideration, as it is often possible to perceive both challenges and opportunities emerging from a given context or issue. This duality is duly recognized here, although some matters do lend themselves somewhat more naturally to one category or the other.

Perhaps one of the most central challenges identified by the study is consistent with the section of this report presented just above—on **effectiveness and impact**— and relates to the difficulties inherent in engaging with training scheme alumni. **Alumni engagement** is complicated. It requires adequate resources and a coherent strategy to carry out such tasks as maintaining a high-quality database of past participants and tracking evolving career trajectories. The benefits of doing so are manifold, however. Effective alumni engagement may lead to improved analysis of program strengths, weaknesses, and possible future directions. Alumni may help sustain a program by serving as informal participant recruiters and program marketers/ambassadors, and overall exemplars of program excellence and "success." In some contexts, they may also be in a position to help provide programs with financial support, and

may be involved in as experts in future trainings and initiatives.

Another key challenge relates to questions of program direction, scope, and content. There is an enormous need for capacity building and training expertise in development cooperation; i.e., there are many opportunities for training scheme provisions. No one program provider can respond to all of the existing needs and opportunities; **funding limitations are always an issue**. Therefore, training scheme providers are called upon to make careful strategic decisions about how best to deploy their limited resources, and to thoughtfully consider where their expertise and preferred approaches to training match well with identified training needs.

An age-old issue connected to the matter of training scheme **supply and demand** comes down to the question of who decides on the content and focus for higher education management training schemes? How do the needs and interests of higher education institutions and systems seeking expertise align with those of funders, trainers, experts and program managers/providers?

Connected to these questions are many considerations of the **target audiences** for higher education management training schemes. Currently, trainings target a wide range of professionals working in many different functional areas of higher education administration. As the field expands and changes, new training needs will emerge. A key challenge for providers is to stay abreast of these changes and to be nimble and well-resourced enough to respond to new needs.

Providers of higher education management training schemes face real challenges with respect to dealing with change. On the one hand, keeping up with the pace of change in the field of higher education generally presents difficulties. Furthermore, finding experts who are knowledgeable about the changes taking place in particular institutional, national, and regional contexts adds an additional layer of complexity. On the other hand, the lack of change may also pose difficulties for the effectiveness and impact of some training schemes: often, the beneficiaries of training activities face contexts in their professional lives that are highly resistant to the introduction of new practices and principles, which have been fostered in the training experience. Training scheme providers will continually need to assess the extent to which there is alignment between realities on the ground and in the training context.

Ultimately, our findings suggest that there is a diverse landscape of higher education management schemes. This diversity extends to the geographic origin and focus of training funders and providers, the structure and format of training initiatives, the training content delivered, and the types of participants who are engaged in these training activities. Common (if not universal) characteristics include relatively small cohort numbers and a relatively short history of delivery for such programs, with many having been launched only since the year 2000. There is variation with respect to the attention paid, and approaches taken, to evaluation and assessment activities to gauge the effectiveness and impact of these programs. More data are needed on program budgets, numbers of individuals trained worldwide, and the characteristics and profiles of the trainers involved in these efforts in order to get a fuller perspective on these activities around the world.

The relatively short timeline afforded and the focused scope of the study necessarily limit what can be known about the worldwide community of these training programs. However, this research does reveal that the "state of play" in this field appears to be diverse, dynamic, and evolving, with capacity-building in higher education management perceived as a pressing concern in many emerging and transition-economy countries for the foreseeable future.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The various elements of this study, particularly the interviews conducted with representatives of select training schemes, reveal that the need for good leadership and management in higher education in emerging and developing countries is widespread. Leadership capacity is a major shortcoming where well-established higher education institutions need to grow and expand. Meanwhile, new institutions are established in developing and emerging economies around the world at an accelerating rate and often under dire circumstances, to absorb ever-increasing numbers of students and deliver graduates capable of contributing to the development of societies and economies.

As DAAD and HRK consider the future of the DIES training courses, including the IDC, several key issues stand out on the global higher education management training and capacity-building landscape. These issues may point a way forward in terms of innovations to adopt, new directions to explore, or good practices to strengthen.

A. Addressing three fundamental preoccupations

There are three aspects that appear to preoccupy most of the program representatives and experts consulted for this study, which are closely linked: scaling up and diversifying operations; measuring the effectiveness, or impact, of training programs; and accessing stable sources of funding.

Scaling up and diversifying

In light of the considerable demand for management training highlighted by this study from a sector in rapid development, the existing offer of expertise appears to be dispersed, uncoordinated, territorial, and dramatically insufficient. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, genuine efforts are being made to use modern technology, such as online/distance education, as a means to reach larger audiences. The general observation, however, is that this is at best a complement, and that face-to-face interaction with trainers, program facilitators and providers, and fellow training participants remains indispensable. One way to address this need, which could prove to be cost-effective, relevant, and sustainable, is to focus on training local trainers. "Recycling" alumni for new iterations of training modules—thus making sure that the offer is contextualized and addresses the experience of the target audiences, on the model of the ACU programs, for example—appears to be a useful approach. But, here also, as the responsibility of the trainings is taken over by its beneficiaries, there is a need to monitor closely both quality and progress, to make sure that the expectations of the participants are met. Finally, training content must be adapted not only to the regional needs and circumstances of higher education institutions (following the example of SEAMEO RETRAC, mentioned above), but also to the types of institutions (public or private, research or technical/professional, catering for national needs or for local development, etc.) that are meant to be the beneficiaries of the trainings' results.

Providing evidence of impact

The extent to which program providers are able to demonstrate concrete, measurable evidence of the effectiveness of their interventions varies widely. Increasingly, documenting the extent to which trainings have been useful is a condition to access further funding. Yet, this does not seem to be an integrated component of most training operations.

All programs, to some extent, measure participant satisfaction and record anecdotal evidence while the training takes place or shortly after, as this is a way to adapt and adjust the offer to the demand. Projects are nearly universally required to submit proof that they have delivered expected outputs and achieved desired outcomes. Some programs even carry out external evaluations. However, measuring impact in terms of monitoring organizational change and the career development of participants over the longer term is often outside of the scope of

available budgets. SEAMEO RETRAC mentions the area of career tracking as a particular challenge, as participants often fail to update the organization when they transfer positions. In short, tracking needs to be improved and systematized, and the cost of maintaining tracer systems and regular contact with alumni needs to be included as a matter of course in long-term operating budgets.

Securing funding

With few exceptions, the search for stable sources of funding is a common preoccupation among suppliers and target institutions, especially among those that need the most support: less-endowed, often private institutions in rural areas, catering for massive numbers of students. National bilateral programs are under constant threats of budget cuts—and this applies to regional programs, as well. One option explored by training providers is to charge fees. On the one hand, the payment of fees can ensure that participants have a tangible stake in the experience, which can be a motivating factor to engage seriously and enthusiastically. But charging fees also has its limitations, fundamentally when client institutions have insufficient budgets. The other option is for providers to answer calls for projects, which necessitates being able to draw on a whole range of skills (e.g., project acquisition and management) beyond expertise in higher education management. There is also a general concern for the continuity and sustainability of capacity building efforts, where projects are restricted by artificial or arbitrary project timelines. Yet the tendency for funding to be available through time-bound projects seems unlikely to abate. What seems to be occurring concurrently, although not on a large scale, is that providers collaborate to answer calls for tender, or sign strategic cooperation agreements. Undoubtedly, this last development may contribute both to strengthening the parties and extending their "catchment areas." Management training is key to the effort to strengthen higher education and research in developing and emerging economies, and can benefit from a better organization among the providing sector. As such, greater efforts could be made among provider organizations to engage with one another and cooperate across areas of complementarity.

B. Addressing four strategic aspects of training programs

The following recommendations are based on the reflections and "lessons learned" of the experienced training providers, funders, and experts that have been interviewed for this study. They are organized in four sections: the most relevant participants to target for management trainings ("who"); the areas where the need for higher education management training appears to be strongest ("where"); the most essential themes for management trainings ("what"); and, finally, the most appropriate mode of delivery ("how"). Some of the findings confirm that the IDC program in its current form is actively responding to pressing needs and is very much relevant. Others may indicate new avenues for further developments.

Who should be targeted for maximum effect?

As demonstrated in this study, training programs for higher education managers in the global South are a rare privilege for beneficiaries, compared to the magnitude of the demand. It is therefore important to target the professional categories that are most likely to be agents of change within their institutions. Higher education management trainings may be offered on a specific theme and target professionals with comparable functions across institutions, even across countries. The benefit here is that participants are able to "compare notes," provide benchmarks for each other, and forge networks of peers. The challenge for them, however, is to bring the new learning into actual practice at their home institutions. On the other hand, projects targeting one institution in particular contribute to strengthening the inner cohesion of the organization. It appears that working in teams, across hierarchies, narrows the division between academics and administration and provides stability and continuity in a context of repeated turnover of staff. Higher education institutions tend to be elitist. There is a benefit in fostering dialogue and feedback between senior and junior

staff participating in trainings and involved, together, in organizational change.

Identifying the most adequate level of office to train in order to bring lasting change to institutions is mentioned by a number of our interviewees and project informants as a particular challenge. Several program representatives acknowledge that the turnover of officials in higher leadership positions is the biggest threat to the continuity and sustainability of trainings and projects. Vice-chancellors, rectors, presidents, provosts, and deans are key decision-makers and responsible for effectively leading their institutions in a context of unprecedented change for the sector. With academic backgrounds often in areas unconnected to higher education management, they appear to be a crucial target category for management training. Although implementation of strategies and action plans takes place at lower levels, these individuals provide the vision and overall leadership for their institutions. However, they are also the group with, seemingly, the least amount of time at their disposal for such trainings. Also, in most cases, senior leadership positions are politically appointed or elected for limited terms; turnover is therefore unavoidable. They may also often be close to retirement, which brings the logic of investing in training them into question.

Another common target group of management trainings are upper- and middle-level professionals in administrative positions. They tend, in general, to be more stable in their positions; they write guidelines, and are in charge of running systems such as quality assurance, performance assessments, student services, and internationalization. A third category are younger "emerging" academic staff, tomorrow's leaders. This group probably represents the most useful level for training investments. However, individuals at this level may struggle to implement measures contributing to change in their institutions, based for instance on "personal action plans." Most are also at a stage of their careers when they are struggling to juggle multiple loads—mostly with respect to teaching, but often also related to their research. Women in this category may also face (often disproportionately) challenging demands with respect to balancing work and family responsibilities. Participating in management trainings without immediate rewards or incentives, for instance in terms of promotion, may be seen by many as a considerable sacrifice. It is therefore essential to help establish leadership and management as legitimate career paths for junior academics.

Almost all of the programs examined for this study demonstrate concern for the very limited number of women among senior management in higher education, and state explicitly a need to improve gender balance. But few programs go beyond a declaration of intent, and several acknowledge different degrees of helplessness or lack of creativity. Increasing the number of women in senior management is not a new issue, yet progress is generally discouragingly slow. The most common measures adopted to advance change in this area include facilitating networking among female academics or managers; making sure that places in trainings courses are earmarked for women; organizing training targeting women in particular; or consciousness-raising sessions for the broader university community, on the need for, and advantages of, including women in academia. Among the providers interviewed for this study, Sida and Nuffic stand out for their particularly robust and systematic interventions to support women in their academic/managerial career paths, and for trying to change gender trends. However, the scarcity of qualified women for positions of middle to upper management remains an unresolved issue. Although this is beyond, or outside, the scope of management strengthening programs, measures or projects aiming to increase the "pool" of women, in particular where attrition takes place, would help increase the number of eligible candidates for careers in management. This is a long-term initiative that needs to include careful and strategic consideration of the possible trajectories for younger women, now at the very earliest stages of university careers, up the managerial and leadership ladder. Besides that, focused effort within established alumni networks might be a useful tool in this pursuit.

Finally, there is a strong benefit in involving external stakeholders, who constitute the "enabling" (or "disabling") environment for higher education

institutions: ministry officials, representatives of local government and businesses, NGOs, farmers involved in agricultural training, churches involved in healthcare education, among others. Crucially important connections can be fostered through their participation in management trainings, to involve them in the responsibilities of running better universities and colleges. Through international cooperation, universities are often ahead of their stakeholders (in particular their line ministries) on trends or reforms. Actively involving external actors contributes to mitigating resistance to change and preparing the ground for reforms.

Where is there the most need for institutional strengthening?

Without doubt, there is a need to strengthen universities with an international reputation and a regional reach, in particular with respect to their research capacity. They must additionally serve local and potentially also regional student populations, and, crucially, they must train teaching staff for the secondary and tertiary education sectors. At the same time, in developing countries, the growth of the sector is occurring mostly through the establishment of private institutions, often located in rural areas and accommodating large numbers of students. These new institutions are founded with minimal resources, often from the communities where they are located, and they draw their income from fees. The need for managerial staff with proper financial and human resource management skills is considerable. However, training providers wanting to target the private higher education sector will be confronted with the issue of funding, given that many small and/or new private higher education institutions lack the necessary resources to afford training support. There are significant differences here between regions and countries that to a certain extent can provide for their sector, as for example China and India, and those in need of financial support and expertise through international partnerships, in particular sub-Saharan Africa. A number of program representatives interviewed for this study advocate for the considerable needs of universities located in fragile or postconflict zones—which, because of the significant risks involved, require specific approaches. There is also a plea to assist universities functioning under undemocratic regimes, to help them operate more professionally, bring out their best for their students, and grow through international cooperation, in spite of difficult circumstances.

Bilateral development aid holds important potential here because of the centrality of relationship building inherent in that type of engagement. There is a great benefit in building on existing partnerships, where relations are on a human scale and significant expertise has been fostered. Compared to large (often complex, unwieldy, and potentially more politicized) multilateral initiatives, bilateral programs have a strong advantage and better prospects of sustainability.

What content is most useful?

Vartan Gregorian, president of the Carnegie Corporation, states that the framework of educational development in the African context must be situated within "an overall plan by a university to ensure sound institutional management, transparent and accountable governance, a thriving intellectual environment, adequate facilities for faculty members and students, and above all effective leadership" (Mouton, 2015, p. xii). In the context of massification, curricular reforms, and decreasing public resources, the skills requirements of senior leadership and management to accomplish their tasks are considerable. A recent unpublished, internal survey of the World Bank reveals five main topics of current concern: bridging the gap between education and employment; higher education financing; quality assurance; governance and leadership; and equity and access. Our own conversations with higher education experts and program representatives highlight a particular need for training in the following areas:

Basic management training skills: Given the rapid expansion of the higher education sector and the correlated appointment of relative newcomers to senior leadership positions, good governance principles and basic management skills—to promote and monitor change in the organization and maintain fruitful relations with stakeholders, which also in-

clude students—is a pressing demand, and will continue to be so for the foreseeable future. In many cases, new vice-chancellors, presidents, or rectors have backgrounds within disciplines totally unrelated to management. The programs explored in this study offer various notions or approaches to this quandary: the Inter-American Organization for Higher Education, with its IGLU institute, has had successful experience with leadership for positive change and "appreciative inquiry," while the "5 capability approach", which is mandatory in all projects in the Dutch bilateral program, NICHE, offers a tool for senior management to assess the capacity and performance of the institution in a holistic and participatory manner.

Accessing and managing financial resources: Although closely connected to the previous point, this is possibly the main challenge facing senior management of higher education institutions that have insufficient and declining public support. Accessing grants, in particular international funding, is often predicated on demonstrating the necessary capacity to manage such funding. To that effect, some programs such as those from Sida or the United Board combine skill building with the administration of seed money or smaller grants. It is essential for vice-chancellors or rectors to have a good understanding of finance, budgets, and numbers, and systematic institutional research is crucial in that respect. Leaders must develop the data they need to make decisions, and know what analyses will help them understand their institutions. All matters connected to the budget are essential: relying on the financial officer is not enough, as that person is not in charge of identifying the institution's priorities or making decisions. Improved services, coupled with the use of information and communication technologies (ICT)—for instance, setting up management information systems and introducing online admissions—may yield considerable budgetary savings. These technical skills require effective training.

Support for research, teaching, and learning: A growing number of universities are engaged in developing "homegrown" doctoral and master's programs, with the support of international partnerships. Producing and leveraging the talents of postgraduate degree holders is a fundamental condition for academic sustainability and autonomy, but emerging universities are confronted with enormous challenges when trying to sustain their research effort: Sida mentions, in particular, the general lack of available research funding and is itself a strong contributor of such funding internationally. The ACU also actively supports early career researchers and the development of the external environment, such as the establishment of professional research management associations, and fora for dialogue between funders and universities. Support for teaching and learning is beyond the scope of IDC. However, these are issues that DAAD and HRK should monitor for future consideration, in light of the connections between the academic and management agendas of higher education institutions around the world and of the growing use of digital learning. This topic is especially current in Latin America.

How can success be best achieved?

Staying as close as possible to the target populations: Several programs are represented at the local level, to better maintain a dialogue and capture the "real time" and/or uniquely local needs of partner institutions. IGLU has seven centers within Latin America, allowing tailored approaches to the content and delivery of training modules. The Institut de la Francophonie pour la Gouvernance universitaire (IFGU), the division of the Agence universitaire de la Francophonie (AUF) with a mission to support higher education reforms, is located in Yaoundé, Cameroon. The Belgian, Dutch, and Swedish embassies are all closely involved in the implementation of bilateral university cooperation. The United Board tailors its offer according to different regional contexts, based on communication with over 80 client institutions. Further, the use of local experts and former participants to deliver trainings and facilitate workshops is a cornerstone of programs offered by ACU. Solid expertise is available on the provider side in the form of highly specialized trainers on issues of management of higher education in the context of developing countries: indeed, one can almost refer

to an established "industry," not only at universities, but also at specialized consultancy agencies. Yet, the only sustainable and sensible way to address the rapidly growing needs of higher education institutions in the global South must be to train local trainers.

Adopting alternative approaches to the classroom: Increasingly, traditional classroom delivery is reinforced, if not replaced, by flexible approaches to content delivery and learning facilitation that are better suited to the needs and circumstances of the participants. At the highest level of leadership, coaching and networks make the most sense, to foster effective professional development among extremely busy professionals. Support by peers with similar professional profiles appears to be a successful method to give guidance, recommendations, and feedback. Leveraging participants' own expertise and experience is key to maintaining motivation and ensuring sustainability.

Respondents express various opinions on the use of online education. It has the potential to reach larger numbers of users, but to be successful it requires a great deal of motivation at the individual level of the participants, and of monitoring from the providers. IOHE's IGLU program is notable for its use of online modules, podcasts, and even a weekly radio program accessible via live webstreaming. Limited computer literacy, especially among older participants, and the cost and insufficient quality of internet connections, in particular in rural areas, are often limiting factors. At the same time, traditional face-to-face training delivery is costly and requires more logistical effort. A mix of face-to-face and online interaction (for instance, through webinars) is likely to become a dominant model.

Among most respondents, including a "personal action plan" in training programs to advance the participants' agendas for personal or institutional change receives general approval, although there is concern for the limited amount of time that many participants will have at their disposal when back to work, to dedicate to this part of the training experience. For the United Board, personalized action plans actively engage participants in their own professional development through a set of self-guided objectives, goals, and activities, and provide participants with an opportunity to connect theory and practice. ACU mentions that personal projects, prepared through assignments and online discussions prior to meeting in person at a workshop, provide much enthusiasm during the face-to-face session. IGLU awards an annual prize to the best action plan produced by its participants. In particular, "action plans" prepared and implemented not by individuals, but by teams or units across hierarchies and the academic/administrative divide, appear to be a particularly valuable exercise. Organizational change is more sustainable when more people are involved.

Engaging alumni: Many of the respondents to our enquiry acknowledge some form of helplessness with regard to maintaining alumni relations. With few exceptions, it seems that the "return on the investment" in terms of the immediate, significant usefulness of alumni outreach is not clear. Yet the investment by programs in such efforts can be considerable, involving building and maintaining databases, circulating newsletters, cultivating and sustaining online communities via social media, offering further education and networking events, among other activities. Databases may be used, when the need arises, to identify experts for training programs, but this does not seem to happen very often or systematically. The United Board maintains a platform for sharing resources and expertise across national borders, and is also able to track career changes among its alumni—when alumni care to share such information. ACU "recycles" former participants as facilitators for the next round of trainings. "IGLU Permanente" is a weekly radio program featuring updates from the higher education sector. However, while most respondents are positive about the need to remain connected to former participants, the full potential of engaging alumni, beyond measuring whether training programs are effective, does not appear to be realized.

Ultimately, this study concludes with several essential observations. The demand for higher education leadership and management training in the international development context will continue to grow in the coming decade and beyond. Many different kinds of actors will provide training opportunities and options, in a wide range of programmatic configurations and with emphasis on a variety of content and competency areas. .Many of the approaches taken by the IDC specifically, and other DIES training courses, coincide with what appear to be commonly referenced elements of good practice in the field, such as aligning international and local expertise for the design and delivery of trainings; focusing on public good notions of university development as integral to social, economic, human and environmental development; blending distance and in-person components in the training process; and engaging trainees personally, through such pedagogical elements as personal action plans, to help them more effectively translate ideas into action as institutional change agents.

As this field matures and expands, training providers such as DAAD and HRK will need to make new choices and commitments, particularly around the frontier-pushing issues of which focal points for training are most urgent and most relevant to providers' development cooperation agenda; how to identify and engage the newest generation of prospective higher education change agents; how best to leverage new technologies for everything from program delivery to alumni engagement; and how to demonstrate sustained impact. DIES stands out as a thoughtful, well-conceived, and high-quality set of programs in a crowded international higher education leadership development and capacity-building "marketplace." Its position could be further strengthened by collaborating more actively with sister organizations featuring complementary programming or expertise, and by staking a new claim in one or more key programmatic areas.

APPENDIX 1. Major Players in the field of higher education management training for development cooperation

As described previously in this report, a key output of this research was the production of an inventory that endeavors to present a global snapshot of organizations that—like the DIES program—are focused on higher education management training and leadership development in the context of international development cooperation.

For the purposes of this research, this inventory was organized first geographically, and then across seven main subcategories and 14 subcategories, as follows:

1. Region
2. Funding
    - 2.1. Commercial
    - 2.2. Funding source
3. Provider
    - 3.1. Managers
    - 3.2. Trainers/Experts
4. Motivations (what is driving this program?)
5. Program overview
    - 5.1. Name, url, and contact information
    - 5.2. Period operational
    - 5.3. Target participants
    - 5.4. Number of participants since inception
    - 5.5. Number of iterations since inception
    - 5.6. Participant fee
    - 5.7. Geographic focus
6. Program content: Subject/Themes
7. Program format
    - 7.1. Mode of delivery
    - 7.2. Frequency and duration of trainings
    - 7.3. Language(s) of delivery

A simplified version of the inventory is available for public review at: **http://www.bc.edu/bc-web/schools/lsoe/sites/cihe/research-resources/management-training-schemes.html**

APPENDIX 2a. Detailed descriptions of select main training schemes

Association of African Universities (AAU)[1]

Management Development Training Program (MADEV)

Overview

AAU is established to promote higher education and its role on the continent. One of its main focuses is supporting member universities in their core functions of teaching, research, and community services. In the beginning of the 1990s, the capacity development of university leadership became one of the major issues of discussion at AAU. This was substantiated by two factors:

1. In many countries, it was a common practice that the leadership of universities was appointed by governments, often in the form of political appointment. Therefore, many in the position of university leadership did not have the skills required to effectively lead the universities.

2. Higher education in Africa was going through transformation; there were unprecedented changes happening. These posed challenges to the management and leadership of universities to cope up with the changes taking place.

Therefore, it was imperative to provide university leaders and managers with trainings, not only to introduce them to the skills necessary to be effective in their job, but also to enable them to deliver on the requirements of managing universities under change. The consecutive dialogues on the issues led to the development of the Senior University Management (SUMA) Workshop Series.

Later, based on consultations with experts and member institutions, it was realized that there were varying training needs for leaders and managers and two separate programs, MADEV and LEDEV (for middle and lower level managers and high level leaders, respectively) emerged in 2003. However, it took about five years for MADEV was implemented.

The realities mentioned above have not changed much. Still public universities in Africa often get leaders appointed by governments whether or not they have the required skills and higher education is still going through a lot of change. Hence, lack of skills and change in the overall environment remain the primary factors underpinning the need for MADEV.

Program structure and priorities

A number of general themes are commonly offered under MADEV, including strategic thinking and planning in management; strategic leadership and management in the African context; personal organization; communication and public relations within university context; managing university faculties and departments; human resources management in an academic institution; financial management and resource mobilization; ICT in higher education management; quality assurance and accreditation; project management; managing the HIV & AIDS challenge in higher education institutions (www.aau.org).

Recently, new themes have been added, including total quality management in universities, and use of social media in effective management and brand marketing. Besides, cognizant of the fact that research is becoming a major engagement for a growing number of universities, MADEV is offering

[2]Unless otherwise noted in the text, all information provided by Adeline Addy, Program Officer, Management Development Training Program (MADEV), via interview on March 30, 2017.

practical approaches to monitoring and evaluation of research projects. This has gained significant acceptance and demand by target clients.

To determine training themes and priority topics MADEV uses a mixed approach—demand driven and offer driven. While there are some general themes that are often offered on rolling basis, with every call for application announced, applicants are also invited to suggest what themes they prefer to have included in the training program. Then the two are combined. Indeed it is challenging that sometimes applicants might be looking for quite different things. This approach also requires that the organizers need to be ready for any kind of demand that comes from prospective participants and hence need to have trainers of diverse expertise in their pool of resource persons.

Participant selection and profiles

Online call for applications are advertized on the website of AAU for every round of training. In principle, AAU member institutions are considered a priority, but applications from individuals who are not affiliated with members are also accepted on a first come first serve basis, as long as spaces are available.

MADEV uses a combined structure of financing from participant fees and contributions from donors. When funds are available, subsidies, even waiver sometimes, are provided for members with good standing. (Good standing means having no more than three unpaid membership fees.) More applications are received when subsidies and/or waivers are available. Therefore, the availability of funding is a major driving force in the application and selection process.

MADEV focuses on individuals with managerial responsibilities, often from middle and lower level, such as deans, deputy deans, directors/coordinators of institutes and heads of academic departments/units. This sometimes also extends to higher levels like pro/deputy vice-chancellors and vice-rectors (www.aau.org). The number of participants per training session is usually kept about 40. Of this, cohost universities get a few slots reserved as the capacity development package they are entitled to, in return for their contributions offering venues and other resources. Similarly, MADEV, in its effort to improve gender balance in university management, reserves certain number of slots for female participants.

Trainers and training components

MADEV maintains a pool of key resource persons. This includes experts who have in the past offered training with MADEV, experts recommended by others for their expertise in certain areas of training, and others who potentially play pivotal roles in the operation of the program. Trainers may come from any country in the continent. They are identified from the pool of trainers or in some cases via headhunting, based on referrals. This is typically the case when a new theme that has not been offered before is added and/or a specific expertise that is not often widely available is needed. Trainers are generally either professors or practitioners, such as university vice-chancellors with proven/successful experience.

MADEV trainings typically take five days and predominantly involve presentations and small group work. Both the presentations and the group work are specifically developed for the training sessions based on the selected themes. Group work often focuses on practical, problem-oriented cases/scenarios. Recently, a new component has been introduced, in which former vice-chancellors and high level officials come and have discussions with participants on their experiences, practical problems they encountered in their jobs, approaches they use to solve them, and lessons learned in the process.

Personal engagement with the learning

In addition to subject presentations and group work, MADEV includes exercises focused on participants developing projects specific to a particular problem. This is in contrast to the other training program of AAU, LEDEV. Since LEDEV targets high-level leadership, LEDEV's more comprehensive approach of environment assessment and development of projects and proposals is a more pertinent method.

Key opportunities and challenges

The emergence of private universities in large numbers is a great opportunity for MADEV. Not only are they new to the business, but private institutions, just like their public counterparts, face similar challenges and hence need skilled managers. On the other hand, the appointment by government of leaders and managers, who are not necessarily skilled in university management, in the general practice in most countries of the continent. Therefore, MADEV remains relevant.

Increasingly, growing recognition for skills in university management is another area of opportunity. In their effort to improve themselves and become competitive, universities underscore the need for skilled management. On the other hand, in systems where competitive and autonomous university leadership is in place, leaders recognize that the skills and performance of their management team reflects on their overall success. Therefore, sometimes, universities apply for and sponsor their management teams.

There are two major challenges for MADEV. One is funding. MADEV had funding from African Capacity Building Foundation (ACBF) and Sida. However, MADEV is meant to become self-financing as of 2017. The absence of funding could rise the amount of participant fees, which is currently about US$500 per person, and how much that will affect demand remains unknown.

The second challenge is the timing of training. Finding a time that works with all participants, given that different countries have different academic calendars, is a challenge. This compounds with the challenge of aligning the training sessions with the plans of cohost universities.

Future considerations

MADEV has recently launched webinar series. These are meant as a follow-up to the face-to-face trainings facilitating topical discussions among graduates. This directly contributes to the continued capacity building commitment of AAU and helps professional networking among the graduates.

MADEV is also planning to introduce tailored trainings at the regional, national, and institutional levels. The tailored programs will be designed to address specific contextual issues at the level targeted (region, national system, or institution). The regional focus was something in the making for a while. National and institutional tailoring are meant to be demand driven.

Key Facts and Figures: MADEV

Duration	5 days most commonly
Budget	Not available, but has varied over the years based on the support secured from different sources
Number of participants per course	About 40
Number of participants since inception	195 (137 men and 58 women)
Participant fees	US$500 (additional funding by donors keeps the cost at this level)

Note: This information was obtained by the relevant interviewee for this program

Association of Commonwealth Universities[2]

Overview

The Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU) serves 500 member universities in 40 countries of the Commonwealth. It prides itself on leading on the discursive issues in international higher education, promoting international cooperation and the sharing of good practice among members.

It is ACU's mission and strategy to support Commonwealth universities to become more effective and achieve excellence. ACU has a few key themes for its programs, such as benchmarking good practice; early academic career; gender; open sciences; and research management and uptake. It is considering targeting university leaders again.

Program structure and priorities

ACU's offer is structured along the following priorities:

- Early academic career (ACU encourages a more diverse staff profile with the skillset needed to support the next generation of researchers, lecturers, and university leaders)
- Gender (ACU supports the recruitment and retention of women in higher education leadership and management, and promotes gender equity as an integral institutional goal)
- Open science (ACU supports member institutions to meet the changing social and technical requirements for the academic enterprise in the digital era)
- Research management and uptake (ACU provides resources, and actively supports the development of the external environment, such as the establishment of professional research management associations, and fora for dialogue between funders and universities)

ACU's offer of capacity strengthening to university staff (both academic and managerial/administrative) consists of a variety of programs. Some, like the Strategic Management Programme and the Gender Programme, have run already for a number of years, and are funded by participant fees and contributions. The Certificate in University Administrative Practice is much more recent, but also fee-based. On the other hand, the STARS ("Structured Training for African Researchers") and CIRCLE ("Climate Impacts Research Capacity and Leadership Enhancement") programs are one-off, pilot projects financed by various funders. ACU is however looking into ways of turning STARS into a permanent offer.

Trainers and training components

Some experts are British but to a large extent, ACU employs local experts both to develop the content of the courses and to present them. For the Strategic Management Programme, the experts are internationally recognized assessors.

Support is offered in the form of workshops and conferences, rather than formal courses; development of strategies and good practice tools to improve performance; training materials and (online) modules, blended learning, workshops and webinars/seminars; training of trainers; reports; fostering dialogue and networks; advice and mentoring; symposia, etc.

ACU is open to different ways to delivering: blended learning to face-to-face, or the other way around, or use alumni in training courses to share what they learned, adding value and taking issues to wider audiences. Blended learning will continue to be a key part, because it allows reaching more people with the same resources.

Typically, trainings themes are a combination of what ACU believes in, and what the association hears the members wanting, where there is an overlap. ACU is aware that there is a gap in perceived needs at a number of members: programs may be

[2]Unless otherwise noted in the text, all information provided by Ben Prasadam-Halls, Director of Programmes, via interview on April 5, 2017.

supply-driven, in the sense that for some members, certain issues are not even on their agenda.

In short, the Strategic Management Programme started in 1996 and is about benchmarking good practice in management leadership. It has involved 50 universities from 14 Commonwealth countries, in 21 iterations (October to September). The Certificate in Administrative Practice was piloted in 2015. The first cohort comprised 12 staff from six African countries. It is delivered during a block of five contact days, with pre-course study and tasks, an assessed personal project, and structured self-reflection. In contrast, the ACU Gender Programme has run for over 30 years, mostly funded through sponsorship or subsidies, or fee for cost-recovery.

STARS and CIRCLE are projects, but ACU is looking at ways of turning STARS into a more permanent offer. The STARS project covered nine modules over one academic year and is in its final phase. It has developed material and pilots. Twelve universities helped develop the content, which was revised based on feedback. There are nine modules, each offered by a different person through a recorded webinar, and participants get an assignment based on background reading. All the content is African or African-based, and all presenters are African. During each webinar session, discussions are facilitated by one person (the same during the nine sessions, a senior member of staff from a private university in Tanzania), a very appreciated measure. The content was developed a couple of years ago and is now being recycled. The intention is that the participating universities will in turn organize tutorial sessions for their own staff (the course content is published under a Creative Commons license and may be adapted according to needs). Not much has happened yet on that front though, unfortunately, although there is an interesting development at the University of Cape Town, who is contemplating turning the material into face-to-face sessions, in cooperation with ACU.

Participant selection and profiles

Target audiences are currently quite broad, from vice-chancellors to fairly junior administrators within registry or research administration.

How participants are selected varies: for most of the ACU offer, institutions nominate participants among their staff. Programs are not restricted to ACU membership, and nonmembers pay nominal fees. The Certificate Programme is designed for university administrators at a mid-level in their career, for instance at assistant registrar, senior assistant registrar, or equivalent rank. The gender program focuses on training trainers and supporting female academics.

Keeping track of alumni is a pending question. Participants are encouraged to join the ACU's member communities and so contact is maintained in the same way as with other staff at member institutions. They are also engaged through social media groups, which will hopefully help ACU keep track of them. Otherwise, the association does not currently and systematically keep contact with its alumni, although it would like to do more. (On a wider scale, ACU manages the three main UK government scholarship schemes, each of which tracking its alumni through dedicated alumni relations teams.)

Personal engagement with the learning

Some programs include a personal action plan. In the Certificate Programme, the "enhancement project" takes place after a period of assignments and online discussions, followed by a one-week workshop. During four months, participants develop, implement, and assess their action plans, which typically are more institutional than personal. The action plan worked very well under the first cohort: all participants did their plan, and all got certificates in the end. There was a great variety among the personal projects. Some participants proposed small initiatives, others bigger changes. The action plan generated enthusiasm for the face-to-face sessions.

Under the strategic management and other programs, university action plans can get heavy, but ACU's experience is that things move along more reliably when there is regular contact with ACU staff. ACU would not drop that part of the program.

Measures of impact and success

Some programs have very sophisticated monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plans, including longitudinal studies of counterfactual groups. But in some cases, ACU acknowledges that it does not do enough to monitor and evaluate its offer, in particular on the gender trainings and the Certificate Programme: there is a need for more. As a minimum, there are ad hoc examples, anecdotal evidence, case studies on how participants are benefiting from the trainings. Some programs do not end up the way they were planned, for instance some training materials end up being learning guides, rather than training courses. As it moves forward with the trainings, ACU wants more systematic, built-in evaluation taking place in all activities.

Individual staff are trained in M&E, but no single team is responsible for M&E at ACU.

Key strengths and weaknesses of the programs

For ACU, a proof of success is whether it is making a positive contribution to the members, if the trainings lead to any changes in the practice and in structures, and will make a difference in the long term.

For the Association itself, for the moment, the main challenges are resourcing and organizational issues/matters. Staff in charge of the various programs are disseminated in the organization. The unit under Mr. Prasadam-Halls is responsible for STARS, CIRCLE, and the gender trainings. The Strategic Management Programme is in another unit. The Certificate Programme is a bit "orphan." Given the size of the demand, ACU would like be able to do more, and more effectively, with a dedicated team. Resisting the temptation to spread themselves too thin, but rather to stay focused within priority areas, where they can achieve a critical mass and tangible impact that they can properly evaluate, are the biggest challenges of ACU training program managers.

Future considerations

Sustainability is the main question of a feasibility study for which ACU launched a call for tender in April 2017. A lot of what ACU does is project funded, so there is risk and uncertainty. Yet, a significant portion of the programs is not funded externally: ACU gives some modest subsidies and bursaries, and some activities are fee-paying. But there is a need to find a more sustainable business model.

Key Facts and Figures: ACU

Duration	Not available
Budget	Not available
Number of participants per course	Not available
Number of participants since inception	Not available
Participant fees	Not available

Inter-American Organization for Higher Education (IOHE)[3]

Institute for University Management and Leadership

[Instituto de Gestión y Liderazgo Universitario (IGLU)]

Overview

Founded in the early 1980s (IOHE, n.d.b), the Inter-American Organization for Higher Education's mission is "to contribute to the transformation of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in order to respond to their social and political contexts, while building and innovating common spaces of Inter-American collaboration in coordination with its members and other strategic partners" (IOHE, 2016, p. 3). There are more than 350 IOHE institutional and association members in 27 countries across North, South, and Central America, organized into nine regions: the Andean countries, Brazil, Canada, the Caribbean, Central America, Colombia, Mexico, the Southern Cone, and the United States (IOHE, n.d.b).

Program structure and priorities

Since 1983, the IOHE has offered a leadership development program known as the Institute for University Management and Leadership (IOHE, n.d.c), which is commonly referred to as IGLU, the acronym for its name in Spanish, French, and Portuguese. Under the IGLU umbrella, there is a series of programs aimed at building leadership capacity in Latin American higher education in both general and specialized areas. The "flagship" offering among this suite of programs is the IGLU Course, which consists of three main components:

1. knowledge development through a one-week in-person seminar followed by 12 weeks of online training modules
2. an internship carried out internationally, which is focused on exposing participants to a series of guided visits to relevant higher education institutions and organizations
3. an individual "intervention project," which is increasingly referred to as an "innovation project," that participants undertake to advance their agendas for change and improvement in their home institutions

The knowledge development modules are organized around four main themes:

1. contextualization of the higher education enterprise in distinct environments (national, cultural, institutional, etc.)
2. leadership, which the IGLU program is currently grounding in such notions as leadership for positive change and "appreciative inquiry" (Cooperrider, 2005)
3. academic management, which relates to the cultivation and effective management of high-quality intellectual activity (i.e., teaching, learning, and research)
4. strategic management of twenty-first century higher education institutions

Trainers and training components

The training teams for in-person modules are typically comprised of local academic or administrative experts plus at least one nonlocal trainer (i.e., from another IOHE country).

There are seven IGLU centers within Latin America and each may take some somewhat tailored approaches to the content and delivery of the in-person modules; however, their work is coordinated and overseen by the IGLU Executive Director, who holds a three-year (once renewable) term. The 12-week online module is divided into two six-week sections. The first six weeks of the online module,

[3]Unless otherwise noted in the text, all information provided by Miguel J. Escala, IGLU Executive Director, via interview on March 31, 2017.

above). The content and delivery of the second six-week section fall to the seven IGLU centers, with the assistance of tutors and tutor leaders from different countries, and offers more distinct regional perspectives on a range of topics of interest.

Following the online module, participants then move on to the internship phase of the program, spending one week outside of their home country following a program of guided site visits. Organization of the internships is the responsibility of the seven IGLU centers.

Participant selection and profiles

Each year, IGLU puts out a call for applications to the IGLU Course, and prospective participants apply to any one of the seven IGLU centers, submitting a standard application form and letter of support from their employing university/association. The IGLU centers—all connected with universities in the seven IGLU regions of Latin America—screen the participants (most of whom are accepted to participate), then serve as the physical sites for the one-week in-person training modules, which are generally conducted at approximately the same time at all seven of the IGLU centers. Approximately 150 participants have been accepted per year in recent years. In the earliest iterations of the IGLU Course, rectors and vice-rectors were the main participants. Today, more mid-level academic leaders and administrators are involved, such as deans, heads of program or department.

Personal engagement with the learning

The program culminates with an intervention (or innovation) project that each participant is individually responsible for developing. This component does not require that the participant actually implement the project, but at the very least each participant must demonstrate a thoughtful exploration of a key topic of concern at his/her home institution, and a meaningful consideration of ways that this challenge or opportunity could be addressed, in light of the issues and ideas covered in the program. Participants present their projects remotely to advisors connected to each regional center, who provide feedback on these projects and ultimately certify completion of the IGLU Course for all participants. Annually, a prize bearing the name of IOHE's founder, Gilles Boulet, is awarded to the best project presented over the course of the year.

Measures of impact and success

While trainer evaluations are conducted, there is no clear strategy for evaluating the program's impact.

Key strengths and weaknesses of the program

The IGLU Course has existed for over 30 years and in this time has demonstrated significant evolution. Originally, the program relied heavily on Spanish-speaking higher education experts from Canada (mostly from Quebec) to staff the training modules, and Canadian universities to provide the internship destinations. Today, a great deal more expertise resides directly in Latin America, which allows the program to draw from a pool of qualified trainers deeply familiar with, and able to speak directly to, the unique needs of leadership development in the Latin American context.

An affinity for the program seems to have developed over time, to the extent that it is not uncommon for past participants to refer to themselves as *igluistas*. However, currently, there is no clearly defined IGLU alumni network, but there are some efforts to engage past participants. These include social media outreach, a semiactive web portal where some 400 past participants have registered, and (quite uniquely) a weekly 30-minute radio program (which is also available for download online) called "IGLU Permanente." The program is hosted by IGLU's Executive Director, retired university rector Dr. Miguel J. Escala, who is based in the Dominican Republic. "IGLU Permanente" features news from the higher education sector around the world, an update on IOHE developments, and a theme or topic of interest that Dr. Escala specifically hopes will stimulate *igluistas* to discuss with their colleagues, in an ongoing process of personal learning and professional development in the field of higher education.

Future considerations

IGLU's current Executive Director is hopeful that the IGLU Course will move to a "3.0" stage of development in the next several years. This evolution will necessarily need to ground itself in the five strategic axes that IOHE has identified in its 2017-2022 strategic plan: (1) social commitment, (2) innovation, (3) internationalization, (4) sustainable development, and (5) organizational management and leadership (IOHE, 2016). Key innovations could involve the consolidation of what the IGLU Course offers into a more widely recognized (and sought-after) credential. Leveraging technology even more effectively will be important, as well. At the highest levels of leadership, Dr. Escala also sees an important future role for "coaching" as a key component for effective personal and professional development. At the same time, IGLU should also concern itself with actively seeking out younger program participants; a focus on the next generation of change agent leaders in higher education is crucial.

Key Facts and Figures: IGLU

Duration	High-level Leadership Seminars: 2 days (or 2 weeks online) Specialized IGLU Course: 1 week in person + 3 weeks online + 1-week internship + personal time invested in the innovation project (If the program is offered virtually, the duration is 8 weeks online + 1-week internship + personal time invested in the innovation project.) IGLU Course: 1 week in person + 3 weeks online + 1-week internship + personal time invested in the innovation project Permanent IGLU Micro-Seminar: 3 weeks online, with the expectation of 2-3 hours per week, or the equivalent of 1 day in person.
Budget	The IGLU program is managed in a decentralized fashion. If one calculates that the break-even point for most IGLU programming relies on approximately 15 participants, the following budget details can be extrapolated: High-level Leadership Seminars: US$8,000 Specialized IGLU Course: US$22,500 IGLU Course: US$30,000 The overall annual budget depends on how many programs are delivered. IOHE charges a fee for each participant, which covers the costs of the secretariat: approximately US$50,000 between honoraria, travels, and other costs.
Number of participants per course	The goal is 20 per program/activity. The break-even enrollment number (to cover direct and indirect costs—no surplus) is approximately 15
Number of participants since inception	IGLU Course: Over the 34 years of IGLU's existence, this is difficult to calculate, as in some years there was one iteration of the program and in other years two. There is no clear record on total enrollment since inception. An educated guess would be 3,000, and it is possible that there could be another 3,000 who participated in additional programming. Since 2013, the average has been 160 participants annually (160 x 5 = 800). However, this has been the first time that seven IGLU centers have been working simultaneously. The lowest figure was in 2016, with a total participation of 130. In 2017, the program broke the record with more than 200 participants.
Participant fees	Generally, the universities where the participants work pay the fees. High-level Leadership Seminars: US$500, with a 15% discount for IOHE members Specialized IGLU Course: US$2,000, with a 25% discount for IOHE members IGLU Course: US$3,000 with a 30% discount for IOHE members Permanent IGLU Micro-Seminar: No cost

Note: This information was obtained by the relevant interviewee for this program

Leadership Foundation for Higher Education[4]

Overview

The Leadership Foundation for Higher Education was founded in 2004 and is based in the United Kingdom. It engages in capacity building in the United Kingdom and in international development contexts, as well as provides tailored consulting projects and interventions in various national contexts, convenes large-scale education symposia, and conducts a variety of research projects (including longitudinal tracking of women in higher education leadership positions). Although the Foundation does engage internationally, its member institutions are only located in the United Kingdom. It is also not a strictly non-profit entity, as there is a commercial element to some of the Foundation's operations.

In light of both the commercial dimension and the significant domestic focus, the Foundation's work is not an exact match for DIES' goals and priorities. However, its training experience is extensive and it has undertaken (and is currently involved in) some highly relevant international capacity building work, particularly in collaboration with notable actors like the British Council.

Key international examples

Perhaps the most directly relevant Foundation activity is the ongoing project titled "Ukraine Higher Education Leadership Development Programme," supporting 40 universities over three years (2015–2018). As noted by the Foundation's website,

> Universities throughout the Ukraine were invited to apply for a place on the first year of the programme which is aimed at teams made up of senior and middle managers, academics and students...the programme has been designed to enable the implementation of innovative change for universities and includes 'Train the Trainer', Development Centre, Future Leaders and Change Academy modules. Each team has identified an institutional change project and will work with an institution based in the UK. This element will be funded by the British Council mobility grants for UK-Ukrainian exchanges, to enable the exploration of best practice and expertise (Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, 2017c).

Further, the Higher Education Leadership Development Programme in Peru, which operated in 2016, delivered a two-day program to "two groups of 30 delegates with little or no previous international professional development growth" and was meant to complement a larger scale project administered by the British Council in the region. Content focused on behavioral and organizational aspects of "leadership and strategic processes" (Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, 2017a).

Also in 2016 and in conjunction with the British Council, the Leadership Foundation offered "University Leadership Development in India: A Leadership and Management Programme for Institutes and Universities." As noted by the Foundation's website,

> Universities throughout India were invited to apply for a place on the first pilot cohort of the programme, which was aimed at those within Higher Education with [an] aspiration for leadership. The programme contained elements of 'Train the Trainer' and also a project-based task, which directly linked to creating impact within participants institutions...[and] led to the establishment and growth of a community of skilled leaders and managers within the Indian higher education sector (Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, 2017d).

Additional initiatives that may pertain to less economically developed contexts include:

- Working with governments and higher education agencies to undertake surveys and develop tertiary education strategies and capacity building programmes

[4]Information from the Leadership Foundation was obtained not by an interview but rather via document analysis. Due to the delayed response from this organization to the invitation to participate in this project, only limited information—inconsistent with the other detailed analyses in this report—could be included.

- Working with HEIs overseas to build capacity and facilitate succession planning
- Working with international and national aid agencies to contribute to development aid programmes
- Design and delivery of tailored leadership development programmes either internationally or in the United Kingdom. These may be bespoke or based on one of the Leadership Foundation's open programmes and tailored to particular requirements
- Programme development: [Leadership Foundation is] able to offer assistance in the development of leadership programmes
- Organisational Development: [Leadership Foundation is] able to provide experienced consultants to help you address a wide range of organisational development issues
- Organisation of international workshops and conferences (Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, 2017b).

The Netherlands Initiative for Capacity Development in Higher Education (NICHE) Programme[5]

Overview

The *Netherlands Initiative for Capacity development in Higher Education* (NICHE) is a government-funded development cooperation program that contributes to economic development and poverty reduction by strengthening tertiary education in partner countries of the Netherlands. Each NICHE project is linked to the multiannual strategic plan of the local Dutch embassy, which decides on the theme of the project (typically within a priority area such as water and sanitation or healthcare).

In each project, the NICHE program seeks to strengthen the capacity of senior management, based on a conviction that *integrated capacity development* is the most effective and sustainable approach. There is no use training academic staff and developing curricula, if the initiative does not engage the senior management, to anchor these changes in the institution.

Trainers and training components

On the "provider" side, Nuffic itself provides partner institutions with the necessary trainings on the "5C approach" (see below), to help them do a baseline analysis prior to the projects. The lead experts of the projects are administrative and academic staff at a stable group of Dutch universities and consultancies, with considerable experience on tertiary education in the global South, including institutional strengthening.

At program level, the main theme of trainings targeting the (senior) management of partner universities is the "5 capabilities (or 5C) approach" (to *act; deliver; relate; adapt and self-renew; and be coherent*). This tool is used to assess and monitor the capacities of organizations, including universities. When potential partner institutions approach a Dutch embassy in a partner country, or are selected to apply for a NICHE project, they are requested to do a self-analysis following this approach. The analysis reveals the general strengths and weaknesses of the organization, in particular in the area of the project. Each project is then oriented and regularly evaluated with a specific attention to these five capabilities. See https://www.nuffic.nl/en/publications/find-a-publication/the-five-capabilities-approach-in-capacity-building-of-organisations.pdf.

At project level, the experts offer management trainings in a variety of formats, adjusted to the needs and schedules of the participants: coaching or face-to-face interactions, "learning on the job"; seminars and workshops, classroom sessions; sensitization sessions to broader audiences on specific

Future considerations

Adjustments and innovations depend very much on the Dutch ministry of foreign affairs. The most

[5]Unless otherwise noted in the text, all information provided by Jolie Franke, team coordinator, Department Capacity Building, Nuffic, via interview on March 29, 2017. Additional information provided by Ouindinda Nikiema, senior manager, CINOP Global; Marie-José Niesten, senior consultant, MDF Training and Consultancy..

topics such as gender or organizational learning, to reach out to stakeholders outside the project; study visits in the Netherlands or other relevant sites, to focus on topics of relevance for the participants' mandates, on which they are expected to innovate. The use of blended learning is not systematic, because it depends on the quality and cost of the internet connection, and on the "literacy" of the participants.

Typically, it is easier for teaching staff than for senior management staff to attend sessions that are longer than one day.

The frequency and timing of the sessions is also adapted to the experts' own schedules, who combine a number of projects at any given time.

Trying to change gender trends is a particular focus of the NICHE program. Potential partner institutions must demonstrate a clear willingness. Most projects start with gender audits of the partner institution; gender is included in strategies and action plans; increasingly, budgets are gender sensitive; gender focal points are established and empowered; and scholarships granted to (at least) equal numbers of women and men. In short, gender equality is integrated in all the phases of the projects, and in all monitoring and evaluation instruments.

Participant selection and profiles

Typically, target groups of management trainings are presidents of university boards; vice-chancellors (or rectors, in the francophone system) and deputy vice-chancellors; principals; deans and directors of departments; gender focal points; financial officers; etc. When relevant, external stakeholders of the partner institutions, such as representatives of ministries, local authorities, or local businesses, are also included in the trainings, to create an understanding, among the "enabling environment," for the objectives of the projects.

The selection of participants in each of the trainings is decided in common by the senior management of the partner institution and the experts.

All NICHE project participants become members of the "Holland Alumni Network." This alumni database is meant to be an experts bank for Dutch or local companies, or Dutch embassies. There are local "Holland Alumni Networks" in every country. Members can be approached to participate in embassy or private sector events, and may also enroll in a selection of Nuffic refresher courses.

Personal engagement with the learning

In many NICHE projects, "action plans" are assigned to teams or workgroups, as a preventative measure in case of staff turnover.

Measures of impact and success

In general, assessing progress is part of the annual reporting by project implementers. Nuffic also carries out annual monitoring visits in each partner country. In addition, the projects perform an internal midterm evaluation, where implementers are explicitly required to measure accomplishments compared to the initial baseline, following the 5C approach: this is an important moment in the project, when partners can reorient some measures as necessary, while keeping the initial objectives in sight.

The achievement of outputs and outcomes is also registered in an instrument called the "achievement annex," a spreadsheet where the implementers record quantitative data. There is a special sheet there on institutional management, where progress is recorded each year in terms of financial, human resources, and systems strengthening.

Key strengths and weaknesses

Within NICHE, it is the capability of a partner organization *to adapt and self-renew* after the project has ended that is the ultimate sign of success. Of course, it is important that the project deliver the outputs it has planned for itself, but the capacity of the institution to continue, on its own, and with sufficient quality, to work at the level where the project has brought it is a fundamental proof of success. The leadership is key to make this happen.

Key Facts and Figures: NICHE

Duration	Not available
Budget	Not available
Number of participants per course	Not available
Number of participants since inception	Not available
Participant fees	Not available

Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Training Center[6]

Educational Leadership and Management Training

Overview

Established in 1996, the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Training Center (SEAMEO RETRAC) aims to "identify and tackle problems of leadership and management in education at all levels" (SEAMEO RETRAC, n.d.a, n.p.). While these efforts embrace a wide range of a projects and training activities, from English language training to promoting equality in education, they are by large directed toward the development of human resources capacity for SEAMEO member countries, especially Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar and Vietnam. While some of the trainings SEAMEO RETRAC offers are conducted in-house (e.g., training sessions delivered online), most of the in-class training around education capacity-building, especially those that fall within the domain of higher education, are conducted by fostering local and international partnerships in the Southeast Asian region and beyond (SEAMEO RETRAC, n.d.a).

Program structure and priorities

In the early 2000s, SEAMEO RETRAC expanded its education and training services to include courses and workshops geared toward human resources capacity building in higher education. These offerings are known by a variety of names. For example, in cooperation with the Entrepreneurship Educators' Association of the Philippines (ENEDA), SEAMEO RETRAC hosted a training course titled Educational Leadership and Management Training Workshop (SEAMEO RETRAC, 2015). Where the partnership is with other organizations, such as the DAAD Information Center, the course is known by other titles. In the case of the partnership with DAAD, SEAMEO RETRAC conducted the University Leadership and Management Training Course for Mid-level Managers by inviting "experts from Germany and Australia in the fields of Project Management, Training Management and Curriculum" (SEAMEO RETRAC, 2015, p.17). Despite the diversity in training titles, all training courses share the sequential structure of in-class instruction followed by an online component; across these training phases, there is a focus on what SEAMEO RETRAC refers to as "21st century skill development", which can be further broken down into the following thematic categories: leadership and management; staff/faculty assessment and evaluation; curriculum development and assessment; twenty-first century trends and requirements (for administrators) in higher education; strategic planning; information and communication technology; and quality assurance and accreditation.

Trainers and training components

As mentioned earlier, there is a dimension of international cooperation built into the delivery of training materials. Therefore, the training staff at SEAMEO RETRAC comprises foreign experts in addition to internal/local education specialists. They work together to facilitate training activities across online and in-class components.

Typically, the in-class component is conducted over a five-to-ten day period during which internal education specialists and foreign experts facilitate different workshops and lectures. For example, while a lecture on strategic planning might be delivered by Dr. Anita C. Oblina, a senior education specialist at SEAMEO RETRAC, a workshop on school leadership might be facilitated by Dr. Philip Hallinger, Chair Professor at the Hong Kong Institute of Education. In this way, participants of the training program learn from subject-matter experts spanning a breadth of different fields related to higher education leadership and management. Typically, the in-class component includes three to four internal staff members and one to two foreign experts.

[6]Unless otherwise noted in the text, all information provided by Dinh Gia Bao, Deputy Dean, Education, via interview on April 4, 2017.

With respect to the online component, participants reconnect with SEAMEO RETRAC staff through a learning management system (LMS) for a period of six to eight weeks following in-class instruction. The online component serves multiple functions: to "check-in" on participants with regard to their professional development plans (described in a later section of this report); to discuss any "new" trends and data in the field of higher education leadership and management; and to receive some level of instructional support related to in-class materials and content. To note, while the online training lasts six to eight weeks, participants only meet with online facilitators two hours per week.

Participant selection and profiles

SEAMEO RETRAC begins the participant selection process by sending out a call for applications to the various governments of SEAMEO member countries. In Vietnam's case, application requests, along with application requirements, are sent to each of the provincial-level government departments responsible for education and training. The provincial-level Education and Training Departments (DoETs) then select candidates for training based on the application requirements provided by SEAMEO RETRAC. This collaborative approach is defined by the supportive stance the government of Vietnam maintains in favor of higher education staff training, a position that can also be said of the various ministries responsible for education in Cambodia, Laos, and Myanmar. Therefore, the selection process for these countries closely resembles that of Vietnam. From all countries, participants are mid- to senior-level leaders, administrators, lecturers of universities and colleges (SEAMEO RETRAC, n.d.b, n.p.)

Personal engagement with the learning

At the beginning of each training course, all participants are expected to develop personalized professional development plans. Each plan, typically a few pages in length, is essentially a write-up of goals and action steps that participants will address throughout the course, as well as in future practice in the context of their home institutions. Action steps range from a particular application of learning to resolve an institutional issue or challenge to, more generally, "networking" to build professional contacts throughout the training course and beyond.

Measures of impact and success

As a way to gauge the program's impact and success, SEAMEO RETRAC engages participants in two ways. At the end of each training session, a post-training evaluation is conducted in which participants provide feedback and reactions to Likert-scale and open-ended questions related to a number of domains: meals, staff, training facilitators, program structure, transportation, facilities, and training components, among others. Although this type of participant feedback does not directly measure impact and success, it feeds into a larger strategy to maximize program outcomes by a philosophy of continuous improvement. As a core part of this strategy, SEAMEO RETRAC conducts impact studies on a two-year cycle. These studies aim to directly measure impact and success, and are developed around a comprehensive questionnaire that primarily answers one question: How do participants integrate the knowledge and skills they have learned and developed from the training program into daily professional practice? The questionnaire also serves as a reflection tool for participants, as well as SEAMEO RETRAC, to consider another important question: How can the training program be improved to more effectively equip participants with the appropriate knowledge and set of skills for better training-to-practice integration. Another key component of the impact studies is participant career tracking. Thus, several questions target various aspects of career trajectory (e.g., transfers, promotions, raises, etc.). These job-based movements are recorded and maintained in a master database.

Key strengths and weaknesses of the program

Behind SEAMEO RETRAC is long history of international cooperation, a reputation defined by its affiliation with SEAMEO, the umbrella organization of which SEAMEO RETRAC is one of 21 multidisci-

plinary Regional Centers (SEAMEO RETRAC, 2015). Since 1965, SEAMEO has been committed to international cooperation with the aim of "sharing existing knowledge, developing expertise, and addressing educational issues for the common benefit of the countries in the Southeast Asian region" (SEAMEO RETRAC, 2015, p. 5). In the same spirit, SEAMEO RETRAC has also been committed to tackle issues in education, within an international cooperative context, since its formation in 1996; however, its mission is more narrowly defined to focus in on the area of higher education human resource development.

Another strength of SEAMEO RETRAC lies in the supportive positions the various governments of SEAMEO member countries have taken with regard to higher education training. What this means for SEAMEO RETRAC is a constant supply of training participants hand-selected by the government. For the government, this means a highly skilled pool of higher education administrators, managers, and faculty—a beneficial outcome given its high degree of agreement with development aims defined in each of the country's national plans for higher education.

However, several challenges exist as SEAMEO RETRAC strives to further strengthen its position as a training center of excellence in the Southeast Asian region. One challenge is in further diversifying the training team with additional subject-matter experts. Particularly, identifying trainers with expertise in higher education leadership and management related to the context of Southeast Asia has been difficult. There is also some concern around developing program content that is engaging and up to date. SEAMEO RETRAC is constantly seeking to identify ways in which to improve the delivery of their trainings in innovative and engaging ways. As part of this concern, developing up-to-date content in relation to the fast pace of new developments in higher education has also been a challenge. Another challenge is the area of career tracking. As mentioned earlier, participants are tracked in terms of their career trajectory as part of SEAMEO's strategy to measure program impact and success. However, following participants has been quite challenging at times as they sometimes transfer or quit without updating SEAMEO RETRAC with new contact information.

A final challenge lies in the difficulty of introducing new—and what the academic community considers "best" practices—to higher education administrators and managers who have been entrenched in top-down patterns of management and leadership. While acquisition of new trends regarding best practices is always a welcome activity of participants, implementing them in at home institutions has been a slow and, and oftentimes, controversial process. Any attempt to introduce change has been met with the systemic barriers of both a highly bureaucratized system of higher education governance and a culture based on unquestionable respect for authority.

Future considerations

A future consideration of prime importance stems from an online training delivery platform that is currently limited in terms of usability for a majority share of "older" participants who are technology-averse. Thus, SEAMEO RETRAC staff aims to incorporate "newer" online technologies that are more accessible and user-friendly for all participants, regardless of career stage.

Key Facts and Figures: SEAMEO RETRAC

Duration	5 to 10 days, depending on training session
Budget	Varies (US$2,000 to US$20,000 for each training)
Number of participants per course	Subject to change based on training session (e.g., there were 30 participants in the Educational Leadership and Management Training Workshop for leaders, educators and administrators of higher education institutions in the Philippines from 05 January to 10 January, 2015)
Number of participants since inception	Not available
Participant fees	No participation fees for many of the training programs; however, participants pay varying amounts for others.

Note: This information was obtained by the relevant interviewee for this program

Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Centre for Higher Education and Development

Study Visit Programme

As one of the 21 regional centers of SEAMEO, the Regional Centre for Higher Education and Development (RIHED) aims to deepen "regional understanding, cooperation and unity of purpose" (SEAMEO RIHED, n.d.a, n.p.) through regional higher education development of member countries. While SEAMEO RIHED does not mainly focus on higher education management training and education (as noted by Philip Masterson, a program officer in the organization), the organization "provides many opportunities for higher education institutions to build capacity in the areas of governance and management" (SEAMEO RIHED, n.d.b, n.p.). These opportunities are the following:

- education programs on university governance and management; university research management; quality assurance, harmonization of higher education; management of internationalization. (e.g. study visits to Australia, United Kingdom, United States programs)
- workshops on management of higher education (e.g. UNESCO IIEP- RIHED)
- programs on relevant areas for Greater Mekong Subregion countries
- seminars on higher education in Southeast Asia

Of these offerings, this report highlights the Study Visit Programme in which senior higher education administrators of the Southeast Asian region participate in a short-term visit (seven to ten days) to learn about governance and management, leadership, institutional cooperation, quality assurance, research, technology, and emerging higher education trends of the host country. To this effect, SEAMEO RETRAC maintains close relations with the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) in the United States; the International Training, Research and Education Consortium (InTREC) of the UK; the Australian Education International (AEI) of Australia; and the ASEAN-China Centre (ACC) of China. Typically, site visits include a series of lectures (provided by senior exec-

utives and staff of leading higher education institutions in the host country) and targeted site visits to leading universities, as well as other opportunities/activities/events for participants to exchange ideas and information among those in the group and with foreign experts (SEAMEO RIHED, n.d.c)

Key Facts and Figures: SEAMEO RIHED

Duration	5 to 10 days, depending on training session
Budget	Varies (US$2,000 to US$20,000 for each training)
Number of participants per course	Subject to change based on training session (e.g., there were 30 participants in the Educational Leadership and Management Training Workshop for leaders, educators and administrators of higher education institutions in the Philippines from 05 January to 10 January, 2015)
Number of participants since inception	Not available
Participant fees	No participation fees for many of the training programs; however, participants pay varying amounts for others.

Note: This information comes from a publicly available source, http://www.rihed.seameo.org/4th-china-study-visit/

Sida (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency)[7]

Overview

The research cooperation program of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) is part of Sweden's bilateral cooperation and has existed since 1975. Sida's goal is to build research capacity in selected countries, which includes "core support" to universities (research policies and strategies; research management; research capability). The support is "horizontal, structural, and integrative," within the subject areas of health, social sciences, and natural sciences. The current strategy is from 2015 to 2021. The Sida programs have iterations of five years; the time period differs between the selected partner countries (currently Bolivia, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda, with a recent initiative to start a program in Cambodia).

According to the "guidelines for partners," research management refers to support "to efforts aimed at strengthening management and management tools at national, university, faculty or departmental level (but sometimes also at a ministerial level or at national research councils or other agencies of relevance to strengthening the research system). This area should be established and strengthened in order to provide services for the research environment and, in the execution of research, safeguard the values of its research policy working to create credibility, accountability and transparency in both academic and administrative procedures" (Sida, n.d.).

[7]Unless otherwise noted in the text, all information provided by AnnaMaria Oltorp, head of Sida's unit for research cooperation, via interview on March 31, 2017. Additional information provided by Sida embassy officer Gity Behravan and from project documents.

Program structure and priorities

Sida programs consist of development cooperation projects between Swedish universities and higher education institutions in partner countries. The general estimate is that it takes around 20 years to build up a university's research capacity at the international level. In the past, Sida tried several approaches: support to national research councils; support to individual researchers; support to faculties/schools in order to reach a critical mass—but at the end of the program period, there was no research funding available for the researchers to keep on with their activities, no ICT infrastructure, no libraries, and the universities themselves were not capable of handling research funds, so they did not qualify to apply for/receive any, from external sources.

At that stage, Sida decided to target the "enabling context" of research as a whole, which meant, among other measures, training specialized administrative and ICT staff; providing laboratory equipment; establishing central research funds to stimulate research within the institution; and strengthening the institutions' ability to handle these funds, as well as the Sida funding. The idea was that when a university is capable of managing these funds, it can also access funding from other donors. Makerere University in Uganda is a good example in this respect.

It is difficult to maintain a research capacity at universities in developing countries. Academic staff are consumed by teaching. Unlike at universities in industrialized countries, there is no real merit in doing research, and in a context of very scarce resources, there is in general no funding available for research. Sida's efforts contribute to building a supportive research environment and understanding among the university leadership for the value of research, so that staff will be given time and resources.

Initially, university lecturers were trained and graduated in Sweden. Now, partner universities are developing their own doctoral programs, which they offer to their own lecturers and to candidates from other higher education institutions.

Trainers and training components

The trainers are academic and managerial/administrative staff of selected Swedish universities.

The Sida program assists partner universities in developing their own strategies and capacity for doing research and training new generations of researchers. It also focuses on the administrative environment of the researchers.

Examples of training content include, among others: result-based management; financial management; support to PhD supervision and mentorship; research training activities; review of research proposals, institutional review board processes, guidelines to develop postdoctoral and doctoral trainings; quality assurance; intellectual property; innovation and technology transfer; procurement; and also maintenance of research equipment.

The program supports thematic research teams and promotes interaction and teamwork among postdoctoral fellows, PhD, and master degree graduates. It fosters a model for doing research that aims to develop critical examination and democratic relations across hierarchies. It sets up systems of small grants, to stimulate the ability to write bigger research proposals. This is a crucial skill to develop among junior academic staff, as currently most of the staff attracting big grants are retired or on post-retirement contracts. It is the only sustainable way to access necessary financial resources to sustain further PhD training.

Sida has a dialogue with all partner universities to make sure they have gender strategies and policies, and to help them achieve a gender balance in their activities. It promotes women in specific programs and facilitate their participation in capacity building, for instance with measures allowing them to bring their children with them.

Participant selection and profiles

In addition to measures strengthening the researchers, the projects train categories of managerial, administrative, and ICT staff that provide support for academic research. There is no separate program

targeting the deans in particular, although their support is crucial. But, among the deans, there are many scholars who did their PhD with the Sida program, and then moved to senior positions, so in a sense they have received support from the program all the way up to their functions.

Personal engagement with the learning

One can consider that the projects are "action plans" for the schools/faculties as organizational units.

Measures of impact and success

It takes a 20–30 year period before the impact of the Sida program can be seen. Some indicators are: numbers of trained PhD graduates; increase in the number of women in the various disciplines; ability to attract funding from other sources; improved research strategies; gender strategies; various institutional aspects such as improved systems; quality of PhD programs; number of peer reviewed publications; etc. The universities also do tracer studies, for instance to monitor how many of the program participants remain in the country (as an example, that percentage is 95 in Tanzania, which is quite impressive).

Key strengths and challenges

The Sida program is deployed over the long-term in a limited number of countries. There is therefore a sufficient concentration of funding to make a difference. It is sustainable from the moment a local PhD program trains the next generation of researchers. This is what has happened in Vietnam and Sri Lanka. Both countries now have the necessary structures in place, local PhD training programs of good quality in a number of discipline areas, and a critical mass of researchers. If Sida needs to withdraw for political reasons, the focus has still been on strengthening the institution as a whole.

At the institutional level, a big challenge for the universities is to keep crucial staff trained by the program, such as technicians, in particular within ICT, by giving them a sufficient salary. These staff are very much in demand.

On a larger scale, there are hardly any donors who work long-term. Most funding is allocated to shorter-term projects, based on calls for tender. Building the university as such is not in focus. Researchers from developing countries who have been trained abroad find it difficult, after they return, to continue doing research, maintain their competencies, and be part of the international research community.

Yet, researchers with knowledge on local contexts in the South are essential. The Belmont Forum, a global collaboration between national research funders, makes some funding available in the area of environment sustainability. Sida has provided some funding there, so that researchers from low and lower middle-income countries can apply.

Future considerations

Sida is considering intervening and assisting in building research capacity in fragile states such as Somalia or Palestine, but this necessitates a whole different approach and methodology.

Key Facts and Figures: SIDA

Duration	Not available
Budget	Not available
Number of participants per course	Not available
Number of participants since inception	Not available
Participant fees	Not available

United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia[8]

United Board Fellows Program

Overview

Founded in 1922, the United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia (UB) "endeavors to respond to the diverse challenges and opportunities facing higher education in Asia" (United Board, n.d.a, n.p.) This mission, guided by a strong spirit of Christian ethos and UB's commitment to developing the whole person, is carried out and embod-ied in five programmatic areas: leadership development for higher education; faculty development for enhanced teaching, learning, and research; campus-community partnerships; culture and religion in Asia; and special initiatives (United Board, n.d.a). Built into all of these programs is a dimension of local and international cooperation in which the United Board coordinates with more than 80 higher education institutions located in 14 countries and regions across Asia: Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Laos, Macau, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, and Vietnam.

Program structure and priorities

The United Board offers three programs related to higher education leadership development: the United Board Fellows Program, the Asian University Leaders Program, and a program that combines skill-building workshops and seed money to build institutional financial capacity called Strategic Planning and Resource Development. Of these, the Fellows Program—which is considered UB's signature offering—is distinguished for engaging its participants in a year-long educational/professional development experience featuring the following four components:

1. a three-week summer institute at a leading American university (the 2017–18 institute is held at Harvard)
2. a two- to four-month field residency at a university in Asia
3. continued educational support via the United Board's interactive online platform, UB-Net, and UB's mobile app
4. a three-day summative leadership seminar in Asia

Content topics for the summer institute are developed around the following themes:

1. leadership development, organizational structure, and educational management
2. financial management
3. intercultural communication and competency
4. curriculum and pedagogy
5. diversity training
6. trends related to international education

Trainers and training components

While much of the overall structure and content of the program are developed inhouse, the United Board works with over 80 postsecondary institutions in Asia to tailor training activities with the aim of addressing needs and demands emerging out of different regional contexts. In other words, the Fellows Program is flexible in its ability to incorporate "outside" input when developing content to meet the region-based needs of a changing local and global higher education landscape.

Given this international dimension, the training staff is comprised of both internal staff and foreign experts who have different responsibilities across the four components of the Fellows Program. In the summer institute, faculty from the host institution deliver and facilitate activities, workshops and lectures. This component also provides an opportunity for fellows to observe and engage leaders through targeted institutional site visits (United Board, n.d.c). In the field residency, participants are paired with professionals in similar positions (i.e., an aca-

[8] *Unless otherwise noted in the text, all information provided by Kevin Henderson, United Board Program Officer, via interview on March 31, 2017.*

demic dean will be paired with someone of an equivalent professional background) to receive leadership guidance, recommendations on activities, and feedback on progress (United Board, n.d.c). In the online component, fellows receive an additional layer of support and guidance from UB staff related to university leadership and higher education management, particularly in regard to a case study or project each fellow develops for his or her home institution (United Board, n.d.c). Finally, in the leadership seminar, fellows have an opportunity to discuss and share their experiences and thoughts about the program, as well as concerns and ideas related to their case studies, with other fellows, and faculty from UB member institutions (United Board, n.d.c).

Participant selection and profiles

Each year, the participant selection process begins with a call for nominations, sent out to the senior leadership of member institutions across Asia. Nominees are identified (no more than three per institution) and then formally invited by UB to apply as Fellows. In a next step, the core staff of UB begins the review process to pare down a list of roughly 100 applicants to determine candidates who will move on to the interview phase of the selection process. To help facilitate this, applicant reviews are also conducted by region: regional experts from Southeast Asia, Northeast Asia and South Asia provide further feedback, advice and recommendations. These findings are then submitted to senior administration who coordinate with program staff to prepare a list of interview questions. In a final step, candidates are selected for 20 slots. All fellows are mid-career administrators and faculty; in most cases, faculty participants are newly appointed deans or academic heads positions that carry responsibilities related to management and leadership.

Personal engagement with the learning

Over the past two to three years, the United Board Fellows Program has been overhauled to place a greater emphasis on a personal dimension of professional development. The new approach to training means a scaled back focus on experiential leadership development (longer field residencies) to allow room for participant learning through a complimentary and a more critical and academic orientation to a self-guided exercise of professional development. To this effect, the United Board has introduced personalized action plans, which primarily serve two purposes: to actively engage participants in their own professional development through a set of self-guided objectives, goals and activities; and to provide participants an opportunity to connect theory and practice in the context of institution-specific case studies. During the first phase of the Fellows Program (the institute), each participant is asked to describe an issue or a challenge confronting his/her home institution and are expected to explore the case during the full cycle of the program. The critical consideration and assessment of case studies can be seen as a common thread that runs throughout all four components of the Fellows Program.

Measures of impact and success

Primarily, the United Board measures program impact and success by comparing the magnitude of change in terms of career advancement (e.g., role changes, promotions, whether participants are included in presidential searches, etc.) and/or other measures of progress (e.g., institutional change as a perhaps an outcome of integration of new knew knowledge and practices) to a baseline measure taken when participants leave the training program. Several other methods to measure impact are also being pursued. A survey is conducted regularly to garner participant feedback regarding various aspects of the training program (e.g., food, participant general well-being, program modules, faculty, staff, social dimensions related to intra-cohort interaction). In addition, several external reviews have been requested to assess the quality, performance and impact of the training program.

Key strengths and weaknesses of the program

Since 1922, the United Board has promoted a spirit of knowledge diffusion and a platform for sharing resources and expertise across national borders, especially among its member institutions (United Board, n.d.b). This endeavor has resulted in the building of

an extensive partnership network of over 80 institutions that has proved essential to advancing UB's mission of preparing higher education professionals for globally meaningful careers, as well as success in their professional trajectories. Over the years, many fellows have moved on to higher positions, some as rectors and equivalent positions. Not only has UB been able to track the positive impact of the Fellows Program in this way, but also the outcome of having past fellows in leadership positions has allowed it to leverage an alumni base to identify future candidates. Fellows seem to share a deep sense of pride and loyalty, which they are keen to pass on to future leaders.

Despite these strengths, a major challenge has been in identifying ways to produce more concrete and objective data to evaluate impact. Currently, success is measured by a combination of participant feedback, anecdotal evidence and tracking. Therefore, in addition to compiling participant recommendations and critiques at multiple junctures in the course of the program, and beyond, fellows are asked to report any changes to role, as well as share activities of the institution in which they are based. These activities range from changes occurring within the overall governance structure to whether or not fellows are included in active and future presidential searches. As revealing as these data are about the quality of the program and its impact in the institutional arena, UB is mindful that they target a narrowly defined scope which might indicate some level of bias. This has prompted the invitation of several external reviews; however, UB understands that more has to be done.

Future considerations

In addition to quality assurance and improving measures of evaluation (e.g., introducing a pre- and post-test system of measurement), the UB has a number of other future considerations. UB recognizes the need to work with member institutions in creating more formalized mechanisms to select nominees, perhaps as a way of procuring candidates based on a more objective list of criteria rather than on principles of friendship and/or other forms of loyalty, or even on political agendas. Another area in queue for consideration is in cultivating institutional awareness around and commitment to strategic planning. With this aim, perhaps UB seeks to help institutions understand that outcomes of training and/or institutional changes are not often immediately realized, but come to fruition with thoughtful and careful planning. UB is also considering ways to actively engage their alumni base, which comprises over 200 fellows. Currently, alumni relations are maintained through a variety of electronic formats (e.g., email, social media), networking events, and institutional visits; however, UB is seeking ways to engage alumni in more diverse ways for example, in other areas of UB training and activities. Many of the member institutions are small and have limited resources. Thus, enrolling staff in other higher education programs, such as Strategic Planning and Resource Development, may provide the expertise these institutions seek to grow in financial capacity.

Key Facts and Figures: UB

Duration	One year
Budget	Not available [The budget fluctuates, and depends upon the program's structure (which has changed in recent years) and travel costs for each fellow, which also adjusts depending upon his or her country of origin and country of placement.]
Number of participants per course	20
Number of participants since inception	Over 200
Participant fees	No participation fee

Note: This information was obtained in part from the relevant interviewee for this program and in part from a publicly available source, https://unitedboard.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/United-Board-Fellows-Program-Guidelines-2017-2018.pdf

APPENDIX 2b. Perspectives from macro-level organizations

African Development Bank (AfDB)[9]

The Africa Development Bank provides support in higher education, as part of the overall human development support AfDB provides to its member states. However, it should be noted that, depending on the circumstances of the respective country, AdfDB support may or may not include higher education. An interview with the director of human development has emphasized this point.

The value of strengthening the capacities

It is essential for universities to have qualified and capable management and leadership, and this is one of the areas where there is a major shortcoming in many African universities. However, cultivation of management and leadership skills does not receive enough support, perhaps because the relationship between this area and student outcomes is not as clear as for the other major areas of focus, such as curriculum development and quality assurance. AfDB does not have a program specifically committed to addressing higher education. After allocation to countries is determined, each country proposes the way it wants to use the resources, in coordination with its own local capacities. As in the other areas, within the broad area of human development, each country chooses where it wants to focus.

Countries often focus on lower-level education, on teacher education, the advancement of a particular discipline (field of study), or vocational and skills development education. This is influenced by a number of factors relating to the development status of the country and its priorities. The Bank, primarily a financier, has an advisory role on what could be the best human development investment in the respective countries. Sometimes, the Bank makes assessments in countries that require assistance and, indeed, in some fragile or postconflict states, the idea of investing resources in higher education does not appear viable. Other countries with better established education systems have a greater tendency to focus on higher education and the development of other high-level skills—such as ICT, where the issue of leadership capacity is crucial.

The design and delivery of training programs

The Bank tries to avoid making decisions for the countries. It is the choices of the governments of respective countries that determines whether training programs in higher education are needed, and if yes, what type of training is needed. When the governments do not have the capacity, the provider procures the services necessary to the development and execution of the specific training programs. However, many countries prefer to use their own institutions for the conduct of capacity development trainings. It is also important to note that higher education capacity development is often conducted as part of larger capacity-building efforts at national levels. Civil service training institutions often play the role in this regard. Therefore, there is no clear direction as to what the focus will be in the future projected by the Bank, since this is ultimately determined by the respective countries and their specific circumstances.

The content and topics of focus

Again, AfDB has the role of financier and overall oversight of the implementation process. It does not get to the level of details where it would determine what content higher education leadership and man-

[9] *Unless otherwise noted in the text, all information provided by Ms. Sunita Pitamber, Director of Human Development, via interview on April 19, 2017.*

agement trainings should be. However, in the past years, the most common areas of focus for such projects have been quality assurance, the management of student services, and development and revision of curriculum.

Priorities

AfDB has a broad mandate of serving all member countries. In collaboration with its partners, it provides opportunities for all countries, with no specific regional emphasis. The amount of resources to be allocated to each country is determined based on a formula that takes several factors into consideration, including population size and development status. When it comes to higher education, countries with relatively better developed education systems will dominate the request. The less developed countries, such as postconflict countries, often focus on basic education along with infrastructure development and civil service institution building.

Most countries focus on their public universities. Universities with stronger connections with other government institutions and a stronger reputation abroad are strengthened. Countries see more merit in capitalizing on the strengths of such universities and building them into reputable regional giants. In parallel, recently there has been a growing interest in private higher education institutions, as their number is increasing across the continent and that sector is becoming more and more competitive. On the other hand, there is also a considerable focus in many countries on the development of high level skills such as mining, ICT, and the like, identified as priority areas in different countries. They are focused upon either as semiautonomous institutions with in a bigger university setting, or as separate specialized institutions.

Middle-level management is more important as a target for capacity-building training in higher education, for two reasons. First, in most countries, high level leadership constitutes a political appointment. Besides, the top management provides the vision and overall leadership of the institution. Much of the work, the conversion of the plans into action and of vision into results happens at the middle and lower levels. Second, there is a high turnover rate at the middle and lower levels. It is imperative to continuously focus on compensating the capacity deficiency, while at the same time trying to mitigate the problem of turnover.

Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY)

Current activities

The only CCNY higher education-focused program in international context currently in operation is the "Higher Education and Research in Africa" initiative, which will continue for at least the next three to five years. The program is focused on "postgraduate training and research, policy and diaspora linkages focused on strengthening a select number of African public universities." Thus, this it is not an exact match for IDC's or DIES' goals and priorities and it is unclear what focus the Corporation might place on higher education in Africa specifically, or in an international development context more generally, beyond the current programming (C. Fritelli, personal communication, April 14, 2017).

Past activities

The president of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, Vartan Gregorian, has noted that the framework of educational development in the African context must be situated within "an overall plan by a university to ensure sound institutional management, transparent and accountable governance, a thriving intellectual environment, adequate facilities for faculty members and students, and above all effective leadership" (Mouton, 2015, p. xii).

In the introduction to "Leadership and Transformation: Case studies in training in higher education in Africa", Johann Mouton observes that "during the course of its 2000 –2010 investment in institutional strengthening of African Universities, Carnegie Corporation's Higher Education and Libraries in Africa (HELA) programme identified a need to support the leadership development of emerging leaders at expanding and newly forming universities" (Mouton, 2015, p. xii). Indeed, the Foundation invested US$100 million in institutional strengthening at

eight public universities in Ghana, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania, and Uganda, and during the length of this program.

Mouton notes that challenges during this period were the need for strategic recruitment of participants (balancing public/private university participation) and the need to reorient a "pool of African trainers" to facilitate interaction and leverage participant experience rather than employing a lecture format (p. xiv). In some cases, Mouton points out, leadership training was de facto basic management training, given the rapid expansion of the HE sector in Africa and correlated promotion of relative newcomers to the field. Given the increasing focus on the development of research universities on the continent, future leadership trainings should focus on skills needed to support increased research-related activity. Further, emphasis should be placed on increasing and supporting the number of women in leadership positions.

Foundation activities in Africa from 2000 to 2010 also focused on the development of networks of leaders-in-training. These networks included individuals with various degrees of training in the following areas: leadership, policy, and reform issues. Further, they were familiar with the literature on leadership as well relevant approaches. There was also an emphasis on supporting dialogue around research & policy on leadership transitions at African Universities. Foundational data for this dialogue was generated through the support of two organizations: the Council on Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) and the CHET Higher Education Research and Advocacy Network in Africa (HERANA).

During the Foundation's activities from 2000 to 2010, a main mechanism was the support of national councils (such as the Tanzania Commission of Universities), which were situated to provide efficient leadership training to large numbers of senior academics. Indeed, the Ugandan National Council for Higher Education Management and Leadership Programme (MLP) sought to train "150 competent senior leaders" during the period of Carnegie support (Mouton, 2015, p. xiv). Support of three of these national councils has extended beyond 2010.

ERASMUS+ and Capacity Development[10]

ERASMUS+ is a bottom-up, demand-based program, stimulating cooperation among similar institutions, including in developing countries, and helping universities to modernize their education offer and their services and systems.

The current phase of ERASMUS+ started in 2014, but the program is a continuation, since 1992, of a group of previous programs organized according to regions (Eastern Europe, Latin America, and Asia). The benefit of bringing these programs under the same umbrella of ERASMUS+ is that these regions can now all work together.

In brief, Key Action (KA) 1 is for mobility. KA2 is for capacity development projects among similar participant institutions, within specific priorities for the different geographical areas. Projects last three years with a maximum funding of EUR 1 mill. KA3 is for policy reform piloting. In Africa, there are two such initiatives. One is "Tuning Africa" (http://tuningafrica.org/en/); assisting 120 universities to make their education more relevant, learning-outcome oriented, and structured according to ECTS, since harmonized education is an asset for continued exchanges. In "Tuning Africa," higher education management is a priority area (http://tuningafrica.org/en/the-africa-eu-partnership#).

The other initiative is HAQAA (https://www.aau.org/haqaa/), on the harmonization of quality assurance and accreditation. In HAQAA, in particular, DAAD is leading on one of the actions by giving training throughout Africa to all the agencies in charge of quality assurance, or to ministries of education where no such agency exists.

[10] *Unless otherwise noted in the text, all information provided by Deirdre Lennan, European Commission, DG Education and Culture, International cooperation, via interview on March 30, 2017.*

Value and Effectiveness of the Program

Experience shows that the most effective delivery is through project-based, face-to-face modules, with regular homework at various stages to keep commitment high; mentoring and coaching; and tailor-made projects for the individual participants.

The initial phase is crucial to help staff understand what the aim of the project is—then a robust plan is necessary, as well as close communication between the partners during implementation to ensure involvement and progress. Such an approach is successful when done by peers, with similar types of professional profiles. Preparing a proposal together already builds capacity significantly.

At the individual level, the impact of the projects is strong, while it tends to be less so at the institutional level. If the project is narrow, the progress will often remain in the unit where it was placed, results will not necessarily be rolled out, the "trickling down" of new know-how into practice is not always seen, unless you assign concrete homework. As a rule, it is not easy to assign homework to senior management, whereas training programs are much more effective when targeting the level of upper and middle management in charge of transversal systems: quality assurance units, student support services, linking training programs with the professional sectors, or internationalization.

If results have been well integrated, there is a better chance that the project will be sustainable at the institutional level. Nearly always, projects will lead to other projects and reach other levels. But sustainability also depends on whether the participating staff has managed to interact with the wider environment to access more funding. For changes at system level, such as introducing doctoral schools, it takes many individual projects to lead to reforms at the national level. Through internationalization activities and collaborations, universities are often a vector of change, ahead of ministries.

Looking ahead

Linking teaching, research, and innovation is a priority. Also, management needs to build the institution up based on its strengths and where its mission lays: whether its reach is sectoral or national, whether it needs to broaden access through online education, or collaborate with local communities, or enter into private-public partnerships to widen its resources. Even if they do not have the capacity to do much research, universities should develop the capacities of their teachers to search and access existing research, in order to improve the curriculum. Basic connectivity is essential, because technology can provide significant shortcuts. Modern management is essential to motivate, deliver strong messages, assign young people to projects, and stimulate innovation. As mentioned above, middle and upper professional staff are a good target, because they are stable, write guidelines, and are in charge of running systems such as quality assurance and performance assessments. Working together in projects motivates staff and can contribute to narrowing the division between academics and administration. Higher education systems in Africa are still very elitist; it is the region with the greatest need for management training. But other institutions need assistance as well: in particular, if the capacity of universities under undemocratic regimes can be built to operate more professionally, bring out their best for the students, and grow through cooperation in spite of difficult circumstances, international assistance should not stop.

World Bank[11]

The World Bank is one of the biggest players in the field of higher education. In the past it has been supporting different projects in member states that are directed to improving higher education. Considering a 5–10 year period ahead, the following points regarding the training of senior management and administration in higher education are identified as priority areas.

[11] *Unless otherwise noted in the text, all information provided by Francisco Marmolejo, Tertiary Education Coordinator and Lead Tertiary Education Specialist, World Bank, via interview on April 17, 2017.*

The value of strengthening the capacities

Without any doubt, good capacity in leadership and management is of the highest importance in higher education at all levels—institutional, national, and regional. No meaningful change in any area can be achieved without the required capacity. Most higher education-related projects supported by the Bank have a leadership development component. This is largely determined by the needs of the respective client countries. The Bank periodically conducts needs assessments studies with client countries. In consultation with concerned stakeholders, challenges are identified and priorities set. If higher education is identified as a priority area, then the client government decides what it wants to achieve with its higher education system, and when and how it targets to achieve these goals. Then the resource needs will be determined, based on these targets, and financing options are explored: how much investment is needed; what will the contribution of the Bank, of the government, and of other sources be; whether it shall be loan or aid. Therefore, it is basically the needs of the respective clients that determine the priorities for each project. However, the Bank recognizes the importance of capacity development in higher education. And it turns out that most countries that prioritize higher education have a high demand for capacity development.

The design and delivery of training programs

The design and delivery of training, as in the case of its content, needs to be customized to the specific circumstances and local needs of the system it serves. It is of course important to look at good practices and around the world and to learn from what others have done, when addressing a particular challenge and looking for effective solutions. Some elements may be transferrable across institutions, systems, and regions.

One thing that stands out, however, is the use of technology. Traditional face-to-face training delivery takes significant funding, time, and logistical effort. While face-to-face interaction has obvious merits, a mixed use of face-to-face and online interaction has gained attention recently, and will become a dominant mode in the near future. A good example is the IGLU program in Latin America, administered by IOHE. After years of face-to-face delivery, now it uses a mixed method that appears to be working well. Therefore, with increased progress and accessibility in communication technologies, there will be greater endorsement of such technologies as alternatives for delivery of training in this sector, as in other sectors.

The content and topics of focus

The content and topics of training for a particular client are dictated by general, periodic needs assessments. Different systems, institutions, and regions have different challenges requiring corresponding interventions. Therefore, it is difficult to predict what the focus will be. However, the Bank has recently conducted an internal survey that revealed that, in the area of higher education, the five topics of highest priority are bridging the gap between education and employment; higher education financing; quality assurance; governance and leadership; and equity and access.

Obviously, any step forward in any of these areas, such as a suitable policy framework, requires capable leadership and effective governance structure. This reinforces the importance of leadership and management capacity development.

Priorities

With regard to geographic areas, as a global organization the World Bank serves all regions and its engagement is generally based on the needs from the member countries. One important thing to consider here is the rate of expansion taking place in higher education. In countries and regions with large number of institutions and a fast growth of the sector, there will be a greater demand for management and leadership training. In China and India, two countries with massive student populations, the number of tertiary institutions is significantly different—China has about 3,000 institutions while India has about 33,000. India also has one of the fastest growing tertiary education system. This growth requires

a matching increase in the number of professionals with the required management and leadership skills. A similar trend is observable in North Africa, the Middle East, and sub-Saharan Africa. Considerable expansion in higher education is taking place in these regions, posing the challenge of how to adequately meet the needs for leadership.

In principle, all types of institutions need to have capable management and leadership. But due to budget limitations, governments must decide which institutions they can prioritize. One common challenge is the fairness of using public resources to train managers and leaders of private institutions. Different countries have different policies in this regard. However, it is important to remember that higher education is an area of investment that is expected to benefit the whole of society. .

Another challenge is who to train. Would it be worth to train those in service (already holding the position of leadership) or the incoming—the hopefuls? In some countries leadership in higher education institutions is assumed merely based on seniority. In such a system if we train those in service we could be training someone who is downcounting time to their retirement. If we train the young/the hopefuls, we don't know if they are really going to get the leadership position.

Another issue, particularly in smaller institutions, is the lack of motivation among the younger staff. The absence of proper incentive scheme that recognizes such training discourages many from participating since they do not see it adding any value to their career. Besides, many are excessively occupied in teaching responsibilities that they would not have time to take trainings, since often there is no capacity to replace them on the teaching duties while they are away for the training.

These challenges require regulatory (policy) responses in the respective systems. Leadership position has to be established to be earned, based on professional merit, not mere seniority. A mechanism has to be in place to recognize, encourage and reward staff who take management and leadership trainings. Clear possible career path for higher education leadership needs to be established.

APPENDIX 2c. International Deans' Course (IDC)

Since 2007, DAAD and HRK have run the Dialogue on Innovative Higher Education Strategies (DIES) International Deans' Course (IDC), designed for newly elected deans and vice-deans in Africa, Southeast Asia, and Latin America. In particular, the program assists persons who have studied in Germany and have come to occupy leadership roles in higher education institutions (German Academic Exchange Service, n.d.b).

The program deals with various aspects of institutional and academic management and is rooted in an understanding that institutions of higher education throughout the world are operating in an increasingly dynamic environment characterized by global challenges. Managers in higher education need preparation and require diverse skill sets in order to do their jobs more effectively. The program supports these decision-makers, who carry enormous responsibility in the administration and management of faculties (DAAD & HRK, 2017a).

The IDC program is jointly run by the DAAD, the HRK, the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (AvH), the Centre for Higher Education Management (CHE), and the University of Applied Sciences Osnabrück, among other partners (DAAD & HRK, 2017a).

The program provides knowledge on fundamental changes worldwide that have potential relevance to the challenges facing the participants' own institutions. The participants gain new insights about management of higher education institutions, practical skills, and have the opportunity to build networks across countries and regions—in particular with Germany—enabling all sides to utilize knowledge about each other in further efforts related to teaching, research, and administration.

The IDC program is implemented in several stages over a period of more than a year, alternating face-to-face workshops and modules in Europe (in Germany, but also in Spain, in the case of the Latin American program) and in the regions of the participants. In Latin America, modules are also offered through webinars (International Deans' Course Latin America, n.d.).

This specific structure stems from the realization that fundamental, long-term change in the field of higher education management is a process that takes time, requires joint reflection, and needs to be broken down into phases during which the participants are capable of addressing case-specific problems, incorporating inputs, and adapting strategies when necessary. The last step of the program is focused on intraregional and interregional networking of participants. The DAAD specifically supports initiatives linking course participants to participants in other DAAD-activities related to higher education management and other relevant fields. Many participants use their experiences and old or newly established contacts at German higher education institutions to identify joint projects, exchange information, or to establish other forms of cooperation. Finally, the participants have access to various programs explicitly designed to place DAAD alumni in contact with each other and with other scholars in Germany (DAAD & HRK, 2017b).

The trainers and facilitators are German, international, and local experts. Classes typically consist of approximately 25 participants. The IDC program addresses key topics of concern, such as strategic planning, financial management, management of research, quality assurance, project management, and internationalization. Early in the program, each participant identifies a specific project relevant to his/her function or institution. These "Personal Action Plans" (PAP) allow for a more active and relevant application of the ideas, concepts, and theories introduced during the courses, reducing the typical divergence of seminar content and professional reality. Progress on the personal action plans is shared regularly with other participants throughout the duration of the program (DAAD & HRK, 2017b).

Appendix 3. List of Interviewees

Interviews: Training Schemes

Organization/Program	Interviewee(s)	Interview Date
1. AAU/MADEV	Adeline Addy	March 30, 2017
2. Agence universitaire de la Francophonie*	Jean-Philippe Thouard	April 7, 2017
3. Association of Commonwealth Universities	Ben Prasadam-Halls	April 5, 2017
4. CIEP*	N/A	March 31, 2017
5. Inter-American Organization for Higher Education (IOHE)	Miguel Escala	March 31, 2017
6. LASPAU*	Angélica Natera	April 4, 2017
7. Leadership Foundation**	N/A	N/A
8. NUFFIC	Jolie Franke (Additional information from: Marie-José Niesten, MDF; Ouindinda Nikiema, CINOP)	March 29, 2017
9. SEAMEO RETRAC	Dinh Gia Bao	April 4, 2017
10. SIDA	AnnaMaria Oltorp (Additional information from: Gity Behravan and project documents)	March 31, 2017
11. United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia	Kevin Henderson	March 31, 2017

* A detailed description of this organization was not included in this report, based either on participant withdrawal or determinations made by study authors about the relevance/applicability of the data collected to the objectives of the research.
**Information from the Leadership Foundation was obtained not by an interview but rather via document analysis (see Appendix 2a).

Interviews: Macro-level Organizations

	Organization	Interviewee(s)	Interview Date
1.	African Development Bank	Sunita Pitamber	April 19, 2017
2	Carnegie Corporation*	N/A	N/A
3.	European Union	Deirdre Lennan	March 30, 2017
4.	World Bank	Francisco Marmolejo	April 17, 2017
5.	World Bank	Rick Hopper (former World Bank education specialist)	April 3, 2017

* Information from the Carnegie Corporation was obtained not by an interview but rather via document analysis (see Appendix 2b).

Appendix 4. Interview questions

Interview questions for program interviews

1. What motivates your organization to offer training programs in this field?
2. What have been the main content topics for the trainings offered over the past 5-7 years?
3. How does the program decide on the theme and content of a given training (is this decision demand-driven or offer-driven)?
4. How are participants selected?
5. Does the program feature a "personal action plan" requirement for participants (i.e., are participants responsible for working on an individual project of relevance or importance to them in their role or for their own professional development)?
6. Does [insert program name] evaluate its outcomes and/or impact, and if so, how?
7. How does [insert program name] define "success" and in what ways has the program been "successful"
8. Does the program maintain contact with alumni? If yes, through what methods is contact maintained, or in what ways does engagement with alumni occur?
9. What key challenges does [insert program name] currently face?
10. What are the prospects for sustainability of [insert program name]?
11. What adjustments/innovations are planned for the future, with respect to content, mode of delivery, target audiences, etc.?
12. Are there any additional information or insights you would like to share about [insert program name] with respect to its achievements, impact or future evolution?

Interview questions for macro-level organization interviews

1. Among the many possible forms of support to higher education and research in programs for development cooperation, how do you rate the value and effectiveness of strengthening the capacities of the senior management and administration?
2. What does your organization see as the most important elements for the coming 5-10 years with respect to the **design and delivery** of training programs for higher education management in development cooperation?
3. What does your organization see as priorities for the coming 5-10 years with respect to the **content and topics of focus** that should be offered by training programs for higher education management in development cooperation?

4. What does your organization see as priorities for the coming 5-10 years with respect to **the kinds of participants that should be served** by training programs for higher education management in development cooperation? Should such training programs consider focusing on participants:

    a. In specific geographic regions?

    b. Working in specific types of institutions?

    c. Serving in specific kinds of positions or roles within higher education?

References

Altbach, Philip G., Reisberg, Liz, and de Wit, Hans (Eds.). (2017). *Responding to Massification: Differentiation in Postsecondary Education Worldwide*. Hamburg: Hamburg Transnational University Leaders Council

Association of African Universities. (n.d.) Management Development Program. Retrieved from http://www.aau.org/page/management-development-madev

Association of Commonwealth Universities. (n.d.a). Focus areas. Retrieved from https://www.acu.ac.uk/focus-areas/

Association of Commonwealth Universities. (n.d.b). Course in University Administrative Practice – participants' handbook. Retrieved from https://www.acu.ac.uk/membership/course-university-administrative-practice/course-handbook

Association of Commonwealth Universities. (n.d.c). Gender Programme. Retrieved from https://www.acu.ac.uk/focus-areas/gender-programme/

Association of Commonwealth Universities. (n.d.d). Structured Training for African Researchers. Retrieved from https://www.acu.ac.uk/focus-areas/early-careers/structured-training-for-african-researchers/

Association of Commonwealth Universities. (n.d.e). AUC Strategic Management Programme. Retrieved from https://www.acu.ac.uk/membership/strategic-management-programme/

Carnegie Corporation of New York, & Gregorian, V. (1999). *New directions for Carnegie Corporation of New York: A report to the board*. Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Cooperrider, D. L., & Whitney, D. (2005). *Appreciative inquiry: A positive revolution in change*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

DAAD & HRK. (2017a). International Deans' Course: Home. Retrieved from http://www.international-deans-course.org/index.php?id=idc-home

DAAD & HRK. (2017b). International Deans' Course: The Didactic Concept. Retrieved from http://www.international-deans-course.org/index.php?id=idc-concept

Dutch Organisation for Internationalisation in Education (NUFFIC). (n.d.a). The Netherlands Initiative for Capacity Development in Higher Education (NICHE). Retrieved from https://www.nuffic.nl/english/capacity-building/niche

Dutch Organisation for Internationalisation in Education (NUFFIC). (n.d.b). The 5 Capabilities approach in capacity development of organisations. Retrieved from https://www.nuffic.nl/en%3B/publications/find-a-publication/the-five-capabilities-approach-in-capacity-building-of-organisations.pdf

Dutch Organisation for Internationalisation in Education (NUFFIC). (n.d.c). NICHE achievement annex project annual report. Retrieved from https://www.nuffic.nl/en/files/documents/niche-achievement-annex-project-annual-report.xlsx/view

German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). (n.d.a). Dialogue on Innovative Higher Education Strategies (DIES). Retrieved from https://www.daad.de/der-daad/unsere-aufgaben/entwicklungszusammenarbeit/foerderprogramme/dies/en/

German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). (n.d.b). DIES Training Courses. Retrieved from https://www.daad.de/der-daad/unsere-aufgaben/entwicklungszusammenarbeit/foerderprogramme/

DAAD & HRK. (2017b). International Deans' Course: The Didactic Concept. Retrieved from http://www.international-deans-course.org/index.php?id=idc-concept

Dutch Organisation for Internationalisation in Education (NUFFIC). (n.d.a). The Netherlands Initiative for Capacity Development in Higher Education (NICHE). Retrieved from https://www.nuffic.nl/english/capacity-building/niche

Dutch Organisation for Internationalisation in Education (NUFFIC). (n.d.b). The 5 Capabilities approach in capacity development of organisations. Retrieved from https://www.nuffic.nl/en%3B/publications/find-a-publication/the-five-capabilities-approach-in-capacity-building-of-organisations.pdf

Dutch Organisation for Internationalisation in Education (NUFFIC). (n.d.c). *NICHE achievement annex project annual report*. Retrieved from https://www.nuffic.nl/en/files/documents/niche-achievement-annex-project-annual-report.xlsx/view

German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). (n.d.a). Dialogue on Innovative Higher Education Strategies (DIES). Retrieved from https://www.daad.de/der-daad/unsere-aufgaben/entwicklungszusammenarbeit/foerderprogramme/dies/en/

German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). (n.d.b). DIES Training Courses. Retrieved from https://www.daad.de/der-daad/unsere-aufgaben/entwicklungszusammenarbeit/foerderprogramme/hochschulen/infos/en/44514-dies-training-courses/

Holland Alumni network. (n.d.). Main Page. Retrieved from https://www.hollandalumni.nl/

Inter-American Organization for Higher Education (IOHE). (2016). *Strategic Guidelines IOHE 2017-2022*. Retrieved from http://www.oui-iohe.org/assets/Plan-OUI-2017-2022-EN2.pdf

Inter-American Organization for Higher Education (IOHE). (n.d.a). IOHE by the Numbers. Retrieved from http://www.oui-iohe.org/en/iohe-the-only-inter-american-voice-of-its-kind/iohe-by-the-numbers/

Inter-American Organization for Higher Education (IOHE). (n.d.b). Our Background. Retrieved from http://www.oui-iohe.org/en/iohe-the-only-inter-american-voice-of-its-kind/our-background/

Inter-American Organization for Higher Education (IOHE). (n.d.c). IGLU: Forming University Leaders in Latin American Higher Education. Retrieved from http://www.oui-iohe.org/en/iohe-services/leadership-and-university-management/iglu-forming-university-leaders-in-latin-american-higher-education/

International Deans' Course Latin America. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.idc-latinamerica.com/

Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. (2017a). Higher Education Leadership Development Programme in Peru. Retrieved from: https://www.lfhe.ac.uk/en/research-resources/resource-hub/case-studies.cfm/HELeadershipPeru

Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. (2017b). International. Retrieved from: https://www.lfhe.ac.uk/en/international/

Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. (2017c). Ukraine Higher Education Leadership Development Programme. Retrieved from: https://www.lfhe.ac.uk/en/research-resources/resource-hub/case-studies.cfm/Ukraine

Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. (2017d). University Leadership Development in India: A Leadership and Management Programme for Institutes and Universities. Retrieved from: https://www.lfhe.ac.uk/en/international/international-casestudies.cfm/UKEIRI

Mouton, J., & Wildschut, L. (Eds.). (2015). Leadership and Management: Case Studies in Training in Higher Education in Africa. Norwood, ZA: African Minds. Retrieved from http://www.ebrary.com/

Organisation for Women in Science for the Developing World. (n.d.). What is OWSD? Retrieved from https://owsd.net/

South East Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Center for Higher Education and Development (SEAMEO RIHED). (n.d.a). History. Retrieved from http://www.rihed.seameo.org/about-us/history/

South East Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Center for Higher Education and Development (SEAMEO RIHED). (n.d.b). Empowering higher education institutions. Retrieved from http://www.rihed.seameo.org/about-us/objective-areas/empower-heis/

South East Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Center for Higher Education and Development (SEAMEO RIHED). (n.d.c). United States (AGB). Retrieved from http://www.rihed.seameo.org/programmes/study-visits/agb/

South East Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Training Center (SEAMEO RETRAC). (n.d.a). About Us. Retrieved from http://www.vnseameo.org/?id=2

South East Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Training Center (SEAMEO RETRAC). (2015). Annual Report FY 2014/2015. Retrieved from http://www.seameo.org/SEAMEOWeb2/images/stories/SEAMEO_General/About_SEAMEO/SEAMEO Units/Centres_Annual_Rpt/2014-2015/RETRAC.pdf

South East Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Training Center (SEAMEO RETRAC). (n.d.b). Educational Leadership and Management. Retrieved from http://www.vnseameo.org/?id=155

Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA). (n.d.). National Research Development: Programme set-up. Retrieved from http://www.sida.se/English/partners/our-partners/research-cooperation/guidelines-for-partners/national-research-development/programme-set-up

United Board (n.d.c). 2017-2018 Program Guidelines. Retrieved from https://unitedboard.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/United-Board-Fellows-Program-Guidelines-2017-2018.pdf

United Board. (n.d.a). Mission and Identity. Retrieved from https://unitedboard.org/about-us/about-united-board/mission-vision/

United Board. (n.d.b). Our Network. Retrieved from https://unitedboard.org/about-us/our-network

World Bank. (2000). Higher education in developing countries. *Peril and Promise*. Washington, DC: Author.

About the Authors

Laura E. Rumbley is associate director of the Center for International Higher Education, and is also assistant professor of the practice within the Department of Educational Leadership and Higher Education at Boston College. Laura was previously deputy director of the Academic Cooperation Association (ACA), a Brussels-based think tank focused on issues of internationalization and innovation in European higher education. She has authored and co-authored a number of publications, including the foundational document for the 2009 UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education, *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution*. Laura has served as consultant for the World Bank in Ethiopia, and has participated in higher education management training activities in Mexico and Saudi Arabia.

Hélène Bernot Ullerö was employed from 2007 to 2015 at Nuffic in the Netherlands as senior program administrator for the NPT and NICHE programs (capacity development of postsecondary education in developing countries). She was responsible for identifying, developing, and overseeing project portfolios in various countries in Africa, generally including training of senior university managers as a measure to foster ownership and sustainability. Prior to that, Hélène was employed for over 25 years at the University of Oslo in Norway, 10 years as head of the international relations office for education and research (including cooperation with developing countries). She is currently employed at Boston College as program administrator for education and research initiatives, under the Vice-Provost for Research.

Edward Choi is a research assistant at the Center for International Higher Education and a doctoral student at the Boston College higher Education program. His research interests include organization and administration of higher education, family-owned institutions and, broadly, internationalization of higher education. Before moving to Boston, Edward received a master degree in International Educational Development from Teachers College, Columbia University.

Lisa Unangst is a research assistant at the Center for International Higher Education and doctoral student in the Boston College Higher Education program. Lisa worked previously in higher education at Harvard University, Cal State East Bay, and the California Institute of Technology. She earned a master's degree in International Education Policy from the Harvard Graduate School of Education and a bachelor's degree from Smith College in American Studies. Lisa was also the recipient of a DAAD (German Academic Exchange Service) post-graduate fellowship from 2003-2004.

Ayenachew Aseffa Woldegiyorgis is a research assistant and doctoral student of higher education at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College. Ayenachew holds a BA degree in Business Management from Jimma University, in Ethiopia, an MA in Public Administration from Addis Ababa University, and an MSc in Research and Innovation in Higher Education from the Erasmus Mundus program of Danube University Krems, University of Tampere, Beijing Normal University and University of Applied Sciences Osnabrück. Before joining CIHE, he worked as a consultant for the World Bank in Washington DC, participated an internship at the Finnish Center for International Mobility, in Helsinki, held teaching positions at Unity University and Addis Ababa University in Ethiopia, and was a frequent commentator on issues of higher education for a national newspaper in Ethiopia, *The Reporter*.

Hans de Wit is director of the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) at Boston College (USA, and professor within the Department of Educational Leadership and Higher Education of the Lynch School of Education, Boston College. He founded and directed for several years the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy, and was Professor of Internationalization of Higher Education at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences. He is a research associate at the *Unit for Higher Education Internationalisation in the Developing World* at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU), Port Elizabeth, South Africa and is a globally recognized expert on internationalization of higher education.

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. He was Distinguished Scholar Leader of the Fulbright New Century Schools program, has had several DAAD lecture grants, and has been a fellow of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and other organizations. He is currently a member of the Russian government's 5-100 excellence commission and serves on a ministry-level committee that advises the government of Saudi Arabia on its higher education policy and development. He is author of many books, most recently *Global Perspectives on Higher Education* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016).

About the Sponsors

The German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)

The German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) is the world's largest organization for the funding of international student and scholar exchange. It is a registered organization with the German institutions of higher education and student bodies as members. The DAAD awards scholarships, supports the internationalization of German universities, promotes German studies and the German language abroad, assists developing countries in establishing more effective higher education systems, and advises decision-makers on cultural, educational, and development policy issues.

The German Rectors' Conference (HRK)

The German Rectors' Conference (HRK) is the association of state and state-recognized universities in Germany. It currently has 268 member institutions, in which around 94 percent of all students in Germany are enrolled. The HRK functions as the voice of the universities in dialogue with politicians and the public and as the central forum for opinion forming in the higher education sector. The German Rectors' Conference cooperates with universities and corresponding organizations all over the world. Its aim is to represent the interest of German universities at an international level and to support German universities in their internationalization process.

About DIES

The Dialogue on Innovative Higher Education Strategies (DIES) program is jointly managed by the DAAD and the HRK. It offers various program components that foster the competencies of academic staff and contribute to the enhancement of institutional management at universities in developing countries, such as training courses and diaglogue events. In addition, the measures facilitate exchange on matters of higher education management between participants from Germany and the respective partner countries. What all DIES components have in common is that they pursue a practical approach, facilitating change by means of developing the skills and competencies of individual staff members. DIES thereby aims at improving institutional higher education management as well as aligning higher education systems with national and regional development goals, so as to contribute, in the long run, to stronger and more international universities in developing countries.

This publication was produced with financial support from the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ).

DAAD HRK
DIES
Dialogue on Innovative Higher Education Strategies

Federal Ministry
for Economic Cooperation
and Development

CIHE Publications Series

CIHE PERSPECTIVES

Launched in 2016, the CIHE Perspectives report series presents the findings of research and analysis undertaken by the Center. Each number in the series endeavors to provide unique insights and distinctive viewpoints on a range of current issues and developments in higher education around the world. The following titles are included in this series:

- No. 1. Sage Advice: International Advisory Councils at Tertiary Education Institutions (2016). Philip G. Altbach, Georgiana Mihut, & Jamil Salmi.
- No. 2. Global Dimensions of the Boston College Lynch School of Education: Analysis of a Faculty Survey (2016). Ariane de Gayardon & Hans de Wit.
- No. 3. Catholic Universities: Identity and Internationalization, A Pilot Project (2016). Andrés Bernasconi, Hans de Wit and Daniela Véliz-Calderón
- No. 4. The World View: Selected blogs published by Inside Higher Education, 2010-2016 (2016). Georgiana Mihut, Lisa Unangst, Liz Reisberg, and Hans de Wit.
- No. 5. The Challenges of Academic Integrity in Higher Education: Current Trends and Outlook. Elena Denisova-Schmidt.
- No. 6. The Boston College Center for International Higher Education, Year in Review, 2016-2017. Ayenachew Woldegiyorgis, Laura E. Rumbley, Hans de Wit (Eds).
- No. 7. The Boston College Center for International Higher Education, State of Play: Higher Education Management Training Schemes in the Field of Development Cooperation. Laura E. Rumbley, Hélène Bernot Ullerö, Edward Choi, Lisa Unangst, Ayenachew Woldegiyorgis, Hans de Wit and Philip G. Altbach (Eds).

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION (IHE)

International Higher Education (IHE) is the flagship quarterly publication of the Center for International Higher Education. Launched in 1995, IHE features the contributions of distinguished scholars, policymakers, and leaders, who are well-positioned to offer critical perspectives on higher education worldwide. This publication—which is translated into Chinese, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Vietnamese, and French—presents insightful, informed, and high-quality commentary and analysis on trends and issues of importance to higher education systems, institutions, and stakeholders around the world. Each edition also includes short abstracts of new books and other publications of relevance to the global higher education community. http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

CIHE cooperates with the International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA) at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa, and the Association of African Universities in the publication of the International Journal of African Higher Education (IJAHE). Launched in 2014, IJAHE is a peer-reviewed open access journal aiming to advance knowledge, promote research, and provide a forum for policy analysis on higher education issues relevant to the African continent. IJAHE publishes the works of the most influential and established as well as emerging scholars on higher education in Africa. https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ijahe/index

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Since 2005, the Center for International Higher Education has collaborated with Sense Publishers on this book series, which is now comprised of 35 volumes. Three volumes were published in 2016, and three new volumes are in preparation for 2017. As higher education worldwide confronts profound transitions—including those engendered by globalization, the advent of mass access, changing relationships between the university and the state, and new technologies—this book series provides cogent analysis and comparative perspectives on these and other central issues affecting postsecondary education across the globe. https://www.sensepublishers.com/catalogs/bookseries/global-perspectives-on-higher-education/

THE WORLD VIEW

"The World View", published by InsideHigherEd.com, has been the blog of the Boston College Center for International Higher Education since 2010. The World View features the regular commentary and insights of some one dozen contributors from North and South America, Europe, Asia, and Africa, offering truly global perspectives by seasoned analysts. https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/world-view"

INTERNATIONAL BRIEFS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION LEADERS

Developed in 2012 by ACE's Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) in partnership with the Boston College Center for International Higher Education, the International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders series is designed to help inform strategic decisions about international programming and initiatives. The series is aimed at senior university executives who need a quick but incisive perspective on international issues and trends, with each Brief offering analysis and commentary on key countries and topics of importance relevant to institutional decision makers. http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/International-Briefs-for-Higher-Education-Leaders.aspx

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

CIHE Perspectives

Center for International
Higher Education
Campion Hall, Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467 USA

Fax: +1 (617) 552-8422
E-mail: highered@bc.edu
web: www.bc.edu/cihe
Tel: +1 (617) 552-4236

ISSN: 2475-2657 (Print)
ISSN: 2475-2657

The Boston College Center *for*
International Higher Education