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Foreword

The vision of African leaders of integration, peace, prosperity and peerage in the global economy is predicated on the development of Africa’s human resource capital. Education is key to achieving this vision of developing quality human resources. Higher education in particular will enable Africa to contribute to the global knowledge economy and claim its rightful place, both in history and in the future.

Sustainable growth in Africa is contingent on the capacity of national governments to diversify their economies, and to thus train human capital that will help carry out and support this transformation. In this process, higher education plays a key role in training qualified individuals who will be capable of implementing new technologies and using innovative methods to establish more efficient enterprises and institutions, and thus allocate resources more effectively. Ensuring the quality of tertiary education in Africa requires a funding policy that not only can ensure its sustainability but also can provide the incentives to increase efficiency promote a more equitable access and orient the institutions toward the needs of the economy.

This led to the AAU Conference on Innovative Approaches to Funding Higher Education and Research in Africa in Lome, Togo in November 2014. The conference examined how funding approaches to higher education and research in Africa should be relooked at today and tomorrow and what direction it should go. In other words, The conference aimed to support African countries identify innovative, country-specific, approach for funding higher education and research and set forth common strategies to monitor and support countries in resource mobilisation and sustainability. This book delineates the salient features of the conference for the benefit of the African higher education community. It is expected that the content of this volume will be useful to higher education policy makers, scholars, and other key players in the field.

Prof. Etienne E. Ehile
Secretary General
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Since the 1980s, higher education experienced reduced investment in a number of African countries, and was given reduced focus by leading international agencies and donors, and this resulted in the relative neglect of Africa’s higher education institutions (HEIs). All major global initiatives for development and education, including Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Education for All (EFA) in the 1990s ignored higher education, notwithstanding the fact that higher education is key for attainment of the goals in these initiatives. However, from the early 2000s, the key role of tertiary education within policies meant to promote or improve development has been progressively acknowledged, reversing the trends of the majority of the studies conducted in the 80s that gave absolute priority to support of primary education, basing their findings on the rate of return to investments in education.

At the same time, the last two decades have seen a rapid rise in student enrolments, continued loss of intellectual capital (brain drain) and a major reduction in the public financial resources allocated to HEIs. This has led to challenges in quality, as African universities are called upon to do more with less in terms of infrastructure, teaching and research facilities and staff. The result is that most HEIs experience difficulty competing in the global market for knowledge creation and production. This major challenge has led to the need to explore other sources of funding in order to ensure that African HEIs remain globally competitive and nationally relevant.

The Conference on Innovative Approaches to Funding Higher Education and Research in Africa in Lome in 2014 was a direct response to this challenge. The book is the result of the peer review of the commissioned papers presented at the conference. AAU wishes to express its profound gratitude to all the politicians, experts and professionals, numbering about 180 from 19 African countries, as well as representatives from Europe, USA and key development partners, who attended the conference and made very useful comments. In particular, we wish to thank the authors of the five commissioned case studies (Prof. Peter Okebukola on Nigeria; Prof. Crispus Kiamba on Kenya; Prof. Bhen Toguebaye on Senegal; Prof. Antia Bassey on South Africa; and Prof. Mahama Duwiejua and Emmanuel Newman on Ghana).
Models for Innovative Funding of Higher Education in Africa – The Case in Ghana

Emmanuel Newman and Mahama Duwiejua

Introduction

The dominant role of the state in financing higher education in Ghana, as in many other African countries, during the postcolonial period, has been justified by the need to train a corps of professionals to replace the departing expatriate civil servants and managers. Moreover, most governments in Africa recognised that to achieve a socially-optimum amount of investment in higher education, the state representing all citizens must play an active role (Sanyal, 1998). It was also argued that the participation of the state in higher education was necessary to promote access of needy students and other under-represented groups like females in science and engineering who have demonstrated capacities for advanced learning. Proponents of public funding of higher education still canvass these arguments.

Ghana propounds this view as indicated in the following constitutional provisions in Article 25(1)c that “higher education shall be made equally accessible to all, on the basis of capacity, by every appropriate means, and in particular, by progressive introduction of free education” and Article 38(1) which states “the State shall provide educational facilities at all levels and in all the Regions of Ghana, and shall, to the greatest extent feasible, make those
facilities available to all citizens.” Inaccurate interpretation of these provisions have accounted for the slow pace of innovation in the funding of higher education in Ghana. The World Bank (WB) in its report entitled Accelerating Catch-up: Tertiary Education for Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa urges African countries to invest and maintain a high level of investment in tertiary education to:

- ensure that the volume and quality of skills needed – many highly specialised – will be forthcoming, possibly with a gestation period of a decade, capitalise on the youth bulge;
- deepen the institutional base for research in universities and specialised institutions; and
- initiate the process of technology development on a much larger scale, as well as technology transfer between research centres and the business and agricultural sectors.

Times have changed and the demands on tertiary education have gone beyond numbers to emphasis on relevance and social accountability. These recommendations require massive investment but paradoxically, in spite of the spiralling cost of higher education, there has been an increasing decline in public funding on account of competition for limited public resources by the various sectors of the economy; and between higher education institutions and other sub-sectors of education. The situation does not only call for prudence now but innovative and sustainable methods of generating resources from both public and private sources to offset current deficiencies. Re-structuring of current funding mechanisms is therefore an imperative.

Ghana has embarked on the path of reviewing public funding for tertiary education. The case and proposals for alternative modes of funding tertiary education and the drivers for the success of the proposals are presented in this chapter. While the focus of the chapter is on funding, we recognise that fund availability alone will not solve the problem. Concurrent reforms to reflect efficiency in resource allocation, curriculum reform, change in pedagogical practices, strengthening of governance structures and autonomy are crucial for success in any innovative funding mechanism (Hanushek and Woessmann, 2007; World Bank 2007) – it cannot be business as usual.

**Tertiary Education Landscape in Ghana**

The tertiary education sector consists of all post-secondary educational institutions. These comprise three colleges of agriculture, 11 nursing training institutions, 38 colleges of education, 10 polytechnics and 10 public universities and 63 private tertiary institutions. For the purpose of this chapter, we focus on funding in universities and polytechnics which consume the bulk of budgetary allocation to the sector. Total enrolment into these
institutions in the 2013/14 academic year was 318,607. Private tertiary institutions are currently not eligible for public funding. We have not distinguished between higher education and tertiary education. The two terms are used interchangeably in this chapter.

Funding of Tertiary Education in Ghana

Sources of funds

Tertiary education in Ghana is funded through a variety of sources. The main sources being grants from Government of Ghana, the Ghana Education Trust Fund (GETFund), development partners, internally generated funds by the institutions and contributions from students and private sector. GETFund deserves special mention because it has been the major source of funds for infrastructure development since its establishment. GETFund is a public trust set up by an Act of Parliament in 2000 to provide funding to supplement government efforts for the provision of educational infrastructure and facilities within the public sector from the pre-tertiary to the tertiary level. The Fund is supported with contributions equivalent to “two-and-one-half percent or such percentage not being less than two-and-one-half percent of the Value Added Tax rate, as Parliament may determine out of the prevailing rate of the Value Added Tax”. The money is paid by the Value Added Tax Service (now Ghana Revenue Authority) to the Fund through the Minister of Education.

Fund Allocation to the Sector

Tertiary institutions receive their budgetary allocations from government through the National Council for Tertiary Education (NCTE). NCTE is enjoined by the National Council for Tertiary Education Act, 1993, to advise the Minister responsible for education on block allocations of funds towards the running cost of tertiary education and grants towards capital expenditure. In reality, the total amount of money allocated by the ministry of education to NCTE for the tertiary sector is decided through a combination of mechanisms namely:

- **historical funding or incrementalism**: fund allocation is the same yearly, based on the previous year’s allocation with minor variations;
- **bidding and bargaining**: a case is presented for funding every year based on annual budgetary demands from NCTE; and
- **discretion**: the final decision on quantum of allocation to the tertiary sector depends on the total allocation of funds received from the ministry of finance to the education sector.
The education sector expenditure from 2009 to date, accounts for an average of 23.7% of government expenditure. Over the same period, an average of 19.1% of the education sector budget is allocated to the tertiary sector. Except for the compensation of employees, amount of funds allocated for goods and assets from the ministry of education depends on the ministry’s judgement of the relative importance of projects presented for the sector.

Summary of Higher Education Strategic Goals in Ghana

Funding models for higher education are designed to facilitate the implementation of public policy objectives in higher education, and thereby, influence the outputs and outcomes of higher education institutions. In this context, higher education policy objectives of Ghana are based on six main policy goals namely:

- **Facilitate equitable access to quality tertiary education.** For this policy goal, emphasis is laid on gradual expansion of access to tertiary education through expansion in enrolment of new entrants especially females and applicants from under-privileged homes and less-endowed schools; promotion of distance education; establishment of an open university; promotion of access for students with disability and promotion of postgraduate education.

- **Facilitate research in tertiary education, particularly in national development priority areas.** The focus of this objective is the expansion of postgraduate education; provision of resources for postgraduate education and the institution of output-based funding scheme to facilitate research in tertiary education.

- **Promotion of quality and relevance:** For this policy objective, emphasis is laid on curricular review; quality assessments; and training in outcomes-based quality assurance methods.

- **Promote effective regulation, management and planning of tertiary education.** The major strategy for this policy goal is the building of capacity of senior management staff in management and planning through the organisation of training programmes.

- **Facilitate Science, Technology and TVET in tertiary education.** The purpose is to facilitate industrial attachment for all students; institution of competency-based and entrepreneurial programmes and the provision of resources for science and technology education.
Facilitate collaboration in tertiary education: This objective relates to the organisation of joint research and extension programmes with industry, commerce and civil society and other tertiary education institutions.

These policy goals provide the basis for the development of a new funding model for higher education in Ghana.

Justification for New Funding Model in Ghana

The cost of higher education keeps escalating and government expenditure in relative terms is diminishing. Over the last five years the funding gap in higher education has been in the range of 39.7 to 41% (2011=39.7%; 2012=79%; 2013=49.2%; 2014=46.6%; 2015=41.0%). The funding gap of 79% indicated against 2012 is due to excessive demands of institutions to GETFund for infrastructure. This is a symptom of lack of discipline in the budgeting process which is a problem that needs to be addressed under the current circumstances.

In an earlier study, Materu (2007) reported that while enrolment into tertiary education institutions exploded, Sub-Saharan African (SSA) government expenditure on tertiary education declined by 28% between 1980 and 2002 (World Bank Edstats, 2008). The report further indicated that expenditure per student decreased from US$6,800 in 1980 to US$1,200 in 2002. By 2004/2005, the average expenditure per student in 33 SSA countries stood at US$981. The effect of this gross underfunding largely accounts for the underperformance of tertiary education as tools for development. It has become obvious that the current funding mechanism is inefficient and inadequate.

Current models for fund allocation in Ghana are inadequate in several ways. The incremental and negotiated budgeting approach of funding of tertiary education institutions gives little room for serious planning in budgeting. This system of funding pays little or no attention to national priorities and the changes in the volume of activities performed by the institution. Based on the foregoing it could be surmised that:

- the mechanism for budgeting and distribution of public funds in higher education does not provide incentives for public policy implementation;
- higher education funding is not linked to specified outputs; additionally, the line-item and incremental-budgeting approach to budgeting and distribution of public funds does not provide incentives for reform and innovation. It does not reward compliance with education sector strategies like equity (admission of applicants from under-represented groups), encouragement of science and technology, research and graduate training and above all, the question of efficiency;
- the criteria for determining the level of public funds for higher education in Ghana is unclear; and
• funding of higher education in Ghana is not focused on the student as the unit of production.

There is therefore an urgent need for the development of a new funding model to facilitate the steering of public higher education institutions towards the implementation of national policy priorities for tertiary education. The vexed question of government responsibility to private sector has also not been addressed. In this chapter, we shall explore and propose means of generating resources to fund tertiary education and propose means of allocating funds taking into account equity, efficiency, transparency and accountability.

**Methodology**

This chapter is mainly a qualitative analysis of funding of tertiary education in Ghana based on a series of conferences held to garner the views of stakeholders on funding tertiary education in Ghana organised by the National Council for Tertiary Education. The stakeholder groups from whom views were collected included Vice-Chancellors Ghana, Conference of Rectors of Polytechnics, Principals of Colleges of Education, University Teachers Association of Ghana, Polytechnic Teachers Association of Ghana, Association of Ghana Industries, Ghana Employers Association, National Union of Ghana Students, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Finance and Graduate Students Association of Ghana.

After the collation of views of stakeholders, an expert group comprising a former Minister responsible for Higher Education, two former Vice-Chancellors of public universities, and a person with expertise in economics of higher education was put in place to develop a working paper on funding tertiary education in Ghana based on the views of stakeholders. Primary data for the chapter was collected from submissions by tertiary education institutions to the planning and budget units of the National Council for Tertiary Education. Secondary data was informed by a review of funding mechanisms of tertiary education in other countries. Recommendations made were premised on the assumption that funding models are designed to facilitate the implementation of public policy objectives in higher education, and thereby, influence the outputs and outcomes of higher education institutions.

**New Funding Proposals for Higher Education in Ghana**

A diversified funding model is recommended. The rationale for recommending a diversified funding scheme for the higher education system in Ghana is that the different policy objectives delineated for the higher education system cannot be effectively addressed with a single funding instrument. However, in all cases the new funding mechanism for higher
education system in Ghana should be a distribution mechanism focused on the student as the unit of production, to foster equity in the allocation of public funds made available by the political process to higher education institutions.

Private Funding for Undergraduate and Graduate Programmes

In addition to public funding, the following strategies to promote private funding for undergraduate and graduate programmes are proposed:

Undergraduate Programmes

The following strategies should be undertaken to enhance private funding for undergraduate programmes.

- Academic Facility User Fees (fee students pay towards maintenance and replacement of academic facilities) should increase commensurably with the annual rate of inflation. Currently, universities are not permitted to increase this fee by more than 10% per annum.
- Residential Facility User Fees should cover the cost of maintenance of residential facilities.
- The enrolment quota of Ghanaian "fee-paying students" should increase from 5% to 15%.
- Ghanaian fee-paying students should be charged the direct teaching cost, which is the cost required to run an academic department per student.
- Foreign students should pay the full cost of tuition or instruction relating to the programme being pursued.
- The enrolment quota for foreign students should be raised from 5% to 15%.

Graduate Programmes

Suggested strategies for enhancing private funding for graduate programmes are:

- Graduate students should pay one-and-a-half times the cost of undergraduate education in the different disciplines.
- Foreign students will pay the full cost of postgraduate education.
- Institutions will be encouraged to increase their postgraduate enrolment to between 10 and 25%. The policy on differentiation should be implemented and universities designated as research universities should have at least 25% of their students in
postgraduate programmes and a ratio of masters to PhD students of 5:1. Additionally, non-research universities should have less than 10% of their students in postgraduate programmes. Increasing postgraduate enrolment will raise the revenue level.

Fund allocation

It is recommended that NCTE should determine the allocation of the higher education budget according to the following funding categories: Base grants; Institutional Factor Grants; Innovation Grants; Performance Funding Grants and Research Grants. As mentioned earlier, a diversified funding model is recommended. The rationale for recommending a diversified funding scheme for the higher education system in Ghana is that the different policy objectives delineated for the higher education system cannot be effectively addressed with a single funding instrument. In the following section, a description of how funds assigned to the funding categories listed above are to be distributed to higher education institutions is presented.

Distribution of Base Grants

Base grants are funds provided to enable the institutions perform their basic functions of teaching and learning. The distribution of base grants should be based on full-time equivalent (FTE) students. The use of student enrolment as the basis for allocating public funds to support academic programmes in public institutions is to ensure that cost per student per programme is the same in all institutions. The indicators used for fund allocation are the academic programmes (e.g. Medicine, Engineering, Science and Social Sciences), instructional levels (PhD, Masters, and Bachelor) and enrolments in the different academic programmes and instructional levels. To obtain the desired fairness, weights are assigned to the various programmes and instructional levels to reflect the differences in the cost of programmes and programme levels.

Distribution of Institutional Factor Grants

Institutional factor grants are supplementary instructional grants recommended to be paid to small institutions (in terms of enrolment) that would be at disadvantage if the distribution of instructional funds are based on the number of students per se; or to be paid to institutions whose locations make the cost of their operations expensive, thus, they would be at a disadvantage if all instructional funds are distributed on the basis of enrolment. Accordingly, the institutional factor grant is to account for the differences in the scale of production in higher education institutions to ensure that institutions that operate on small scales or expensive locations receive fair compensation.
The recommendation for the payment of institutional factor grant is inspired by the payment of extra funds to small institutions under the regional loading mechanism and the institutional factor grants in Australia and South Africa respectively. It should also be noted that the Higher Education Funding Council of England provides extra funds to small institutions under the Institution Specific Premium scheme. To distribute “Institutional Factor Grants”, NCTE should assign weights (fractions that add up to one) to the institutions to be considered for funding according to their level of need.

Earmarked Grants for Higher Education

The National Council for Tertiary Education should allocate earmarked grants to support higher education institutions to implement activities deemed critical to national development objectives which cannot otherwise be supported effectively under performance funding or other funding schemes. NCTE should declare annually, the policy areas and programmes that are to be supported through the “Earmarked Grants Scheme” and the funding available for the specified programme areas. The institutions should then be invited to apply for the funds indicating how the funds would be disbursed. NCTE should subsequently establish a monitoring system to ensure that the funds are applied towards the intended purpose. Accordingly, it is recommended that “Earmarked Grants” should be applied towards the following:

- providing seed money for newly-accredited programmes to pay the cost of set-up;
- supporting the organisation of remedial programmes to improve enrolment in academic programmes that are deemed critical to national development but record low enrolment due to stringent entry requirements. The remedial programmes should be targeted at students who have the minimum passes to enter higher education institutions but have grades below the prescribed cut-off points. Such programmes should be organised by the institutions to boost enrolment of students in science and technology programmes. Earmarked grants could also be applied to support staff capacity building to improve teaching and learning as well as management and governance;
- providing funds to build the research capacity of the institutions. The earmarked grants should be provided to enable institutions acquire facilities to conduct research in areas they have comparative advantage; and
- providing funds for capital expenditure in disciplines considered critical to the development of higher education and national development.
Performance Funding

It is recommended that in addition to the funding schemes mentioned above, NCTE should implement a performance-based funding scheme to provide incentives to institutions to implement programmes that would lead to the realisation of national development policy objectives which cannot be reinforced through enrolment-based funding instruments or any other funding instrument. The difference between performance-funding and earmarked-funding is that earmarked-funding is programme or project-based and not contingent upon the institutions delivering specified outputs, while performance funding is paid as part of recurrent expenditure upon delivery of the required performance.

This recommendation is based on international experiences as well as the need to foster the achievement of the variety of public policy objectives for higher education. For instance, the Tennessee Higher Education Council administers a performance-funding programme with the view of providing incentives to enhance the quality of academic programmes and promote accountability in higher education. Thus recommended performance-funding scheme would stimulate institutions to implement programmes that would lead to the delivery of outcomes deemed critical to the development of the higher education sector.

The performance-funding scheme is based on the agency perspective and aimed at reducing risks in public funding of higher education, to ensure that institutions are compensated only if they demonstrate outcomes deemed critical to sector or national development goals. The purpose is to change institutional behaviour by offering financial incentives to institutions to implement activities that would lead to the realisation of outcomes that are in tune with national policy goals for higher education. Thus, NCTE has identified performance goals and specific performance targets required by the higher education sub-sector. A weighting scheme delineated by NCTE should be applied to the performance goals to facilitate the distribution of the funds earmarked for the performance-funding scheme. In the implementation of the performance-based funding programme, the baseline performance of an individual institution is the starting point for determining the amount of funding provided, such that if an institution achieves or improves upon its performance in a particular area, it receives resources from the performance-fund.
### Table 2: Suggested Standards and Indicators for Performance Funding in Higher Education in Ghana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational/Technical Education</td>
<td>Industrial attachment and internship for polytechnic students and teachers.</td>
<td>The purpose of this indicator is to provide incentives to institutions to facilitate industrial attachment for students and teachers of polytechnic institutions.</td>
<td>W₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competency-based and entrepreneurial training programmes.</td>
<td>This indicator aims at providing incentives to polytechnics to make all academic programmes competency-based; and organise entrepreneurial training.</td>
<td>W₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Female students enrolled, physically challenged and student admission from less-endowed schools.</td>
<td>This indicator is to provide incentives to enable institutions implement affirmative action programmes to enrol more applicants from under-represented groups.</td>
<td>W₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Governance</td>
<td>Capacity building for council members and senior faculty and administration members.</td>
<td>This indicator aims at providing incentives to institutions to organise training on governance and management for council and senior faculty members.</td>
<td>W₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with stakeholders</td>
<td>Joint programmes with industry, commerce and civil society organisations.</td>
<td>Provide incentives to promote joint research programmes and community extension programmes.</td>
<td>W₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>Curricular review</td>
<td>This indicator aims at providing incentives to review curricula to promote national development objectives.</td>
<td>W₇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality assessments</td>
<td>This indicator is to provide incentives to the institutions to submit their programmes to voluntary assessments by NAB.</td>
<td>W₈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training in facilitation and academic assessments.</td>
<td>This indicator aims at providing incentives to the institutions to organise training programmes in facilitation and assessments for teaching staff.</td>
<td>W₉</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommended indicators reflect the policy imperatives of higher education and the areas where constant improvements are required. Table 2 provides the policy basis for the establishment of performance-funding scheme for higher education in Ghana.
To implement the performance-funding scheme, NCTE should determine the amount of money required for reinforcing the selected policy areas, and consequently, assign weights to the selected indicators as portrayed in Table 2, taking into consideration the relative importance of the various indicators to the development of higher education in Ghana.

NCTE is required to score the performance of higher education institutions on the basis of their performance using the indicators in the selected policy areas. The distribution of the performance funds is therefore, based on the weighting and the performance scores of the institutions.

**Distribution of Research Grants**

Currently, the distribution of research grants in higher education is not geared towards any specified research outputs. Consequently, we recommend that the funding of research should be based on research outputs of higher education institutions. It is therefore, recommended that NCTE uses the following research outputs as the indicators for distributing public funds earmarked for research in tertiary education institutions in Ghana. These outputs are: research publication units; doctoral graduates; and researched master graduates. These indicators will be used to distribute the research and staff development fund from GETFund.

The use of research output as the basis to allocate research grant is in line with international practices. For instance, Australia has an output-based scheme to facilitate the distribution of research grants. In England, institutions benefiting from research funding must be graded above a certain threshold in Research Assessment Exercises. Moreover, the distribution of the mainstream quality research funds is based on output-based criteria where the total funding for each subject area is determined as a product of the volume of research in that area and their relative weights. In South Africa, the distribution of research grants is based on research outputs such as publication units, researched masters and doctoral graduates.

In view of the recommendation for the use of an output-based funding scheme to distribute research grants to higher education institutions, it is recommended that NCTE determines weights that should be applied to the various output indicator units to facilitate the distribution of research grants to tertiary education institutions. In this, we need to take into consideration the research areas (such as science, social science and engineering) and research outputs (e.g. MPhil, PhD and publications in international journals).
Table 3: Summary of Policy Implementation Strategy and Funding Mechanisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Instrument</th>
<th>Intended Policy Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Instructional and Institutional Factor Grants | Expand enrolment of new entrants.  
Enrol more graduate students.  
Increase enrolments of science students.  
Enrol more distance education students. |
| Research Grants                    | Promote research in graduate education.  
Increase research output.  
Enrol more graduate students. |
| Earmarked Grants                   | Provide facilities for research.  
Train more science teachers.  
Provide ICT facilities.  
Increase library holdings. |
| Performance Funding                | Facilitate internships for polytechnic students and teachers.  
Promote competency-based training.  
Build capacity of Council and faculty in management and governance.  
Promote joint programmes with industry.  
Facilitate curricular review.  
Facilitate quality assessments.  
Facilitate training in facilitation and assessments. |

Support for Private Tertiary Education Institutions

Apart from the allocation of research grants, all the aforementioned funding categories are designed for allocating public funds to public institutions. In this regard, it recommended that the following strategies should be adopted to support private tertiary education institutions and their students.

- Private tertiary education institutions should enjoy tax-free concessions;
- Student of private tertiary education institutions should enjoy the same bursaries and scholarships given to students of public institutions who pursue programmes considered as national priority; and
- Private tertiary education institutions should be eligible to compete for special project funding such as the Africa Centres of Excellence initiative of the World Bank and the National Research Fund under consideration.
Characteristics and Consequences of the New Funding Mechanism

The Characteristics

In the new funding framework, a funding formula is used in allocating base grants to higher education institutions in Ghana, based on the number of students enrolled in the institutions. Other funding categories are the institutional factor grants, earmarked grants, performance-funding and research grants. Accordingly, the new mechanism presents a diversified approach to financing higher education.

The funding schemes for allocating public funds to higher education institutions correspond with the diversified goals of the higher education system. Indeed, the four recommended funding schemes have been designed to provide incentives to higher education institutions to reinforce policy implementation as shown in Table 2.

The base grants funding scheme uses student enrolment to distribute public funds to higher education institutions. Thus, it reinforces the planned policy strategies aimed at promoting access. This is because the enrolment-based funding instruments provide incentives to institutions to enrol more students. The recommended mechanism for allocating research funds is based on the output of research (research publication units, doctoral graduates, and output of research master graduates). Thus, the funding for research inure to the promotion of research and enrolment of postgraduate students.

As indicated earlier, earmarked grants are to provide extra funding to institutions to provide resources for research, ICT facilities, train more science teachers and increase library holdings or any other needs of the higher education system that cannot be supported through enrolment-based funding mechanisms.

The performance-funding instruments are to provide incentives to higher education institutions to undertake activities necessary for the realisation of national development objectives and promote quality outcomes in higher education by implementing activities such as training in course facilitation and assessments, curricular review and facilitation of internships for polytechnic teachers and students.

Perhaps, the major characteristic of the new funding mechanism is that, it has been designed as funds distribution instrument, rather than an instrument for estimating the amount of money required for higher education in Ghana. Political authorities in Ghana are required to determine the amount of money needed for higher education. In this discourse, it has been recommended that the quantum of public funds required for higher education should be indexed to GDP of Ghana. The figure determined should be reviewed periodically in the light of new developments in the higher education system and in the economy of Ghana such as growth in enrolment, introduction of new technologies in teaching and learning and expansion of the economy. In this regard, this new mechanism is adaptable to
the economic conditions of Ghana. Indeed, the economic system will only provide what it can generate for higher education.

This new mechanism could be characterised as indirect demand-side financing. The core public grants for teaching and learning (base grants) will be allocated directly to higher education according to the number of students they attract and retain. The recommended funding mechanism has *input and output dimensions*. As noted earlier, the distribution of base grants is based on the number of students enrolled, while the distribution of research grants is based on the number of research papers published by teachers, and the output of PhD and research Masters students.

The new funding mechanism is designed to promote *equity* in higher education. Indeed, the recommended mechanism for distributing base grants to higher education institutions allocates equal tariff per student for the same programme in all institutions. Moreover, institutions with low enrolments due to the type of programmes they offer, or the disadvantages associated with their locations, will receive additional funding under the institutional factor grants scheme. The indicator, “the number of female students enrolled” is aimed at providing incentives to the institutions to implement affirmative action programmes to foster the enrolment of more female students.

The new funding mechanism is *mission-sensitive*. That is, the distribution of base grants, the institutional factor grants and research grants recognises differences in programme offerings, instructional/programme levels and costs associated with economies of scale. Accordingly, the funding mechanism allocates different tariffs for different programmes and instructional or programme levels. The allocation of institutional factor grants is to recognise differences in economies of scale such that institutions, which operate in expensive locations or offer programmes that are unpopular with students, will receive fair compensation.

The new funding arrangement is *flexible* and could be adapted to meet the changing national development and sector goals. The weighting devices allow NCTE to steer the institutions to lay emphasis on programmes deemed national priority, to foster institutional capacity building and enhancement of enrolments. Additionally, NCTE could make funds available through the earmarked-funding scheme, to enable the institutions introduce or strengthen new programmes to meet the emerging human resource needs.

The recommended funding arrangement presents *better and impartial* means for allocating public funds to higher education institutions. It is a better mechanism because the basis for fund allocation is the policy objectives for higher education, thus, it is responsive to the sector and national development goals. Moreover, fund allocation is tied to the quantum of work the institutions are expected perform or have already performed. In this regard, the new funding mechanism avails an impartial means for allocating public funds to higher education institutions.

Finally, the new funding framework presents a *transparent* approach for allocating public funds to higher education institutions. Indeed, if the funding bases are clearly...
defined, and the weights assigned to programme levels are known, an institution will be able to project its share of public funds for higher education in the medium-term.

**Some Consequences of the New Funding Mechanism**

The recommended funding mechanism will have consequences for the governance of the higher education system and individual institutions. Layzell and Lyddon (1990) assert that funding decisions for higher education are based on policy judgements that can be categorised in four distinct ways: the link between efficiency and enrolment; diversity of mission; equity, fair share and quality; outcomes and effectiveness. However, this discourse examined the consequences of the new funding framework regarding governance, institutional planning and management, quality outcomes, and efficiency and diversity of mission of higher education institutions at the system and institutional levels.

*Consequences for system governance:* In the new funding framework, public policy imperatives for higher education will be the basis for allocating public funds to higher education institutions. And these policy imperatives are to be co-determined by stakeholders such as the state, academia and interest groups.

*Consequences for efficiency and enrolment:* The new funding mechanism is aimed at promoting efficiency in resource allocation by linking funding to the performance criteria (Salmi and Hautman, 2006). The performance criteria in this new mechanism include outputs of research, and the number of students enrolled and retained. Consequently, an institution wishing to maximise its share of public funds would have to recruit more students and demonstrate results in the other performance indicators to benefit from more public funding.

   The number of students to be used in determining the base grants for instruction and administration will not be based on head counts but on full-time equivalent number of students. In this regard, the institutions would be compensated for the actual number of hours used in teaching and learning.

   To enhance efficiency, government might encourage enrolments at present prices or facilitate the introduction and expansion of distance education, while ensuring that quality outcomes are not diminished. Another option is the fostering of the growth of private higher education institutions. However, rapid enrolments without corresponding increments in funding have implications for quality outcomes. Akintoye (2008) discussed the consequences of underfunding in higher education and human resource development and noted that underfunding will lead to curtailment of the purchase of library books and chemicals and basic laboratory equipment, curtailment of laboratory/practical work; loss of research capacity leading to low quality of research, and narrow strategic profile. It is therefore imperative that NCTE agrees with stakeholders (government and higher education
institutions) on enrolment targets and levels of funding that would ensure sustainability in funding and quality outcomes.

**Management and planning:** The implementation of the new funding framework will depend on accurate and reliable data supplied by higher education institutions. Accordingly, the institutions would have to expend more resources on equipment and personnel to collect, analyse and provide accurate data for transmission to NCTE. NCTE will also need to strengthen its capacity on data collection and retrieval systems to enable it to distribute public grants on the basis of accurate and reliable data.

The new funding framework provides incentives for the institutions to inculcate public policy objectives in their strategic and annual operational plans. Indeed, the institutions can no longer ignore public policy objectives for higher education in their routine planning processes. The management of higher education in Ghana cannot be business as usual. The distribution of public funds should be tied to the performance indicators delineated from public policy objectives. Consequently, institutions wishing to maximise public funding would have to inculcate public policy objectives in their strategic and annual plans to enable them maximise their share of public funds allocated to higher education institutions.

**Consequences for quality outcomes:** The new funding framework seeks to promote quality outcomes in higher education. Accordingly, one of the policy areas for the recommended performance-funding scheme is quality assurance. In this regard, the defined quality indicators are curricular review, quality assessments and training in course facilitation. Indeed, the institutions are required to review curricula and train their staff regularly and subject their programmes to quality assessments to benefit from the performance-funding window.

**Consequences for autonomy:** The recommended funding mechanism address concerns regarding autonomy of higher education institutions. Indeed, they (funding mechanisms) are aimed at distributing public funds to higher education institutions according to the size and performance of the institutions. The management of the funds is the business of the institutions. Decisions of academic nature are still within the remit of the institutions. The Academic Boards, with the support of the University Councils, will continue to determine programmes to be offered, pedagogical methods, academic standards and appointment of teaching and administrative staff.

**Consequences for accountability:** One of the running themes in this chapter is the accountability of higher education institutions in Ghana. In this study, it was discovered that higher education institutions in Ghana do not account for the use of public funds by way of outputs and outcomes ensuing from their operations. At present, auditing in higher
education is concerned with the management of funds rather than outputs. This new mechanism has been designed to foster the delivery of clearly-defined output.

The performance-funding framework compensates the institutions for demonstrating certain results deemed critical for the development of the higher education sector. The distribution of base grants for instruction and administration is based on the number of students enrolled. Additionally, the distribution of research grants is based on the outputs of research by higher education institutions. In this regard, the institutions will have to demonstrate results for the use of public funds to benefit from public funding.

**Consequences for systemic coordination:** The new funding framework has implications for costs, enrolments, efficiency and collaboration at the systemic level. Thus, it presents some challenges for the NCTE and the Ministry of Education. NCTE and the Ministries of Finance and Education should ensure that unit costs do not decline because of excessive enrolments, reduction in public funding and inflation. NCTE should therefore, collaborate with the Ministry of Education and the institutions to determine enrolment targets to foster planning and distribution of funds in the medium-term. Enrolment targets should be determined on the basis of the capacity of the institutions, the manpower needs and developments in the economy of Ghana. With the targets so determined, enrolment overrun by the institutions should not be counted during the allocation of the base grants. Accordingly, if the institutions overrun their enrolment targets, they should be made to bear the cost of their excess enrolment from their own internally-generated funds. Conversely, institutions that fail to meet their enrolment targets for justifiable reasons should be considered for extra funding under the institutional factor grants scheme. Additionally, it is recommend that NCTE should consider discounting cost figures during planning to ensure real cost values are not diminished by inflation.

It is also recommend that NCTE should institute a mechanism to subject new programmes to macro-efficiency test as done in The Netherlands, to ensure that the institutions demonstrate the need for the programme taking into consideration programmes offered by other institutions and relevance to the human resource needs of the nation. In this regard, the public sector would be saved from wastes arising from profusion and duplication of programme offerings. Finally, it is recommended that the new mechanism should not be imposed by command by the Ministry of Education or NCTE. NCTE and the Ministry of Education should facilitate stakeholder discussions on the funding framework to foster ownership and collaboration.

This chapter is based on the premise that NCTE could use financial incentives to encourage higher education institutions to implement programmes that would lead to the realisation of higher education policy goals. The use of weighting devices in the distribution of funds in the recommended funding framework allows NCTE to allocate funds to higher education institutions in accordance with the priorities of the higher education sector. The performance-funding framework has an indicator for female enrolments. Thus, as in the
analysis above, if enrolment of females is prioritised, the weight assigned to female enrolments could be increased relative to the other indicators to provide incentives to the institutions to enrol more females to achieve the enrolment target of 50:50 for male and female students.

Apart from enrolments, the new funding arrangement could be employed to steer the institutions achieve other sector objectives such as the promotion of research outputs, the enhancement of quality outcomes, the acquisition of facilities and library holdings. Thus, if the promotion of research is prioritised by government and NCTE, the amount of public funds allocated to the research component (RG) of the funding categories could be increased relative to the other policy areas and weighted appropriately according to the preferred research outputs (publication units, doctoral graduates and researched master graduates) to steer the institutions to enhance research in the preferred area. Funds could also be made available through the earmarked grants scheme (EG) to support the acquisition of facilities for research.

The earmarked grant scheme offers avenues for government to specifically provide funds to improve facilities and increase library holdings. As shown in Table 2, the earmarked grants scheme has four indicators. In this regard, the increment in the earmarked grants relative to the other funding indicators and higher weighting for facilities and library holdings would ensure that facilities and library holdings are improved.

The performance-funding programme offers opportunities for promoting quality outcomes in higher education. Indeed, the indicators of the performance framework include curricular review, quality assessments; and training in facilitation and assessments. These indicators offer institutions avenues to earn non-base funds if they are able to demonstrate that they have performed the afore-named activities, which are aimed at promoting the quality of higher education. The weights assigned to the performance indicators: curricular review, quality assessments and training in course facilitation and assessments could be increased to reflect governments desire to enhance quality outcomes in higher education in Ghana.

This report discussed how the institutions could be stimulated to initiate activities to achieve the policy imperatives for higher education. However, the same principle could be used to stimulate other policy areas according to the priorities of government. Finally, a combination of the policy instrument discussed above could be applied towards the achievement of the varied policy objectives for higher education.

Challenges and the Way Forward

The proposed funding mechanism offers a diversified framework for funding higher education institutions in Ghana. As indicated earlier, the funding framework recommended for financing higher education is not an open-ended mechanism. It is designed to distribute
funds made available by the political authorities of Ghana to higher education institutions, hence, its sustainability during changes in the national economic climate is not in doubt. The recommended mechanism should appeal to the Ministry of Education and the NCTE due to its easy applicability and simplicity. However, it could be envisaged that the recommended funding framework might face challenges, which might hamper its adoption and implementation. In this regard, this section examines these challenges and ways to ameliorate them.

The Challenges

**Appreciation of the technicalities of the funding model:** The recommended funding mechanism offers a formulaic approach to funding higher education and eliminates the negotiated approach to funding tertiary education institutions. Though the model is a simple one, the algorithm may not be obvious to everyone. Therefore, lack of understanding of the funding formula might lead to lack of appreciation. It is envisaged that the formulaic approach to the distribution of funds would eliminate the discretion of bureaucrats and politicians in the distribution of public funds to higher education institutions and eradicate favouritism in fund allocation. Another concern is that the formula could be ignored or manipulated by bureaucrats to ensure that they retain their influence in the allocation of public funds to higher education institutions.

**Co-operation and appreciation by managers of higher education institutions:** The new mechanism would require authorities of higher education institutions to demonstrate results and provide data regarding their performance annually. Previously, the State provided funds to meet the annual incremental budgetary requests of higher education institutions - which repeat the same items of expenditure year after year irrespective of the changes in the volume of their activities. The requirement to demonstrate performance might be misinterpreted as intrusion on the autonomy of higher education institutions or micro-management by the managers of higher education institutions. Indeed, Adu and Opoku-Afriyie (2003) state that higher education institutions in Ghana tend to plead autonomy and argue for the need to preserve academic freedom which they also tend to extend to financial management.

Despite the opportunities the new funding framework offer for improving sector performance, it is probable that the proposed funding framework might face resistance from a section of higher education institutions. Resistance might come from institutions that would suffer reduction in funding due to the implementation of the proposed framework. The comparison of the allocation of funds with the old and new mechanisms proved that the institutions that are likely to suffer losses are the older and influential institutions. This state of affairs would pose a threat to the implementation of the funding mechanism proposed in this chapter.
The need for reliable data: Formulaic funding of institutions would require accurate and reliable data on the performance of higher education institutions. Adu and Opoku-Afriyie (2003) state that records and statistics kept by the institutions have not been adequate, that is, in the form that would allow for cost-benefit analysis. The recommended base funding, performance and research funding would be difficult to operate without data on enrolment, research outputs and data on the defined performance indicators. The institutions might be tempted to exaggerate data on their performance to earn more funding. Another challenge is the ability of the institutions to collect, validate and present accurate and reliable data from their departments and faculties for onward transmission to the NCTE.

Administrative capacity of the National Council for Tertiary Education: A major challenge to the implementation of the proposed funding framework for Ghana is the administrative capacity of NCTE. The Council has over the years, been allocating public funds to higher education institutions irrespective of the performance of the institutions. The new mechanism requires a major shift in the way NCTE distributes public funds to higher education institutions. In fact, a re-orientation of the relations between the Council and tertiary education institutions is required. There is also the need for the Council to institute a mechanism to validate data supplied by the institutions to ensure that the implementation of the new mechanism is based on accurate data. Also, the lack of understanding of the recommended funding mechanism on the part of the staff of NCTE as well as inadequate capacity in data collection and analysis could be a drawback on the implementation of the new funding mechanism.

Leadership and political support: The new funding mechanism would remain on paper if the NCTE fails to take up the leadership challenge to ensure its implementation. The Council has initiated the process of advocating for the change by submitting a draft policy brief on the recommendations to the Minister. This is because if the political establishment does not accept this new mechanism, it might never be implemented. For instance, if the Minister responsible for education would not accept the recommendations of this study, it would spell the doom of the recommended funding mechanism for higher education in Ghana.

The Way Forward

The prescribed framework imposes tremendous responsibilities on the major stakeholders—the Ministry of Education, the NCTE and higher education institutions. Indeed, without the collaboration of these three institutions, the implementation of the new funding framework for higher education in Ghana would be frustrated. In this regard, the roles and responsibilities of these three stakeholders regarding the implementation of the proposed funding mechanism are discussed in this section.
Salmi and Hautpman (2006) propose three measures that should be taken into consideration for countries implementing funding mechanisms:

- The administrative capacity of the government and the tertiary education institutions, including the degree to which different mechanisms promote flexibility of institutions to change and adapt rapidly and the capability of the system to collect necessary data;
- the transparency and perceived objectivity of the proposed allocation mechanisms and the potential for leakage and corruption of the system; and
- the political dimensions of adopting new reformed allocation mechanisms, particularly, the risks and difficulties involved in the transition from existing to new approaches.

Indeed, a workable funding mechanism requires the full backing of government authorities, and effective management information system to help track changes engendered by the reforms. The Ministry of Education, as in other countries, has general oversight for the development of education in Ghana. Consequently, the Ministry has responsibility for setting the policy agenda and instituting a mechanism for regular review of the higher education policy. The Ministry of Education should periodically determine the policy, mission and relevance of higher education in the light of new developments in the world of learning. The annual budget for higher education could be indexed to the gross domestic product or determined as a fixed percentage of the total budget of the education sector.

NCTE has the responsibility for advising the Minister responsible for education on the policy direction for higher education. The Council should regularly assess the higher education environment and provide the necessary policy briefs to enable the Ministry of Education determine the policy direction for higher education in Ghana. The Council should also co-facilitate stakeholder discussions on the policy agenda for higher education; and promote the appreciation of the new funding framework among politicians and managers of higher education institutions.

In order to foster the cooperation among stakeholders, NCTE would have to create a platform to enable the managers of higher education institutions subject the goals of higher education, the proposed funding framework, as well as the indicators that would form the basis for fund allocation to deliberations to foster ownership and implementation. Thorn et al (2004), suggest that pilot and phased implementation might be necessary to create opportunities for further refinement before scaling up on the evidence of lessons learnt. Another strategy is that, NCTE should facilitate the passage of a legislative instrument to give legal backing to the new funding framework, after stakeholder support has been obtained.
The proposed funding framework cannot be implemented without accurate and reliable data. Indeed, without accurate data, the credibility of the new funding mechanism will be in doubt and its underlying principles would be defeated. In this regard, NCTE should institute a mechanism for collecting and validating data supplied by the institutions. Finally, higher education institutions should cooperate with the Ministry of Education and the NCTE by implementing the policies collectively determined by stakeholders for higher education.
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An Innovative Model of Funding Higher Education in Kenya: The Universities Fund

Crispus Kiamba

Introduction

Innovative resource mobilisation for higher education has been recognised as critical to both university education and high quality national human resource development which are, in turn, *sine qua non* to the successful achievement of Kenya’s Vision 2030. This study is about the “Universities Fund” (to be managed by a buffer body called “The Universities Funding Board). It is a new funding model of higher education in Kenya that has been proposed under the Universities Act, 2012 and one of the key pillars of the post-2012 higher education reforms in the country. The reforms in the funding of university education was underpinned by the recognition that the financing for higher education in Kenya has been both inadequate and lacked effective coordination mechanism, especially in the face of competing demands for the limited national budget.

Higher Education Buffer bodies: Theory and Reality

*Rationale for the Creation of Buffer Bodies*

Buffer bodies are generally bodies created by governments to perform some of its functions, but
which are to a greater or lesser extent relatively autonomous of the Government. The reasons for the establishment of buffer bodies are numerous, and may vary from case to case. One of the most commonly stated reasons for the establishment of buffer bodies in the university sector is to protect the academic freedom of universities and to reduce the possibility of government undue interference which might compromise academic freedom.

A second argument is that buffer bodies enable decisions to be taken about the development of universities and university system outside the normal political cycle. Universities are bodies that can take a long time to implement change, and need a long time for developments to mature and become embedded. It does not make sense for short-term decisions to be taken as political fashions change. Governments, particularly in democratic systems, find it difficult to take long-term decisions regardless of their immediate political impact, and the existence of buffer bodies enables this.

Related to this, buffer bodies can take difficult political decisions which governments are often unable to take. It can often be helpful to a government faced with controversial decisions affecting individual universities or the system as a whole, to be able to point out that the decision was not theirs, but was taken by an independent body which the law or even the constitution forbids them to control. A further reason for the creation of buffer bodies is that it enables decisions to be taken by experts. Not all decisions require experts, of course, and some are better taken by people who are not close to the topic, but it enables informed and expert decisions be taken when necessary.

**Legal Status of Buffer Bodies**

The most common legal form for a buffer body is a body created by legislation with powers and responsibilities set out in that legislation. This is important, because in such cases the law sets out the powers and responsibilities of the government on the one hand and the buffer body on the other. This is a safeguard against the government attempting to carry out functions or influence universities in ways that go beyond their powers as set out by law.

**The New Higher Education Reforms in Kenya**

**The National Vision: The Context of Reforms in Higher Education**

*The Kenya Vision 2030* (Republic of Kenya 2007), which aims at transforming Kenya into a “newly industrializing, middle income, globally competitive and prosperous country providing a high quality of life to all its citizens in a secure and clean environment”, and the new *Constitution of Kenya, 2010* (Republic of Kenya 2010), have provided the overarching environment of reforms of all sectors in Kenya, including higher education. It was against this background and building on earlier works, that the Minister for Higher Education, Science and Technology established a Taskforce, which generated the *Report of the Taskforce on the Alignment of the Higher Education, Science and Technology (TAHEST) Sector with the Constitution of Kenya* (Republic of Kenya 2012a) (hereafter called “the

The proposed new universities funding buffer agency is one of the new innovations recommended by the TAHEST report and introduced and provided for under/by the Universities Act, 2012. The new fund has not been set up, but the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology is in the process of making the necessary arrangements of setting it up. As the Taskforce Report argued in its provisions regarding education, the youth and promotion of science and technology, the Constitution of Kenya, 2010 ventured into an area that the former Constitution was completely silent on, effectively launching a paradigm shift towards constitutional recognition and promotion of higher education, science and technology. In addition to the recognition and the setting out of general principles of rights that appertain to higher education, the constitution has also gone a long way in assigning obligations that are necessary towards the realisation of the general principles under the Constitution that relate to higher education. In this connection, some of the key and express provisions under the new Constitution that relate to and directly influence strategies of higher education, science and technology include: freedom of expression, which includes academic freedom and freedom of scientific research; right to education for everyone as one of the socio-economic rights; right of access to educational institutions and facilities for persons with disability; and right of opportunities for the minority and marginalised groups.

Minority and marginalised groups are to be provided with special opportunities in educational and economic fields under Article 56(b) of the Constitution. This is a particularly critical and urgent matter considering the issues of historical injustices and marginalisation of some areas in the country in terms of availability of higher education learning opportunities. Most institutions of higher learning especially universities are concentrated in urban areas and their environs, especially in Nairobi, central Kenya, around Nakuru and Eldoret in the Rift Valley and around Kisumu and Kakamega in western Kenya. This has led to a situation whereby some areas have remained marginalised and underdeveloped. The implications of all these was an urgent review of policies and strategies on the spread and distribution of learning institutions in the country, especially taking into account the principle of devolution under Article 10 of the Constitution of Kenya, 2012.

---

1 These are some of “rights and fundamental freedoms” under Chapter Four on “The Bill of Rights” of the Constitution of Kenya, 2010.
Under Vision 2030 and the Constitution of Kenya, 2010, the new vision for higher education and more particularly, the legal framework as captured by the Universities Act, 2012 and other related legislation, the country intends to “invest in the people of Kenya” by providing a globally competitive and quality education, training, and research to support that development. Along with this, the Vision proposed intensified application of science, technology and innovation in order to raise the productivity and efficiency levels across the three pillars of the Vision, i.e. the economic, the social and the political.

The Universities Act, 2012, has therefore made it clear that, in the discharge of their functions and powers under this new environment, higher education institutions would be guided by the national values and principles of governance that have been set out by the new Constitution. In this regard, in Clause 2 of the Act, which borrows largely from Article 10 of the Constitution, the institutions are expected to, inter alia: promote quality and relevance of programmes; enhance equity and accessibility of its services; promote inclusive, efficient, effective and transparent governance systems and practices and maintenance of public trust; ensure sustainability and adoption of best practices in management and institutionalisation of systems of checks and balances; promote private-public partnership in university education and development; and institutionalise non-discriminatory practices. Any new and innovative model strategies relating to higher education must therefore respond directly and urgently to the challenges set out in both Vision 2030 and the Constitution of Kenya 2010. These will include but not limited to:

- freedom of expression, which includes academic freedom and freedom of scientific research;
- right to education for everyone as one of the socio-economic rights;
- right of access to educational institutions and facilities for persons with disability; and
- right of opportunities for the minority and marginalised groups.

The Status and Growth of University Education

The demand for higher education in Kenya has continued to grow and, as observed above, it has been acknowledged that it has a pivotal role in the achievement of both the Kenya Vision 2030 and the ideals of the Constitution of Kenya, 2010, hence Kenya’s global competitiveness and national prosperity. Like what is happening globally, Kenya’s higher education system is getting more complex due to the growth in the number and complexity of public and private institutions and the demands of key stakeholders, the task of managing and monitoring and funding the sector has increasingly become more demanding and specialised. Kenya has the following categories of public and private universities:\footnote{2 The Universities Act 2012 has defined a “public university” as a university established and maintained out of public funds and “private university” as “a university which is not established or maintained out of public funds”}

---

2 The Universities Act 2012 has defined a “public university” as a university established and maintained out of public funds and “private university” as “a university which is not established or maintained out of public funds”
Chartered Universities. These are universities that have met the set standards for full university accreditation status by the Commission for University Education (CUE). The President on the recommendation of both the Cabinet Secretary responsible for education and the Commission grants the Charter for university education.

Universities with Letter of Interim Authority (LIA). These are universities issued with a LIA by the Cabinet Secretary responsible for Education upon the recommendation of the Commission for University Education under the Universities Act 2012. Before 2012, only private universities were granted LIA by the Commission for Higher Education (CHE) under the repealed Universities Act. A university granted LIA operates under the close guidance of CUE awaiting the grant of Charter and has power to: set up a governing body for the university; to develop physical facilities; assemble academic resources; admit students; and establish internal quality assurance mechanism.

Registered Private Universities. These came into existence before the establishment of the Commission for Higher Education in 1985. They are at various stages of development of resources and facilities for full university accreditation.

Foreign universities. Under the Universities Act 2012, these are universities established outside Kenya, which offer university education in Kenya and are subjected through the accreditation process as Kenyan universities. A foreign university may enter into an arrangement with an institution in Kenya for purposes of offering its programmes or joint programmes of instruction in Kenya, with the prior approval of the CUE.

Over the years, university education in Kenya has witnessed exponential growth from having one university (The University of Nairobi) to 22 fully chartered public universities (15 of which were established in 2012 and 2013), 9 public university colleges, 17 private universities, 5 private university colleges, 11 Universities with LIAs and 2 Registered Universities (see Table 1 for details of these universities).

---

3 Thus making this period the most dramatic in the development of university education in the history of Kenya.
Table 1: Status of Universities in Kenya (2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chartered Public Universities</th>
<th>Chartered Private Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public University Constituent Colleges</td>
<td>5. Uzima University College (CUEA) (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Murang’a University College (JKUAT) (2011)</td>
<td>Universities with Letter of Interim Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rongo University College (MU) 2011</td>
<td>5. Inoorero University - 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Garissa University College (-MU) (2011)</td>
<td>7. GENCO University - 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Riara University - 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. UMMA University (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registered Private Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Nairobi International School of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. East Africa School of Theology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The coming of the new Universities Act in 2012 ushered in the establishment of 12 new public universities in Kenya. This was through the upgrading of Constituent University Colleges of the seven public universities. In addition, the population in the seven universities has also been rapidly increasing, especially the privately-sponsored component. The
establishment of these new universities, initially as affiliates of the existing universities had been a strategic process over the last five years preceding the new 2012 legal framework, especially geared towards responding to the enormous pressure for more university spaces from 2015 because of the major expansion and reforms of the basic education system, especially the free primary education introduced by government in 2003. In effect, the expansion of basic and secondary education created a strong potential demand for the tertiary level education, at both university and middle level technical, vocational education and training level.

Student enrolment in Kenya’s universities has been on the rise since the introduction of free primary and secondary education. Recent statistics (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics Facts and Figures 2013) show that the number of students enrolled in primary schools increased from 8,831,400 in 2009 to 9,997,900 in 2012. Similarly, 1,914,800 students were enrolled in secondary schools in 2012 compared to 1,472,600 in 2009. The increase in primary and secondary school enrolment has led to a significant increased growth of student numbers in the universities. At least 240,500 students were enrolled in local private and public universities in 2012 up from 177,700 in 2009. Nevertheless, more than half of the university students enrolled in the public universities were privately sponsored. Table 2 shows the growth in university enrolment (CUE, 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>177,700</td>
<td>117,600</td>
<td>198,300</td>
<td>240,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Based on statistics from the Kenya National Bureau of Standards (KNBS), enrolment in the universities is projected to grow from 240,500 in 2013 to 970,00 in 2018 (CUE 2013). This translates to 403% increase in just five years! To accommodate the increased number of students, government needs to establish one new university in 2014; five in 2015; 15 in 2016 and 30 in 2017. The newly-established and older universities, however, need to upgrade their human resource capacities and physical facilities to ensure students receive quality training in conducive learning environments.

The increase in enrolment has happened without any increase in government funding levels as a percent of the total expenditure of the public universities and university colleges. This expansion has therefore been mainly financed by tuition fees of self-sponsored students who now constitute about 50% of the total university enrolment in Kenya.

The expansion of basic education was not the only force to account for the unprecedented expansion and diversification of Kenya’s higher education over the last 20 years. A lot of these forces have been global in nature. The growing demand for the labour market has been important contributor to the expansion and diversification, especially the
increasing level of skills and competencies required for a modern, globally-competitive and increasingly knowledge-based economy. Another force is the need for continuing professional upgrading, buttressed by the natural tendency of professions to seek enhanced status by requiring ever higher amounts of education.

Some of the new universities set up in 2013 by government were deliberately in the areas of the country hitherto not served by universities with a view to responding to the need to improve equal access to tertiary education. These areas include the coastal area of Kenya, where two new universities\(^4\) were started and northern Kenya\(^5\), where in addition to addressing equity issues, they are the same areas where the resources (especially petroleum, gas and coal) are being discovered, hence the urgent need for training the relevant human resources.

A study sponsored by CUE has shown that quality has declined in university education in Kenya due to exponential growth in enrolment without matching physical and human resources (CUE 2013). Government should ensure adequate university staffing levels for quality university education in order cater for the current deficits in teaching staff and accommodate the projected increase in enrolment, at least 23,400 lecturers and other teaching staff are needed by 2018 from the current 6,200 in the universities sampled by the CUE study. This calls for a proactive human resource development strategy on the part of government to reduce the lecturer to student ratios in the universities for quality education to be provided.

**Brief History of the Models of Funding Higher Education in Kenya**

*Background of the New Proposed Model of Funding Higher Education*

Funding higher education and related activities in Kenya has been inadequate and without effective coordination mechanisms in the face of competing demands for the national budget. Innovative resource mobilisation mechanisms for higher education have been recognised as crucial to successful implementation of the objectives of national development. The new strategy recognises that new approaches to financing and prudent financial management are essential to achieving the goals of the new reforms of the sector. Government, the private sector, development partners as well as students themselves to ensure increased access, equity and maintenance of quality will share financing of the sector.

*Earlier Attempts at Establishing University Grants Committees*

---

\(^4\) The Technical University of Mombasa and the Pwani University.
\(^5\) Garissa University.
There have been several attempts to set up a university funding buffer body relatively autonomous from the government ministry responsible for university education since the 1970s, when there was only one university in Kenya. The first of these attempts was the University Grants Committee, which was established largely along the same lines as the British University Grants Committee. It produced its first and only report in 1981. This was later followed by the provision of a Universities Grants Committee under the Commission for Higher Education in the 1985 Universities Act. Although the Commission was largely an accreditation and quality assurance agency, the Act also gave it functions of coordination of university budgets and the power to “delegate to the Universities Grants Committee such of its functions as it may determine”. In this connection, the Act provided that the Commission shall, by resolution, appoint a Universities Grants Committee and which would consist of such members as may be appointed by the Commission. The Commission however, never established the Committee and the government continued funding universities directly or at least through the Commission.

**The Experience of a Competitive Research and Innovation Fund**

Investment in research in Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) is key to the country’s realisation of development targets set in Vision 2030 as the long-term economic plan for global competitiveness. In line with this, government set up a research and innovation fund in 1978 under the then National Council for Science and Technology (NCST) to mainly support critical areas of research which were not being undertaken by publicly-funded research institutions, and to assist talented researchers and innovators who may come up with new ideas of potential importance to the country.

The purpose of this fund is to support advancement of scientific research, inventions and innovations and build capacity in STI sector for national development. The fund targets

---

6 This was an advisory committee of the British government, which advised on the distribution of grant funding amongst the British universities. It was in existence from 1919 until 1989. Its functions have now largely been taken over by the higher education funding councils (HEFCE (England), SFC (Scotland), HEFCW (Wales), and the Department for Employment and Learning in Northern Ireland).


8 The Universities Act Chapter 210B, 1985.

9 Sections 6(n and o) of the Act provided that some of the functions of the Commission are “to plan and provide for the financial needs of university education and research, including the recurrent and non-recurrent needs of universities” and “to determine and recommend to the Minister the allocation of grants of money for appropriation by Parliament to meet the needs of university education and research and review expenditure by universities of moneys appropriated by Parliament”
priority areas in relation to the development agenda of the country as provided in Vision 2030 among others policies documents. These funding categories include:

a) Thematic research
b) Innovations
c) Women scientists research projects
d) Postgraduate research (PhD & MSc)
e) Post-doctoral research
f) Bilateral matching grant (Kenya/South Africa; Kenya/German & NACOSTI/JSPS)
g) Research facilities
h) Support of scientific conferences and symposia
i) University research chairs (NACOSTI-IDRC)

Since the inception of the enhanced Research Endowment fund in 2008/09, the Fund has grown steadily from Ksh. 250,000,000 per year to Ksh. 397,000,000 in 2014. Through this fund, the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) (the successor of the NCST) has supported a total of 1,283 research and innovations projects in priority areas and conferences covering over 100 public and private institutions throughout the country. The research grants are awarded through a competitive process. The calls for proposals are publicly advertised through local newspapers and websites. All received applications are subjected to peer review by external reviewers.

The Proposed Universities Fund

As indicated earlier, against the background of Kenya’s Vision 2030 and the new Constitution of Kenya 2010, the Minister for Higher Education, Science and Technology established a Taskforce, which generated the Report of the Taskforce on the Alignment of the Higher Education, Science and Technology (TAHEST) Sector with the Constitution of Kenya (Republic of Kenya 2012a) (hereafter called “the TAHEST Report”). The Report recommended, inter alia, that the government would:

“Establish an institutional government funding mechanism which would be a lever for achieving University Education policy objectives and alignment to the Constitution of Kenya 2010. The funding mechanism would be used along with appropriate regulatory frameworks for achieving high quality university education and research” (Republic of Kenya 2012a, 87).

---

10 Some of the funded ongoing projects are in priority areas such as food security, climate change, renewable energy, engineering, health water and sanitation.
The strategies that would be used to implement the “funding mechanism” recommendation would include the following:

a) Develop a comprehensive University Education Funding policy.

b) Establish the University Funding Board (UFB) with a mandate to develop the detailed institutional funding criteria, disbursing all government funding, and then monitoring the utilisation and impact of the funds by the universities. UFB would also have the mandate of fund-raising, developing incentives for private sector participation in university education, developing public private partnership frameworks for university education, negotiating tax waivers to foster individual and corporate/institutional support to university education, etc.

c) Develop in consultation with county governments a transparent and equitable institutional funding criterion that would be aligned with the Constitution of Kenya 2010 and other national socio-economic development goals.

d) In consultation with stakeholders, UFB would:
   • develop a revised Differentiated Unit Cost (DUC) for all degree programmes offered in Kenyan Universities;
   • adopt DUC as basis for institutional financing public universities;
   • develop and implement automated university financial information systems with interfaces to the National Government Integrated Financial Information System; and
   • develop the capacity of chief financial officers and senior leadership of universities on efficient and effective financial management practices.

The Universities Act, 2012 Establishes the Universities Fund

To understand the new and proposed funding model for higher education, it is necessary to look at the new legislation that is now governing university education in the country. Passed by the Parliament as the main law governing higher education in Kenya, the general purpose of the Universities Act is to provide for the development and management of university education in Kenya, and more particularly:

• provide for the role and powers of the Government, especially the relevant Ministry responsible for higher education;
• provide for the establishment, accreditation and governance of universities;
• provide for the establishment of key government agencies or buffer bodies for: the establishment, accreditation and quality assurance of higher education (i.e., the Commission for University Education as a successor to the hitherto Commission for Higher Education); co-ordination of the placement of Government-sponsored students in universities and colleges (i.e., the Kenya Universities and Colleges Placement Service as the successor to the Joint Admissions Board); the co-ordination
of funding of public universities and for giving conditional grants and loans to private universities and coordination funding of universities (i.e. the Universities Funding Board);
- provide for the governance and management of universities, including governing organs and the appointment of officers of the university; and
- make provisions relating to financial matters of universities.

This Act repealed all the previous Acts that had established all the seven public universities\(^\text{11}\) and the Act that established the Commission for Higher Education (CHE) (the precursor of the new Commission for University Education), which is also the Act under which private universities were previously established, accredited and managed\(^\text{12}\). The new Universities Act 2012 is therefore the successor to all the previous legislation that dealt with higher education and effectively not only consolidated all previous public universities law, but also brought both public and private universities under one law. It thus introduced a level playing field by removing the dichotomy or duality that existed in the establishment, quality assurance and management between public and private universities. Before this, following their establishment by government, public universities operated as self-regulating entities whilst private universities were subjected to detailed and strict regulatory control by CHE.

The proposed “Universities Fund” and the University Funding Board (UFB)

Following the recommendation of the TAHEST Report, the Universities Act established the Universities Fund and the Universities Fund Board. The function of the Board/Trustees is to generally manage the University Fund and more particularly to:

a) Advise the Cabinet Secretary, and therefore the government, in matters of university education funding and related policy issues;

b) in consultation with the Cabinet Secretary, develop a transparent and fair criteria for allocation of funds to universities;

c) apportion funds to universities in accordance with criteria established;

d) in consultation with the public universities, establish the maximum differentiated unit cost\(^\text{13}\) for the programmes offered; and

e) establish the minimum discipline differentiated remuneration\(^\text{14}\) for academic staff of

---
\(^{11}\) These were: The University of Nairobi Act, Cap 210; The Kenyatta University Act, Cap 210C; The Moi University Act, Cap 210A; The Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology Act, No. 8 of 1994; The Egerton University Act Cap 214; The Maseno University Act, No. 7 of 2000; and The Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology Act, 2006.

\(^{12}\) The Universities Act, Cap 210B.

\(^{13}\) The Universities Act defines “differentiated unit cost” as the annual per student cost of mounting a particular degree programme. It is therefore the annual cost of providing a particular degree program per student, taking into account the staff costs, facility costs and other institutional overhead costs.

\(^{14}\) The Universities Act defines “discipline differentiated remuneration” as the academic staff remuneration based on
universities, which shall be fair and globally competitive, and, advise the Government accordingly.

The Act provides that the sources of monies for the fund would come from: the Parliament; donations to the trustees; income generated by investments made by the trustees; and endowments, grants and gifts from whatever source designated for the fund. The purpose of the fund is to support university education in Kenya, and more particularly it would be used for the payment of:

a) any expenditure approved by the trustees for the funding of the public universities;
b) any expenditure approved by the trustees for conditional grants and loans to private universities; and
c) any expenditure authorised by the trustees to be incurred in connection with the administration of the fund.

**Leadership and Management**

The Universities Fund Board will comprise trustees who would manage the fund so established. The Board of Trustees shall consist of nine members appointed by the Cabinet Secretary for education as follows:

a) A chairperson who has knowledge and experience in matters related to finance, investment and fundraising;
b) The Principal Secretary in the Ministry responsible for finance;
c) The Principal Secretary in the Ministry for University Education;
d) Six persons who have proven knowledge and experience in financial matters of which at least two and not more than three will be of the same gender.

The criteria for the appointment of the chairperson and the six persons of the Universities Fund Board are the same criteria and process of the appointment of members of the governing bodies of the several buffer agencies that have been established under the Universities Act. Such appointments are largely guided by principles of integrity, competitiveness, transparency, fairness and inclusiveness, which are to guide appointments to all public offices as espoused by the Constitution of Kenya, 2010. In this connection, a selection panel would be appointed by the Cabinet Secretary to manage the process. The positions are publicly advertised and the names of both the applicants and shortlisted candidates placed for public scrutiny in at least two daily newspapers with national circulation. The Cabinet Secretary from a list submitted by a selection panel following a
competitive and transparent recruitment process appoints the chairperson and the members of the Board.

In determining the nomination criteria for the members of the bodies, regard is given to the objectives of the development of university education, ensuring that there are balanced competences, gender equity, and the inclusion of persons with disabilities, the marginalised and other minority groups. In order to ensure competent and effective participation in and contributing to the affairs of university education, the new law has put minimum educational and experience requirements of the members of the Commission. In this connection, a person shall be qualified for appointment as a chairperson or member of the Commission if the person in the case of the chairperson, holds a doctorate degree and have ten years’ experience in leadership and management of public or private institutions, in case of a member holds at least a masters degree, and at least five years’ experience in leadership, management or academia. Further, a member of the any of the agencies shall be a person of high moral character and integrity in accordance with Chapter Six of the Constitution of Kenya. Finally, the chief executives of these agencies are appointed by the Cabinet Secretary on the recommendation of the governing boards following a competitive recruitment process and who shall serve for a period of five years, which term may be renewed once.

**Challenges, Opportunities and Impacts of the Universities Fund/Board**

The challenges in financing public universities include: inadequate budgetary support; inadequate funds for capital development; lack of programme differentiated unit cost in provision of funds from government; inadequate internal income generation by the universities; and system inefficiencies. These challenges will become increasingly more complex given the exponential growth and the attendant questions of quality and relevance of university education in Kenya. There are clear indications that quality has suffered in university education in Kenya due to exponential growth in enrolment without matching physical and human resources. There is an urgent need of an equivalent of a national “Marshall” or master plan to ensure not only adequate and quality university staffing level but also requisite modern technology support.

In fact, the need to increase tuition revenue by public universities has been the key driver for increased enrolment. The proportion of private fee-paying students when compared to government students admitted on merit alone by Joint Admissions Board (JAB)\(^{15}\) has been increasing. It is currently estimated at 50% of the student population and is even higher for students in low-enrolment but popular professional degree programmes like

---

\(^{15}\) The Joint Admissions Board (JAB) has been succeeded by the Public Universities and Colleges Central Placement Board (PUCCPB).
medicine. Public universities have established campuses that do not have a quality of learning environment comparable to the main campuses. The campuses are also established without consideration to the locations of university colleges established by government. The focus on courses that generate high tuition revenue (e.g. law and commerce) means that some strategic degree programmes have not been receiving adequate attention by the university leadership or even adequate funding. This is particularly the case with engineering and science degree programmes that cannot attract high number of private fee-paying students. In such cases, there is limited upgrade or expansion of laboratory facilities. This is inconsistent with Vision 2030, which considers science, engineering and technology to be foundational degree programmes.

The majority of university teaching staff now focus on teaching-related income generating activities especially teaching in the campuses, university colleges or private universities and not research. This means that there is limited focus on knowledge generation and the knowledge economy as envisioned by Vision 2030. Research publications had fallen to just about 0.11 per full-time faculty member at University of Nairobi by the year 2007. Internal quality assurance processes have weakened (e.g. using moderation and peer review) because of the large classes and many university campuses in different parts of the country. Universities have neglected the more difficult sources of revenue like private sector sources, establishing foundations or attracting research grants. Consequently, public universities have not achieved the necessary diversification of revenue with decreasing government funding. The PhD throughput of public universities is low, particularly in the strategic areas of science, engineering and technology areas necessary for Vision 2030. Thus, public universities have operated like private universities with limited focus on science, engineering and innovation and foundation areas required by Vision 2030. Since the Commission does not regulate these new public universities for higher education, the quality of education has declined as observed in the Public Universities Inspection Board report of 2007.

It is these challenges that the Universities Fund Board is expected to confront. There are, however, a lot of opportunities and benefits that will accrue from the reform of the manner of funding of public universities. There will also be the opportunity to review any possibility and benefits of the government funding some aspects of private universities.

Transparency and fairness of funding of universities: The Universities Fund and the Board are expected to respond to the long-standing criticism to the current approach of funding of public universities, which has been seen as lacking transparency and fairness in the way funds are allocated or distributed to public universities.

Public support/funding offered to private universities: Private universities in Kenya have received limited financial support from the state. Indeed as discussed earlier, a private university in Kenya has been defined as “a university which is not established or maintained
out of public funds”. The rational for proposing some financial support to private universities recognised that, although the Government may not fund them the same way it funds public universities, it could however give conditional grants and loans to private universities. Demand-side financing is, however, sometimes used in arguing for the state support of private higher education. Financing instruments coming under this category are often referred to as “conditional grants”, “scholarships,” “bursaries,” “financial aid”, etc. Indeed, one of the key objectives of the proposed Universities Fund is precisely to consider giving conditional grants or loans to private universities. The Fund is therefore expected to respond to the need of the government to support private universities since they play an important role in the university system and national development in the country.

It is against this background that, since 2010, financial support through higher education loans, bursaries and scholarships managed by Higher Education Loans Board (HELB), which had traditionally been available to students in public universities is now equally available to both students in private universities and privately or self-sponsored students in public universities. Further, faculty in private universities have access to research and innovation funds managed on behalf of the government by the Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation. The proposed conditional grants and loans to private universities would therefore be the next logical step in the critical development of a well-balanced university system in Kenya. The biggest challenge will largely be limited funding that will be available for the Universities Fund.

**Equity in charging tuition to students:** One of the critical issues the Fund/Board is expected to deal with is the current major problem of the manner of charging of tuition fees to “Regular” or “Module One” students, where despite the different costs of mounting the different courses, all academic programmes are currently charged the same fees. For example, the fees for a degree programme in a social sciences course and a medical or engineering degree course per year under the regular programmes are the same despite the enormous differences in the costs for the two programmes. The funding structure is therefore not based on the unit cost for undergraduate programmes but allocated uniformly per student enrolled irrespective of the course a student is pursuing. The cost per course

---

16 The Universities Act, 2012.
17 This is the successor to the National Council for Science and Technology.
18 This is the category of students who are government-sponsored and the fees they pay is subsidised by government and they directly pay tuition that is the same for whatever degree programme a student is registered. The level of this tuition has remained unchanged since the 1990s when it was introduced. Initially, it was based on unit cost per student of Ksh 120,000 per program calculated in the year 1995. The government then paid Ks 70,000 per student enrolled and the students were supposed to pay the balance either from household incomes or loans given by the Higher Education Loans Board.
does not differentiate between expensive and inexpensive programmes. Furthermore, there is uniform funding per student in irrespective of the university and location in the country. It is therefore insensitive to different unit costs of the courses offered by the various universities and in different locations in Kenya. As a result of applying this uniform unit cost, public universities with relatively expensive programmes are under-funded as compared to those with relatively less costly programmes.

The adoption of differentiated unit cost: There is the need for public universities to adopt a Differentiated Unit Cost. This means that each public university will set its own DUC based on its own unique circumstances subject to a programme-based maximum DUC. The proposed Universities Fund Board in consultation with the public universities will determine the maximum DUC. Since the concept of differentiated unit cost of degree programmes has already been applied in “Module Two”\(^{19}\) or full fee-paying programmes, there is already good experience how it could similarly be applied in the regular degree programmes. Doing the same for the regular degree programmes would play a major role in regularising fees charged to all students in public universities. The introduction of DUC in public universities will eliminate the distinction between government-sponsored and self-sponsored students in public universities.

Review of the dual-track system: This will require the review of the dual-track system of charging government-sponsored vis-a-vis the privately-sponsored students in public universities. This will, however, require massive education to the student community and other key stakeholders in order to manage the ownership and acceptability of such drastic reforms in the higher education system. There will be the need to ensure that any application of the regularisation or harmonisation of fee burden would not introduce unacceptable inequities in university education.

Differentiated remuneration for academic staff: Another critical issue that the new fund is expected to deal with is the need to have a realistic manner of paying or remunerating faculty or staff of public universities. This is already taking place in the payment of faculty who teach in Module Two programmes in public universities. Clearly, establishing the minimum discipline-differentiated remuneration for academic staff of universities, which shall be fair and globally competitive would go a long way in not only regularising the payment structure but also in responding to the problem of staff retention, especially in most expensive yet competitive academic disciplines like medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, architecture and building and engineering and technology. These disciplines are also most critical to the country’s response to the scientific and technological requirements and a knowledge-based

\(^{19}\) Full fee-paying students or privately sponsored students pay different tuition/fee for different programmes. The level of this fees is largely market determined.
economy, which Kenya aims for under its Vision 2030.

Performance-based budgeting and funding: Clearly, the Universities Board is also expected to start the important work towards performance-based funding to public universities by developing the methodology that would be used. This, and indeed the entire work of the Board is a major challenge but, at the same time, a huge opportunity for the rationalisation and development of the higher education system in Kenya.

Concluding Remarks

Today’s fiscal environment has forced states to carefully consider how their limited funds are spent on higher education. States have commonly allocated funds on the basis of enrolment, a process that reinforces their commitment to university accessibility and ensures a relatively equitable distribution of per-student spending across institutions. Enrolment, however, is a poor predictor of overall institutional performance. Ongoing budget limitations combined with a rising national demand for highly educated workers, make it increasingly important for the state to invest in university education that has quality, and relevance and critical for the pressing and urgent development needs of the country. It is time to rethink the current postsecondary funding model. To ensure that taxpayer investments yield the best possible returns, states must incentivise and reward the best performers in achieving these objectives.

Performance-based funding is a system based on allocating a portion of a state’s higher education budget according to specific performance measures such as course completion, credit attainment, and degree completion, equity and gender considerations instead of allocating funding based entirely on enrolment. It is a model that provides a fuller picture of how successfully, institutions have used their state appropriations to support clearly stated objectives or targets.

Performance based funding has many qualities, including:

- Ensuring that enough money is apportioned for performance to create incentives that are sufficiently strong to change institutional behaviour.
- Developing different funding formulae for different types of universities or use the same formula but weight it differently depending on the type of institution and characteristics of the student population.
- Integrating all metrics and provisions into the state higher education funding formula, as this makes it more durable when universities are faced with limited funding or budget cuts.
- Subjecting institutions to frequent monitoring and evaluation to ensure dedicated pursuit of targets and results.

A funding agency would therefore not only give institutional support based on productivity for supporting teaching but also has special targeted grants for capacity
development, innovation and research. These are just two examples of how government can leverage university funding to achieve government policy objectives.

Kenya could benefit from setting a University Funding Board for institutional funding in addition to the existing Higher Education Loans Board that focuses on student financing. This body would develop the detailed criteria taking into account Vision 2030 and the Kenya Constitution 2010. It is possible that a more efficient system of funding universities and monitoring the utilisation to support the academic programmes would encourage universities to diversify their sources of income and become much more efficient.

To steer universities towards policy goals while respecting institutional autonomy, the Kenya Government has devised several mechanisms for this purpose. Among them are annual performance contracts. Performance contracting of public universities is part of the overall government public sector reform programme which has been going on over the last seven years. Government has been monitoring the performance of public universities against the goals each university sets for itself in its strategic plans and annual performance contracts. In both cases, each university is expected to reach specified output level of indicators of good performance.

One of the new and most important buffer bodies established under the Universities Act, 2012 is clearly the Universities Funding Board. Despite the centrality of the functions and the work of the Fund/Board to the university or higher education reforms, it has not yet been set up by Government. Indications by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology are, however, that the setting up of the Fund and the Board are in progress and are expected to be up and running soon20.

References


20 Given the previous unsuccessful attempts of University/ies Funding Councils any concerns would be warranted.


Towards Models for Creatively Funding Higher Education in Nigeria

Peter A. Okebukola

Introduction

Nigeria has one of the most expansive higher education systems in sub-Saharan Africa in terms of number of institutions (618) and enrolment (1.8 million). This attribute comes with huge financial demands to drive the system which has failed to deliver on quality. Between 1970 and 2014, there were 38 national summits on education convened to probe the aetiology of factors hindering quality and to propose sustainable solutions. The common refrain in the resolutions of all the summits is the under-resourcing of the educational system. In one accord, all made recommendations for adequate funding, a pole which has been greasy to climb. In 2002, the gaze of the national summits narrowed to higher education and it was the consensus of the over 800 participants from all members of the Nigerian higher education stakeholder community that funding should be hiked in a way that will facilitate the restoration of the old glory of the Nigerian higher education system.

The reaction of the higher education community to the depressed funding has been varied but mainly directed at inducing enhanced funding. The typical response is industrial dispute climaxing in strikes. Within the last 20 years, strikes have accounted for about 36 months of university closure. The other reaction has been proprietor infusing funds to douse tension induced by strikes. It is hard to controvert the leading role of the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) in the elevation of funding of the Nigerian university system since 1992. A “bark” by ASUU and other national staff unions indicative of a
prolonged strike often translates to speedy offload of funds to the universities by
government in the typical knee-jerk response. It is a wonder for many where government
unlocks the funds from in these circumstances in the face of the traditional claim of “no
money”. In the recovery phase of this response mode, government slows down on
sustaining the funding regime and the staff unions gear up for another round of “barking”
and strikes, triggering fresh rounds of agitations and strikes.

In this chapter, funding is taken to mean the act of providing a primary stream of
money to offset cost of delivering higher education. A related term that will be used in the
paper is financing. Financing, in addition to providing funds, means raising money, as
endowments bank loan, soliciting contributions or looking for sponsors. Both terms which
are similar but not exactly the same, surface in philosophical and pragmatic arguments on
investment in public higher education.

Investment in public higher education has been justified on the grounds that
university degrees benefit society by adding to the skills of the population and thereby
improving the economy, increasing tax revenues, and in general adding to the “public
good.” The more people who could attend universities and benefit from advanced study,
the better. A university degree leads to higher income and greater civic participation. It is,
without question, a good investment. Because of the clear social benefits of higher
education, society, it is argued, should invest in it. There is a pervasive agreement in many
developing countries that government should provide most of the funding for public higher
education. In many developed countries, however, that commitment eroded when
conservative economists began to argue that the benefits accruing with higher education
went to individuals, and were therefore a “private good” for which individuals and their
families should pay. A concomitant of the private good idea is that grants have been
changed to loans—placing major burdens on many university graduates. This ideological
shift, combined with growing pressures on public budgets, is influencing a dramatic change
in thinking about public higher education in some developing countries. A number of these
countries have been slowly shifting the cost of public higher education from tax revenues to
tuition paid by students.

In Western Europe, tuition remains low, or in some cases entirely free. This is a
commitment to the public good argument. The European experience shows that modern
post-industrial societies can support public higher education systems and provide access to
growing numbers of students. In Australia, where there has been a U.S.-style shift to the
private good idea, the funding system is based on a concept of a tax on the earnings of
university graduates—degree holders pay back the cost of their higher education, over time,
based on their incomes. There is less of an immediate burden on individuals and a greater
degree of equity. In Nigeria, the subscription is to the public good idea as the funding
burden of public higher education is still largely borne by government.

Four questions shall be answered in the paper which will be exemplified by the
Nigerian university system: (a) what are the historical antecedents to the current model of
funding the Nigerian university system? (b) What are the different funding scenarios that predominate in the system highlighting their merits and demerits? (c) What is the impact of the current funding system on the quality of university education? (d) What are creative models of sustainably funding the system? First we begin with the context of the Nigerian higher education system and give downstream visibility to the university component.

**The Context: The Nigerian Higher Education System**

Higher education which covers all forms of post-secondary delivery is typically the last four years of the 1-6-3-3-4 education system. It has a history dating back 89 years with the establishment of the Yaba Higher College. It had a glorious past with products of the system being part of a global stock of professionals. These products have been a national resource and drivers of Nigeria’s socio-economic and political development. Within the last 15 years, the lustre in the quality of these products is dimming and inadequacy in funding has been a factor of interest.

There are three main clusters of higher education institutions- colleges of education, polytechnics and universities, all with public and privately-funded elements. About 80% of the 83 colleges of education are publicly funded. Of these, 69% are owned (hence funded) by the federal government. State-owned colleges make up 12% of the total. There are nine private colleges of education. The sub-system is regulated by the National Commission for Colleges of Education (NCCE). Section 5 (g and h) of the NCCE Amended Act 12 of 1995 provides that the Commission shall “receive block grants from the Federal Government, and allocate them to colleges of education in accordance with such formula as may be laid down, from time to time, by the President; and act as the agency for channelling all external aids to colleges of education in Nigeria. Since its establishment in 1989, NCCE has been providing funds to the colleges based more on availability rather than need.

The polytechnic sub-sector has 406 institutions. This is made up of polytechnics (74), monotechnics (27), colleges of agriculture (36), colleges of health technology (50), other specialised institutions (16) IEs and VEIs (71). About 25% of these institutions are owned by the federal government with another quarter being state-owned. There are 95 privately-owned institutions in this sub-sector that is regulated by the National Board for Technical Education (NBTE). NBTE takes responsibility for overseeing the funding of the federal institutions.

The Nigerian university system has 141 universities made up of 80 public and 61 private universities. The National Universities Commission (NUC) is the superintending and regulatory authority which over years, has played oversight role in the funding mechanisms especially of federal universities. In order to provide a more detailed view of these funding mechanisms and models, this paper will henceforth narrow its focus on the Nigerian university system.
Trends in Funding Universities in Nigeria

Major turning points are discernible in the funding of university education in Nigeria. Between 1948 and the beginning of the oil boom period of the 1970s, the universities secured funds largely from government grants and tuition. However, a turning point occurred when the economy was literally awash with funds as a consequence of the oil boom. By the early 1970s when the boom was starting to pick up, the fee structure became skewed in favour of government subvention. At the same time, tuition was annulled and user fees reduced. For instance by 1973, tuition was made free and hostel accommodation set at N90. When the oil boom declined around the mid-1980s, government grant observed a drastic reduction. The upward adjustment of user fees and introduction of tuition to cushion the cut in subvention could not be achieved because of stiff opposition from the student community. Thus, gradually, the revenue accruing to the universities commenced a steady decline.

The Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) of the mid-80s to early 90s also took a toll on the funds available to the universities. The unfavourable exchange regime of the Naira and attendant high inflation depressed the purchasing power of the universities. The revenue of the universities could hardly support the purchase of equipment and library resources from overseas suppliers. The decay had set in and the system was fast deteriorating.

The Nigerian university system was made up only of public universities from 1948-1999. There were 45 of these universities, 23 of which are owned by the federal government, the rest owned by state governments. The federal universities were funded based on the instrument of the NUC 1993 law section 3(b). At the beginning of the budget preparatory process, NUC issues a call circular specifying the metrics for funding recurrent (personnel and overhead) and capital costs. A bottom-up approach beginning at the level of the department is implemented and progressed through the Faculty, Management and Council. The draft budget of the university is defended at NUC in what the Commission labelled “Estimate Hearing”. The tortuous defence of every kobo to be spent by the university and inter-university centres results in an aggregate sum that is fed into a compilation by NUC. In turn, NUC defends the aggregated budget for the federal university system and the secretariat (NUC) at the different levels of the federal budgetary system until approval is secured. Following approval of the national budget, NUC issues a demand note for the block grant for the federal university system in accordance with the NUC Act section 3 (d). As the new financial year rolls in, NUC disburses personal, overhead and capital grants to the universities and inter-university centres in quarterly instalments which by 1999 moved to monthly instalments. The monthly instalmental release was a consequence of monthly release of the block grants to NUC by the Federal Ministry of Finance.
The state university sub-system had a slightly different funding process. With no intermediary such as the NUC, the management of the university relates directly to the State Ministry of Finance for budget defence and release of funds. Between 1999 and 2006, all state universities had an unpredictable funds release pattern through the State Ministry of Finance. The agonising pattern is a hesitant handout of fractions of salaries by the State Government far into the following month. The Vice-Chancellor carries the burden of finding the differential. No overhead cost grant is provided and a token capital grant may be flung at the university every five or so years or not at all.

By 1999, a major shift in the funding pattern began to emerge. The Obasanjo Administration was committed to reversing the decay through the injection of more funds. As can be seen in fig. 1, the quantum of funds into the federal university system rose steadily.

![Fig 1: Total Grants to Federal Universities through NUC (1992-2002) and capital through ETF (1999-2002)](image)

From 2007 to date (2014), the Goodluck Jonathan Administration has hiked the volume of funds to federal universities (Fig. 2). The picture for state universities follows the same general trend although this high volume is significantly depressed when the Naira exchange rate and other cost-of-living indices are factored into the funding profile.
Factors Shaping Change

As we review the trend in the funding of university education in Nigeria, four factors have emerged as agents of change. First is political will. There is a large corpus of opinion that the military had distaste for the academe and hence did not demonstrate enough political will to provide adequate funds for the universities. Noteworthy though, is that all the sectors of the economy had some taste of under-funding. Indeed, within this context, the universities did not fare worse. The rise in the number of universities and the establishment of new programmes did not suffer during military regimes. For instance, the General Obasanjo Administration approved the establishment of all the seven second-generation universities in 1976. Beginning from 1999, the democratic government of Obasanjo as a civilian President has exerted tremendous positive effect on the funding of universities (see fig. 1).

The second factor is the state of the national economy. The changing vicissitudes of the national economy resonate with the profile of funding of all sectors, education inclusive. The third factor is the pressure brought on government by Staff Unions in the universities for improved funding for the system. It is to the credit of the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) that such pressure of which it was the arrowhead, led to improved welfare scheme for staff, establishment of the Education Tax Fund and now Tertiary
Education Trust Fund and the universities stabilisation fund. The fourth factor is the pressure brought on government by the National Association of Nigerian Students (NANS) and student unions in various universities not to increase fees. Within the last 10 months, agitations have been rife on many campuses where token increase in tuition is applied.

The “Envelope” System of Funding Higher Education in Nigeria

The “envelope” system of funding public service derives its name from a finite package of funds allocation in a literary envelope whose content has no regard to the funding needs of the Ministry, Department or Agency (MDA) but on what is available for sharing in the central government purse. It gained traction in the early 2000 when the Nigerian government took steps to clear its external and domestic debt. Debt accumulated over decades was huge and it was the intention of President Obasanjo to exit the debt and free Nigeria from the invidious conditionalties imposed on it by the creditors which could hamper the plans of his administration to attain the vision of making Nigeria one of the 20 largest economies by 2020 (Vision 20:2020).

A debt-clearing agenda syncs with belt-tightening, financial prudence and expenditure constriction. President Obasanjo put in place a number of strategies to conserve funds, reduce/eliminate wastage and stamp out corruption. The Due Process Office now Bureau for Public Procurement was established to enforce due process in public procurement. The Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) and the Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC) were established to tackle corruption. Along with the envelope system, the Obasanjo administration was able to exit about $36 billion external debt by 2006 thus loosening the tight and choking funding belt of the public sector.

The envelope system is a top-down approach to funding. It begins with a government notation of how much is to be spent in a financial year for goods and services for the entire public sector. This is then shared among the sectors by the Federal Executive Council on the advice of the Federal Budget Office, the Federal Ministry of Finance and the National Economic Management Team. Each sector or Ministry in turn shares the envelope into smaller envelopes for its constituent units. In the case of the Federal Ministry of Education, the sharing is made to the parastatals under the Ministry. Each constituent in turn will adapt its internally-developed budget to fit the contents of its envelope. It is this adjusted budget that is defended with the National Assembly. The approved budget is then processed by the National Assembly as an Appropriation Bill to be signed into law by the President.

The envelope system trimmed profligate spending. In spite of the constriction in spending, the Obasanjo administration paid generous attention to staff welfare. The period
witnessed a quantum jump in salaries especially of university staff and increase in grant for running cost. A modified envelope system is currently in use where adjustments are made to the envelope from the top based on priority needs of a Ministry, Department or Agency. This can be labelled a “modestly flexible envelope”. The finite nature of money available for spending by the national government dictates that the envelope system will be a feature of funding higher education. The system will continue to depend on intervention funds for augmentation.

Creative Funding through Education Intervention Funds

There are four major education intervention funds in Nigeria. These are the Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC), Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund), Petroleum Technology Development Fund (PTDF) and Petroleum Equalisation Fund (PEF). They are “intervention” funds to the extent that they are meant to “intervene” to narrow or bridge the gap between what has been provided for in the national budget and what is needed by the Ministry, Department or Agency (MDA) for its full implementation. Guidelines set up by the enabling laws of the funding agency are applied in the disbursement to benefitting MDAs. We should now examine the intervention agencies in a little detail except UBEC which is essentially for basic education.

Education Trust Fund/Tertiary Education Trust Fund

Nigeria is one of the African countries to legislate the establishment of a special fund for supporting educational development outside the national budget. This was a spin-off from the protracted strike action by the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) demanding improvement in funding education by the Nigerian government. ASUU proposed to government to establish an Education Trust Fund (ETF) to which 2% of gross profit of all registered companies in Nigeria will be paid and from which the universities will complement funding from the national budget. Following its establishment in 1993 to cover the entire education system rather than the universities as originally proposed by ASUU, ETF made significant impact on the physical development landscape of the Nigerian education system at all levels. With its insistence on inscribing ETF labels on buildings and other projects, one finds such labels and the year of funding on many buildings in primary, secondary and tertiary institutions in Nigeria as well as buses, cars and equipment for offices, laboratories and workshops. Other activities such as research and training were also covered by ETF support.

With the realisation that the basic education system was unduly advantaged in government’s intervention funding since it was equally benefitting from funds from the Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC), the decision was taken in 2011 to revert to
the original plan of using the fund for tertiary education. By Act of 2011, the fund was changed from Education Trust Fund (ETF) to Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund).

TETFund is an intervention agency set up to provide supplementary support to all level of public tertiary institutions with the main objective of using funding alongside project management for the rehabilitation, restoration and consolidation of Tertiary Education in Nigeria. The main source of income available to the Fund is the two percent education tax paid from the assessable profit of companies registered in Nigeria. The Federal Inland Revenue Services (FIRS) assesses collects the tax on behalf of the Fund. The funds are disbursed for the general improvement of education in federal and state tertiary educations specifically for the provision or maintenance of:

- Essential physical infrastructure for teaching and learning
- Institutional material and equipment
- Research and publications
- Academic staff training and development and
- Any other need which, in the opinion of the Board of Trustees, is critical and essential for the improvement and maintenance of standards in the higher educational institutions

The 21-year history of ETF/TETFund shows an impressive record of impact. This includes enhancement of physical development and improvement in human capacity of the system through ETF/TETFund-supported training. Many stakeholders in education in Nigeria hold the view that if ETF/TETFund support were taken out of the funding equation in Nigeria, a rather mediocre system would have been the outcome. Whereas TETFund supports public tertiary institutions, a strong case is being made by private providers to benefit in some form from the Fund. There are two key thrusts to the argument. First is that the Fund is a contribution from the private sector and hence equity demands that private higher education should also benefit. Second is that both public and private higher education institutions provide graduates for the same Nigerian economy hence any attempt to bolster the economy through improving high-level human resource development will be incomplete with support only for public higher education institutions. While the call by stakeholders in the private higher education sub-sector has been strident in recent years, steps to heed the call have been rather tardy.

**Petroleum Technology Development Fund (PTDF)**

The Petroleum Technology Development Fund (PTDF) is a parastatal of the Ministry of Petroleum Resources established by Decree 25 of 1973 for the purposes of development, promotion and implementation of petroleum technology and manpower needs through research and training of Nigerians. According to its enabling Act, the Fund is set up for the purposes of training Nigerians to qualify as graduates, professionals, technicians and
craftsmen, in the fields of engineering, geology, science and management in the petroleum industry in Nigeria or abroad. The Fund is utilised:

(a) to provide scholarships and bursaries, wholly or partially in universities, colleges, institutions and in petroleum undertakings in Nigeria or abroad;
(b) to maintain, supplement, or subsidise such training or education;
(c) to make suitable endowments to faculties in Nigerian universities, colleges, or institutions approved by the Minister;
(d) to make available suitable books and training equipment in the institutions;
(e) for sponsoring regular or as necessary visits to oilfields, refineries, petro-chemical plants, and for arranging any necessary attachments of personnel to establishments connected with the development of the petroleum industry; and
(f) for financing of and participation in seminars and conferences which are connected with the petroleum industry in Nigeria or abroad.

The following programmes are supported through local and overseas scholarships by the Fund at the postgraduate level:

- Asset Management (Engineering Asset Management)
- Basin Evolution and Dynamics
- Diving And Underwater Technology
- Energy Systems Engineering
- Environmental Engineering
- Environmental Remote Sensing
- Fire & Explosion Engineering
- Health Safety and Environment
- Marine Computational Fluid Dynamics
- Maritime Operations
- Occupational Health and Safety
- Offshore and Ocean Technology
- Offshore Engineering
- Pipeline Engineering
- Purchasing and Supply Chain Management
- Refinery Design and Operations
- Subsea Engineering
- Thermal Power (Gas Turbine Option)
- Welding Engineering
- Design Of Rotating Machines
- Control Systems
The Issue of Tuition

As it is the case in most countries, the magnitude of tuition in universities in Nigeria has remained a vexed issue erupting in agitations by students and inflicting disruption to school calendar when there is a consideration for increase. At least four forces interplay in the matter of tuition in Nigerian universities—two philosophical, one policy-related and one financial. Philosophically, education is largely taken to be a public good with most Nigerians believing that education kits the individual with knowledge and skills to serve the Nigerian public. Society should therefore support to the fullest, the education of its people so that it can derive maximum benefit from the investment. This philosophical standpoint argues in favour of a fee-free regime. The second philosophical underpinning endorses a minimal or low-tuition policy. The argument is that where poverty prevails, it is unethical to economically strangle to death through high tuition, parents of brilliant students wishing to enrol in higher institutions. The policy factor derives from the philosophical. There is a low-fee policy by the federal government drawing from the understanding that over 70% of Nigerians live below the poverty line hence the need not to subject students in universities to a fee regime that will burden their parents. The lack of a thriving social security system adds fillip to this position. As attestation, for eight years while in office, former President Olusegun Obasanjo insisted on all federal universities not increasing the token tuition which was charged. Instead, he made significant efforts to cushion the impact of the low-fee regime through increased grant to cover personnel costs.

The fourth factor is financial. This applies largely to state-owned and private universities where proprietor funding is weak and university managers have to depend largely on tuition fees to run the university. State universities, though public, suffer financial distress since the state government tries to play the political card of insisting on low fees while failing to play the bridging card of paying for the shortfall. On their part, private universities charge tuition which they consider commensurate with the quality of education.
they deliver. Patronage in these universities is low as many parents are unable to afford steep tuition charged in some of the universities. The resultant is a rush by candidates for federal universities and low patronage of the private. Of federal, state and private universities, in terms of overall performance, state universities present the poorest report card in terms of quality of programmes.

Student Loans, Bursaries and Scholarships

The student loan scheme in Nigeria thrived for a few years in the early 1970s. Inability of beneficiaries to pay back and the difficulty of tracking them ran the system aground. Many loaners believed that the loan should be taken as part of their share of the national cake and should not be compelled to refund. In addition a good number of graduates were unable to secure paid employment from which to derive repayment. The Education Bank that was later put in place to resuscitate the loan scheme did not take long to sink on account of similar reasons.

In contrast, bursary and scholarship schemes have fared relatively better. These are implemented at the federal and state levels. Most states offer bursaries to their undergraduate indigenes for local and overseas studies which cover mostly tuition and part of living expenses. In many cases, bursaries fail to cover all eligible indigenes and may be late in coming. States with relatively fewer students in universities especially in the northern geopolitical zones and the south-south have good track record of implementing bursary and scholarship schemes. The federal scheme is also well implemented through the Scholarship Board of the Federal Ministry of Education. PTDF and TETFund offer “juicy” scholarships in specialised areas. The Presidential Special Scholarship Scheme for Innovation and Development (PRESSID) is a recent addition to the growing list of scholarships which includes scholarships offered by oil companies and other private enterprises and individuals. In total a rough estimate of 65% of undergraduates in Nigerian universities enjoy or have the potential to benefit from one form of bursary/scholarship or another.

Impact of Current Funding Models

The current funding model in public universities in Nigeria has underperformed in terms of providing the basic elements for quality teaching, research and community service. Three major areas are noteworthy- adequacy of funds, capacity for utilisation of available funds and capacity for internal generation of funds.

Inadequacy of funds: Data gleaned from the universities, the Federal Ministry of Finance and Central Bank of Nigeria showed that at no time in the last 40 years have the universities had funding level beyond 70% of what is needed to run a good university. This period
coincided largely with when tuition was proclaimed free by government about the mid-1970s and government was unable to bridge the funding gap left by the free/low-tuition policy. The financial pain to the universities has observed a steady rise, narrowing only when staff unions, especially the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU), compels government to inject more money into the system. The “gains” soon get swallowed by expansion of the system and the harshness of the financial pains picks up. Fig.3 shows a 10-year funding gap between what the federal university system (N=20) needed (projected from budgetary requests) and what is actually released to the universities as capital and recurrent grants as well as from internally generated revenue. What is clear from Fig 3 is that salaries of approved staff are paid in full by the federal government and overhead and capital grants have increased substantially. The overall funding gap has narrowed from about 50% in 2007 to less than 29% in 2014 for all cost elements. While the Obasanjo Administration significantly hiked personnel cost (salaries and emoluments), the Jonathan Administration has invested hugely in capital costs.

![Fig 3: Percentage of Released Grants Relative to Required for Salaries, Overhead and Capital Grants for 20 Federal Universities, 2002-2012](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45.67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51.67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64.33</td>
<td>72.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Sources: Federal Ministry of Finance, Budget Office, Central Bank of Nigeria, National Universities Commission, Proposed Budgets of 20 Federal Universities

Low Capacity for Utilisation of Available Funds for Capital Development: Since 2002 building up to 2014, with the insistence on due process before funds are accessed and utilised, the Nigerian university system as it is the case for other sub-sectors in education has been weak in funds utilisation especially for capital development. On assumption of office in 2014, the new Executive Secretary of the Tertiary Education Trust Fund from where universities derive most of their capital grant interventions, was alarmed at the magnitude of funds yet to be accessed by universities. Inability of universities to access the grant is mainly due to the slow pace of implementing due process in project conception and implementation. This slows down retirement of initial funds and hence inability to request for new tranches of funds allocated to the university for a particular project. In spite of seminars and workshops for university managers to mitigate the problem, the rate of access is still paltry.

Low Capacity for Internal Generation of Funds: Many universities are yet to maximally explore their potential for internal generation of revenue. The typical area of focus is on fees from sub-degree and postgraduate programmes. Over 80% of the public and private universities depend on these sources to augment proprietor funding. Those that are in commercial ventures hardly make a success of it on account of weak management structures and corruption by the operators. Few creatively explore endowments as well as local and international consultancies involving university staff.

Resultant Effects: The effects of inadequacy of funds and the injudicious utilisation of the meagre funds have been non-salutary. In 2012, the federal government of Nigeria commissioned a nationwide survey of the needs of the university system. In the course of its assignment, the study team found that majority of the universities are: grossly understaffed; many laboratories and workshops are old with inappropriate furnishing; classrooms/lecture rooms are overcrowded and overstretched; equipment and consumables are absent, inadequate or outdated; kerosene stoves used as Bunsen burners in some laboratories; engineering workshops operating under zinc sheds and trees; in many universities, science-based faculties are running ‘dry lab’ for lack of reagents and tools to conduct physical/real experiments. Where major equipment exists, the ratio to student, in some universities, is as high as 1:500. It also found that there are 701 physical development projects dotted across the universities in the country- 163 (23.3%) are abandoned projects; and 538 (76.7%) are on-going projects. There is rapid deterioration of hostel facilities, overcrowding and undue congestion in rooms, overstretched lavatory and laundry facilities as well as poor sanitation (see Figs 4, 5 and 6).
**Fig 4:** Gap Analysis of Required and Procured Furniture, Equipment and Fittings in a Typical Lecture Theatre in the Nigerian University System  
**Source:** 2012 FGN Needs Assessment Report

**Fig. 5:** Chemistry laboratory of one of the federal universities in 2012  
**Source:** 2012 FGN Needs Assessment Report
Towards More Creative Funding Models for the Nigerian University System

Models of sustainable funding of the Nigerian university system have three base elements - government’s minimum funds allotment; availability of revenue to government to meet the allotment; capacity for creative internal generation of revenue by the managers of the universities, and the determination of unit cost for grant disbursement.

Government’s Minimum Funds Allocation

As studies by Babalola (2013), Babalola (2014), Bamiro (2014) and Bello (2014) confirmed, the Nigerian government has been investing less than 2% of GDP on education over the last 10 years. The segment for university education is estimated to be in the region of 1.6%. Since this apportionment has failed to deliver on quality, we need to re-calibrate the scheme to guarantee making the system more nationally relevant and globally competitive.

Prescription No. 1

Government at the federal and state levels to provide and release minimum of 25% of national/state budget for education with minimum of 40% of the education budget for universities. This is in alignment with the provisions of the operational plans of the country’s Vision 20:2020.
Prescription No. 2

Section 10 (150e) of the 2013 National Policy on Education directs that contractors, consultants and other service providers are to contribute minimum of 1.5% of contract sum/fees to a Special Education Corporate Social Responsibility Fund (SECSOF) for providing additional government funding support to education.

Methodology for Developing the Funding Models

As can be gleaned from the foregoing situation analysis, there is a general dissatisfaction with the current model of funding university education in Nigeria. In search of alternatives, this study implemented a 6-step methodology.

Step 1: Survey of areas needing improvement in current model

A survey was conducted on areas of dissatisfaction of university managers, staff and students with current funding model. The first data source were reports of Vice-Chancellors and Council Chairmen to convocation ceremonies over the last 10 years. About 90% of such reports lamented inadequacy in funding from government for capital and recurrent expenses and the need to increase tuition and or grant from the proprietor. Other data sources were (a) reports of Vice-Chancellors to the University System Annual Review Meetings (USARM) from 2003-2006 which provided suggestions on how to better fund the universities; (b) informal interviews of two federal and three state university Vice-Chancellors between June and July 2014; and (c) papers on funding models for the Nigerian university system by Babalola (2013), Babalola (2014), Bamiro (2014) and Bello (2014). Key findings of the survey were that current funding models are not equitable in terms of the funding load that government should carry relative to other stakeholders; poor but bright students are not well served; too much pressure is put on university management on internally-generated revenue making most to be distracted towards commercial ventures at the detriment of their core functions; funding by government is unreliable, paltry and unpredictable; and hurdles placed by intervention agencies such as TETFund for accessing grants are too difficult to scale.

Step 2: Brain-storming session with experts in higher education financing

A brain-storming session was held online through Skype with three local and one international expert on higher education financing to develop models that will address the gaps identified through the survey data. Three draft models were initially generated by the
experts moderated by the author. These went through further refinement by three Vice-Chancellors. Four models emerged as output from this effort.

**Step 3: Emergence of four draft models**

The four draft models which emerged from step 2 were subjected to mathematical review. These are:

- Access-Equity-Cost-Sharing Model
- Contextualised Formula-Funding Model
- Performance-based Funding Model
- Host-Proprietor-University-User-Funding Model

**Step 4: Validation of Draft Models**

The four draft models were subjected to review by selected stakeholders. Feedback was as follows:

---

**Professor Olusola Oyewole, President Association of African Universities and Vice-Chancellor, Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta**

My ranking are as follows:
1st - Performance-Based Funding Model .
2nd - Contextualised Formula-Funding Model.
3rd - Access-Equity Cost Sharing Model for Public Universities.
4th - Host - Proprietor-University-User Funding Model.

(B) I. The Access-Equity Cost Sharing Model for Public Universities will demand that students pay Tuition , and Scholarship Avenues be created. Our scholarship system will be corrupted with politics in this country.

II. The Contextualized Formula-Model is similar to what is currently being run in our university system, except that Annual Envelope which is not based on realities on ground has taken the place of Steps 1 - 3 (Nobody is calculating the UTFN) and steps 2 - 4 are not being transparently done. There is an official impression that Step 6 is being followed but I doubt it.

III. I will go for the Performance-Based Funding Model, because it will help universities to be committed to their visions. It will also remove the current corruption that appears to be the hallmark of what we are doing now. I will be glad to see a Performance-Based Funding system that is based on:

- Research Journal publication
- Number of Post Graduate students
- Students Population
- Number of Professors and Quality of Professors.
- Teaching outputs
- Institutional outreach / Community Engagements.
- Amount of External grants attracted

---
No. of Foreign students in the University.
No. of Foreign staff.

IV. The Contextual - Formula Funding Model will work if Nigerians will not corrupt the scholarship process. I am not sure if we can sustain the no tuition policy for a long time, except if we are not interested in improving the standard of our system,

IV. With our system of politicization, I am not sure if the host or host local governments will like to contribute to the institutions in their domain.

(C) I will welcome a combination of the Performance-Based Funding Model with the Contextualised Formula-Funding Model.

Oyewole

**Professor Oye Ibidapo-Obe, former Chairman, Committee of Vice-Chancellors and former Vice-Chancellor, University of Lagos. Currently, Vice-Chancellor, Federal University, Ndufu Alike**

Thank you for sharing your thoughts on Funding Models for the Nigerian University System.

I wish to respond to your email as follows:

1. Preferences for the Models(1-4) in terms of Priority.
   1st: Host Proprietor University Funding Model.
   2nd: Access Equity Cost Sharing Model for Public Universities.
   3rd: Contextualized Formula Funding Model.
   4th: Performance Based Funding.

2. Suggested Modification to Preferred Model(Host Proprietor University User Funding:
   This model is excellent for the recurrent expenditure but university can only grow if sufficient funding is provided for capital. The 2012 Needs Assessment Survey testifies to the neglect of capital development. There must be more contributions to capital development to include direct contribution by the stakeholders such that the proprietors will contribute 30%, Host 30%, University 30% and User(Students) 10%.
   A modified PNAS as an input to the model will give a more robust scheme.
   I suggest that buffering period should be reduced to 5 years as this depends on the stability of the Naira as the national currency itself and the corresponding labour and wages situation in the country.

3. Combination of Models.
   Your Models 1 and 4 can be combined whilst Model 2 and 3 can also be combined.

   GFMIS is new in the Federal Universities whereby the Personnel cost is paid directly to staff of the Universities.

I thank you.

O Ibidapo-Obe
Please find attached the draft with my comments inserted (see below as underlined text). I have refrained from creating a new model but decided to pitch my tent with Model 3. For all models I admire the recurrence of this phrase: "the Universities are also to apply transparency, due process and budget disciplinary tools in the implementation of the budget and subject to external audit maximum three months after the end of the financial year".

Thank you for the opportunity to go through this important intellectual piece.

With very warm and sincere regards,

IFA

Access-Equity Cost-Sharing Model for Public Universities

Obtain maximum number of new students from NUC - How do ensure that we do not violate cc? Estimate Proprietor Share (PS) of TFN as 75% and 65% to be borne by the federal and state government owners respectively as direct grants, scholarship or bursaries (this should be a legal condition for licensing universities) State Governments are not committed

Contextualised Formula-Funding Model

- GS= Generation Status (1=first generation; 2=second generation; 3=third generation; 4=fourth generation) - This model puts the first generation universities at a disadvantage
- K= constant of annual grant of N500 million to all public universities

NUC to make quarterly release of UTFN in advance to enable universities to plan. - Places an additional burden on NUC as Universities get direct allocation/release from FMF

Performance-based Funding Model - My preferred model. Capable of promoting competition and enhancing growth and development of Nigerian University System

- CC= Carrying capacity - Can we enforce this?
- GER= Graduate Employability Rate -Percent of first degree holders employed and/or continuing their education one year after graduation - A major challenge is our commitment to creating jobs to allow for realistic assessment

Host-Proprietor-University-User Funding Model

1. Determine unit cost of university education for the next financial year (UC)
2. Obtain maximum number of new students from NUC – Challenge is our ability to enforce carrying capacity. I was at Unilorin on Thursday and 217 MB; BS candidates, almost double permitted quota graduated! Is anyone interested about regulations and standards?
3. All local governments within the catchment of the university to contribute through legislation, a total of 7.5% of TFN (to be shared among the catchment Local Government Councils) Our LGs are dysfunctional now. The nation is the catchment area of UI!
My comment is appended Sir (please see below). The summary is as follows:

**SUMMARY**

**Ranking:** It is difficult to rank the models as they are now, for the observations above. However the performance based model of C combined with estimating model in B will be a way forward. So I rank B+C+A best, with B replacing the estimating in A and C complementing the Sharing in A. Model D may not be applicable to Federal universities.

**Modification:** Already suggested for each as above

Possible Combinations: B+C+A; B+C and A+C

Thanks for seeking my input.

Mike Faborode, FAE, FNSE, FNIAE
Secretary General CVC Nigeria

I consider the funding model options as A, B, C & D as presented. Observations, general and on each model follow.

**General:**
1. For greater clarity, I suggest the harmonization of parameters for better comparison of models. Each model would also need two component formulae, one for estimating the total funding cost per university (UTFN) and the other sharing or allocating to various stakeholders. I have tried to suggest these.
2. I presume that UTFN incorporates staff personnel costs.
3. From the observations that follow, it appears Options C & D did not incorporate Cost sharing or were only focused on refining the proprietor’s component (PS)?

**Option A:**
Estimating: UTFN = UC x CC
Sharing: UTFN = PS (75 or 65%) + US (20% of IGR) + ST (Student Tuition) + Other Capital funds as in point 8

Cost sharing is very clear here

**Option B:**
Estimating: UTFN = PNAS + (CCxFSTxRAxGS)AUC + K; in its original form the term in parenthesis was not a cost item but simply factors, so I multiplied it by AUC

Does this model assume that all of UTFN will be provided by the proprietors (Government), with University and students contributing nothing by way of tuition? That is, are both US and ST = 0

Or is the model only explaining how the PS component will be determined, while the sharing model in Option A is still adopted?

**Option C:**
Estimating: BGU = .......

Compared to Option A, BGU seems = PS, so that just like Option B it appears to assume that both US and ST = 0
Option D:
Estimating: UTFN = UC x CC
Sharing: UTFN = PS (70 or 60%) + LGF (7.5%) + US (20% of IGR) + ST (Student Tuition) + Other
Capital funds as in point 9

The LG Fund addition is understandable for States, but can it be applicable to Federal Universities, with different understanding of catchment? Only the LGF component differentiates this model from A

Oluwasogo Ajayi, former University Bursar, Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta and currently University Bursar, Crawford University, Igbesa

Ranking of models 1 - 4 in most to least preferred order

1. Most Preferred: - Contextualized Formula - Funding Model
   
   Suggested Modification:
   (i) Devise means of avoiding submission of bloated funding needs through guided consultative processes.
   (ii) Formula to be made simpler.
   (iii) Encourage growing IGR in deficient Campuses.
   (iv) Requires commitment of all stakeholders especially Federal Government, National Assembly, Governors and their Parties Manifestoes with differing priorities.

2. More Preferred: - Performance - Based Funding Model.
   (i) Factor undergraduate intake into disciplines of economic and national development priorities
   (ii) Requires commitment of all stakeholders including Federal Government, National Assembly, Governors and their Parties (as in 1(iv) above).

   (i) 20% non-tuition IGR may be too high for some public Universities.
   (ii) Tuition paying by students may be alien and rebuffed, at least initially. However, if this is not in excess of what the students are already paying for Hostel maintenance, deposit for breakages, medical fees etc, it may not generate too much furore. provided these will no more be charged.
   (iii) Reasonable student population needed to lower unit cost and therefore financial barriers in individual Universities.
   (iv) Lobbying Government Officials at Federal Ministry of Finance - Budget Office and National Assembly critical. So also at Federal Ministry of Education.
   (v) State of physical structures on Campuses need to be factored in TFN

4. Least Preferred: - Host -Proprietor - University - Model
   (i) Local Governments may not be able to contribute as they are likely to find loopholes in any legislation. Many of the Local Governments ' live ' from hand to mouth.
   (ii) It will be difficult to achieve consensus for the desired legislation at Federal and State levels.
   (iii) Education support may not rank high in the Federal, and State Governments priorities across the country.
Step 5: Revision of the Models

Based on the feedback from the validation sample, the models were revised especially the computation formulae and the description of the parameters.

Step 6: General Test and Level of Acceptability of the Models

The four adjusted models were subjected to wider stakeholder test at the National Summit on Education organised by all staff unions in the Nigerian university system between October 27 and 30, 2014 including principal officers of universities and civil society representatives. Staff unions opposed the issue of tuition in the model. About 86% of operators of the federal university system expressed preference for the Access-Equity-Cost-Sharing Model followed by the Performance-based Funding Model. Within this sub-sample, over 70% of the Vice-Chancellors opted for the Performance-based Funding Model as first choice, with more performance variables in the equation as suggested by the Vice-Chancellor of the Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta. Most of the state-university managers (81%) ranked Host-Proprietor-University-User-Funding Model first and Performance-based Funding Model second.

The uniqueness of the Nigerian public university system is evident in the study where the federal universities opted largely for the contextualised performance-based funding while the state universities felt more comfortable with the Host-Proprietor-University-User-Funding Model. The expectation is that all the local governments within the state will make contributions towards funding the university. A good number of state-owned universities are already implementing this model successfully. Osun State University provides a good example. When aggregated, the stakeholders were in favour of a combination of Performance-based Funding Model with Access-Equity-Cost-Sharing Model and Host-Proprietor-University-User-Funding Model.

Calculating Unit Cost of University Education for the Models

Unit cost is determined if we divide the total cost of delivering quality education by the number of students enrolled. This method has the virtue of simplicity and works reasonably well when the education of full-time resident undergraduate students is being considered. However, with the increasing differentiation of institutions by functions this rough and ready method of computing unit cost becomes faulty, except for comparisons of institutions having similar missions and student bodies. Also, the counting of number of students also has its complications. Some students attend part-time and others full-time. To estimate the effective number of students the concept of "full-time equivalent student" was devised. With this concept, the number of students is computed by counting full-time students as
one each and counting part-time students as a fraction of one according to the number of credit hours for which they are enrolled. But students differ also as to academic level. Some undergraduates are 100-level students, some in 200 and some in 600. Some are advanced graduate and professional students. Costs tend to be higher as students advance up the academic ladder.

The educational cost per student therefore tends to be greater in institutions with high proportions of advanced students than in institutions with high proportion of beginners. To standardise the units in which teaching loads are measured, heavier weights are assigned to advanced students than to beginners. The resulting adjusted enrolment is expressed in what is called "student units" -each unit being the equivalent of one full-time 100/200-level student. The unit cost of any institution can then be calculated by dividing the educational expenditures by the number of student units. Theoretically at least, the educational costs of institutions of all types may thus be reduced to the same units and compared.

In a study of institutional costs, it would have been desirable to include the costs of organised research and public service, because research and public service are integral and important functions of universities. To include them, however, would have required units in which the products of research and public service could be measured. Unfortunately, these two activities do not lend themselves to measurement in discrete units. It is generally difficult, except through the broad general judgment of experts, to measure the output of an institution's organised research or public service programme. Cost studies, therefore, are usually confined to the educational function for which a tenable measuring unit is available. This unit is a full-time-equivalent student with appropriate adjustment for academic level (Okebukola, 2001; 2002).

Several factors determine the unit cost per student in Nigerian universities chief of which are student enrolment (FTE), type of university (conventional/specialised) programme spread, location, age, institutional management and efficiency and the funding parameters in use at any one time.

*Enrolment:* The nature and type of university determine the unit cost per student. Most specialised universities have higher unit cost because of their resource needs and requirements and relatively fewer student enrolment. In the Nigerian context, Universities of Technology and Agriculture are expected to have higher unit costs than conventional universities.

*Discipline/programme spread:* A university that offers many disciplines is likely to have lower unit cost per student, because of the increased likelihood of resource sharing between faculties. It will, for example, be cheaper to teach Biochemistry to medical students in a university that also runs a B.Sc. Biochemistry Programme than in an institution that does not have the programme.
**Location:** Location of an institution to a great extent determines the cost of goods and services and ultimately unit costs.

**Age:** Older universities are more likely to have higher maintenance costs. They are, however, also more likely to have more students and wider programme spread - factors that could lower unit costs.

The unit cost of university education per year for Nigerian universities is computed using the formula:

\[
U.C = \frac{TRC + TCC + SLE}{TSE}
\]

Where,

- **U.C** = Unit Cost
- **TRC** = Total Recurrent Costs
- **TCC** = Total Capital Costs
- **SLE** = Student Living Expenses
- **TSE** = Total Student Enrolment

The components that constitute each of the costs are:

- **TRC** - Total Academic Costs + Total Administrative Costs
- **TCC** - Main Capital + Rehabilitation & Refurbishment + Teaching and Research Equipment
- **SLE** - Academic Support Expenses (Books, Stationery, etc); Living Expenses (accommodation, food, transport etc)
- **TSE** - Total Undergraduate Full Time Equivalent

With all programmes at full accreditation status, we have a set of unit cost values that are known as **expected** costs. **Observed** costs on the other hand are those reflecting the situation on ground regardless of accreditation status. Table 2 provides values for expected and observed values for various disciplines. The differential between these values gives a hint of the magnitude of funds that is needed in the system to run it at optimal, full accreditation mode.
Table 2: Observed and Expected Unit Cost per Student per Discipline (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Observed Unit Cost (N)</th>
<th>Expected Unit Cost (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>525,000</td>
<td>719,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>555,000</td>
<td>760,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>690,000</td>
<td>945,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>555,000</td>
<td>760,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>645,000</td>
<td>883,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>735,000</td>
<td>1,006,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>594,000</td>
<td>813,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>549,000</td>
<td>752,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>615,000</td>
<td>842,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>906,000</td>
<td>1,241,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>735,000</td>
<td>1,006,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>735,000</td>
<td>1,006,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Tech</td>
<td>510,000</td>
<td>698,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Models

Access-Equity-Cost-Sharing Model

This demands the lowering of financial barriers to higher education while ensuring equity in sharing of the funding burden by different stakeholders based on ability to pay. The steps in using this model are as follows:

1. Determine unit cost of university education for the next financial year (UC)
2. Obtain maximum number of new students from NUC
3. Add current to new student numbers (including non-degree) to determine carrying capacity (CC) for the proposed budget year
4. Calculate total funding need (TFN) as product of UC and CC
5. Estimate Proprietor Share (PS) of TFN as 75% and 65% to be borne by the federal and state government owners respectively as direct grants, scholarships or bursaries (this should be a legal condition for licensing universities)
6. Allocate 20% of non-tuition Internally-Generated Revenue (IGR) as university’s share (US) of TFN
7. Allocate balance [TFN-(PS+US)] as tuition for student component of cost sharing. Retain tuition for 10 years buffering with US.
8. Support capital development with IGR, grants from TETFund, endowments, alumni support, donation of buildings from individuals and corporate organisations.
9. For federal universities, personnel cost component of TFN to be paid directly to staff through GFMIS
10. Apply transparency, due process and budget disciplinary tools in the implementation of the budget and subject to external audit maximum three months after the end of the financial year.

Contextualised Formula-Funding Model

Fund universities based on a formula which factors in individual peculiarities and current state of physical development and a desire to encourage programmes in science and technology with potential to accelerate impact on Nigeria’s socio-economic development.

1. Calculate Total Funding Need of each university (UTFN) through a series of consultative processes with each public university using the formula:

\[
UTFN=PNAS+(CC \times .02AUC \times FST \times RA \times GS).02AUC + K
\]

Where

- **PNAS=** 10-Year Annualised cost of remediation from data from the 2012 Needs Assessment Survey on state of physical facilities and infrastructure; enrolment; vision and mission; and anticipated programme delivery for the next financial year.
- **CC=** carrying capacity of the university as provided by NUC
- **FST=** Degree of focus of programmes on science and technology-based disciplines. This is scored on a scale of 10 (only science and technology to 0= no science and technology programmes)
- **RA=** Research activity. This is scored on a scale of 10 (national and global research intensive to 0= no nationally and globally-recognised research activity)
- **GS=** Generation Status (1=first generation; 2=second generation; 3=third generation; 4-fourth generation)
- **K=** constant of annual grant of N500 million to all public universities
2. Sum up total funding need of universities (∑UTFN) under a public proprietor- federal and state (for each state)
3. Channel request for ∑UTFN to proprietor through NUC tying institutional accreditation to compliance with total release of ∑UTFN for three consecutive years.
4. NUC to make quarterly release of UTFN in advance to enable universities to plan.
5. Universities to support capital development with IGR, grants from TETFund, endowments, alumni support, donation of buildings from individuals and corporate organisations.
6. For federal universities, personnel cost component of TFN to be paid directly to staff through GFMIS
7. Apply transparency, due process and budget disciplinary tools in the implementation of the budget and subject to external audit maximum three months after the end of the financial year.

Performance-based Funding Model

This rewards universities for efficiency in teaching, research and community service and encourages competition among universities which will stimulate the evolution of centres of excellence. It makes funding allocation more transparent and more competitive through redistributive funding formulae mainly based on performance. (The funding formula is kept simple, with unambiguous metrics, so expectations are clear to everyone.). The Block Grant to a University (BGU) in Naira is given as

\[ BGU = CC \times 0.60AUC \times APR \times DSE \times 4GR \times GER \times RSO \times EGO \]

where

- **CC** = Carrying capacity
- **AUC** = Average Unit Cost for all programmes in the university for the financial year under consideration
- **APR** = Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0)
- **DSE** = Percentage of Bachelor’s Degrees awarded in areas of strategic emphasis for Nigeria’s Vision 20: 2020
- **4GR** = 4-Year Graduation Rate
- **GER** = Graduate Employability Rate - Percent of first degree holders employed and/or continuing their education one year after graduation
- **RSO** = Research Output
- **EGO** = Efficiency of Governance measured as a ratio of input/output multiplied by degree of stability of academic calendar
49. In addition to the BCU, universities are to support capital development with IGR, grants from TETFund, endowments, alumni support, donation of buildings from individuals and corporate organisations. Universities are also to apply transparency, due process and budget disciplinary tools in the implementation of the budget and subject to external audit maximum three months after the end of the financial year.

Host-Proprietor-University-User Funding Model

This model implicates all beneficiaries of the location and service of the university in contributing to funding the university. The steps in the model are:

4. Determine unit cost of university education for the next financial year (UC)
5. Obtain maximum number of new students from NUC
6. Add current to new student numbers (including non-degree) to determine carrying capacity (CC) for the proposed budget year
7. Calculate total funding need (TFN) as product of UC and CC
8. All local governments within the catchment of the university to contribute through legislation, a total of 7.5% of TFN (to be shared among the catchment Local Government Councils)
9. Proprietor (federal and state government) to contribute 70% and 60% of TFN respectively as direct grants, scholarships or bursaries (this should be a legal condition for licensing universities)
10. Allocate 10% of non-tuition Internally-Generated Revenue (IGR) as university’s share (US) of TFN
11. Allocate balance [TFN-(PS+US)] as tuition for student component of cost sharing. Retain tuition for 10 years buffering with US.
12. Support capital development with IGR, grants from TETFund, endowments, alumni support, donation of buildings from individuals and corporate organisations.
13. For federal universities, personnel cost component of TFN to be paid directly to staff through GFMIS
14. Apply transparency, due process and budget disciplinary tools in the implementation of the budget and subject to external audit maximum three months after the end of the financial year.

Conclusion

Four questions were answered in this paper: (a) What are the historical antecedents to the current model of funding the Nigerian university system? (b) What are the different funding scenarios that predominates in the system? (c) What is the impact of the current funding system on the quality of university education? (d) What are creative models of sustainably
funding the system? The answers to the first three questions showed that Nigerian universities had a glorious funding past and a more recent constricted funding model which has placed limits on the huge potential to be more impactful on national development. The system is starved of directly-infused funds and even when funds are available, utilisation of the funds by many university managers is compromised.

The emerging paradox is in having huge amounts locked up in intervention funds and the target beneficiaries— the universities, unable to access and judiciously utilise the funds. Surely, there is no shortcut to transparency and accountability in the use of public funds. The funds will keep locked up if all are not in agreement with the methodologies for disbursement and expenditure and strict compliance with such methodologies cannot be adhered to by the granting and the expending parties.

The models proposed in this study have been tested and found largely acceptable by the sample of key stakeholders in the Nigerian university system. Further consultations are on-going with a view to securing near-global acceptance since a scenario where all will accept the final model is not envisaged. Hopes are high that the final model will assure the system of a better funding regime leading to improved performance. An extract from the Communiqué of the Stakeholder National Summit on Higher Education (given below) is a useful way of concluding this paper with regard to the final model:

1. An increase in the funding levels to universities to enable them improve on the provision of facilities and services.
2. Universities must increase their internally generated funding levels.
3. All stakeholders should be challenged to share in the cost of education by paying some fees in order to attain and sustain a reasonable level of funding of higher education in Nigeria;
4. Government should implement and sustain the provision of scholarships, bursaries and loans to ensure that all Nigerians with capacities to seek education at the tertiary level can actualise them.
5. Funding for postgraduate training and research should be enhanced;
6. Accountability and transparency are *sine qua non* to the management of funds in the institutions and resolved that established mechanisms for checks and balances (including internal and external audits) be strictly utilized. It was further recommended that governing councils should ensure adherence to this.
7. Development partners have great potentials to bring in significant resources to the institutions and agreed that this potential be comprehensively explored with due cognizance to national interest.
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Performance Contracts in Public Universities in Senegal

Bhen Sikina Toguebaye

Introduction

For some years now, the development of economies has been increasingly dependent on the production, dissemination and use of knowledge. In this knowledge economy, higher education plays a major role because it is at the heart of training, research and innovation. However, to effectively implement its missions, higher education in Africa must enjoy the conditions which will enable it to meet the requirements of the knowledge economy. One of the major difficulties currently confronting the higher education sector in many African countries is the inadequacy of public funding as a result of economic difficulties. In this regard, some African countries have introduced new mechanisms for the financing of their higher education system based on parameters of autonomy and good governance of the higher educational institutions.

The Association of African Universities has, as part of its missions, initiated studies to take stock of these mechanisms in order to ensure that they can be shared with all the higher education systems in Africa. One of these studies which focuses on Senegal is reported in this chapter. The specific objectives of the study are to:

- narrate the genesis, stages of implementation, objectives, outcomes and impact of the financing mechanism;
- describe the innovative nature and steps developed to implement this mechanism,
provide responses to the following questions:

- What are the issues relating to these new approaches, the various stakeholders and their involvement?
- Which options still look like priority areas today?
- How can we encourage the development of innovations in financing higher education?
- What are the hindrances and prerequisites?

**Methodology**

The methodological approach had the following stages.

*Collection and Analysis of Data:* This stage consisted of collecting documentation, conducting interviews with the main stakeholders in the area of performance contracts in Senegal as well as analysing and synthesising the collected data.

*Preparation of the Report:* The report was prepared in accordance with the terms of reference. It was used to consolidate the analysis of the various types of information collected. It was then submitted to the Association of African Universities.

**Funding of Public Higher Education in Senegal**

Higher education in Senegal is basically funded by the State. Table 1 indicates the extent of the effort of the State in support of higher education.

*Table 1: Indicators of the Financial Efforts of the State (FCFA)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Public Expenditures</td>
<td>89,431,400,000</td>
<td>90,439,361,190</td>
<td>101,319,579,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In % of GDP</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In % of Current Expenditures of the State</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In % of Current Expenditures for Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Higher Education and Research

In 2012, for example, the State allocated FCFA 101,319,579,629 (USD 202,639,159) to higher education, i.e. 1.62% of GDP. This allocation accounted for 7.5% of the total expenditures of the State and 23.8% of public resources meant for the education sector. As indicated in Table 2, the State also remains the main source of funding of public universities.

Table 2: Status of Resources of Public Universities (in FCFA and %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Subvention</td>
<td>33,424,800,000 (82.74%)</td>
<td>37,341,809,417 (83%)</td>
<td>31,992,645,000 (81.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally-Generated Resources</td>
<td>6,973,084,909 (17.26%)</td>
<td>7,610,174,153 (17%)</td>
<td>7,418,004,740 (18.82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40,397,884,909 (100%)</td>
<td>44,951,983,570 (100%)</td>
<td>39,410,649,740 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Higher Education and Research

In 2012, for example, the total receipts of public universities stood at FCFA 39,410,649,740 (USD 78,821,299) distributed as follows:

- State subventions: FCFA 31,992,645,000 (USD 63,985,290) = 81.17%
- Internally-Generated Resources: FCFA 7,418,004,740 (USD 14,836,009) = 18.82%

These figures show the efforts made by Senegal to fund higher education. In spite of all these efforts, the performance indicators of the system as well as the stability of the social environment of the sector have not met the expectations of government. The main shortcomings observed are:

- low internal efficiency, particularly at the undergraduate level of the universities;
- fall in the quality and relevance of the training programmes and research;
- obsolescence of certain governance tools and management of the sub-sector and institutions, and
- lack of transparency in the management of resources.
In the face of this situation, government decided to revitalise higher education by setting three priorities. These are increase access; enhancement of quality and relevance of education; and enhancement of the effectiveness of the governance and management of these public higher education institutions. As a funding mechanism, the performance contract was borne out of the desire of government to reform higher education.

**Genesis of Performance Contract in Senegal**

Performance contract is a funding model which is being experimented in Senegal. It is a contract between the government and the public universities. In this contract, government undertakes to disburse a predetermined amount. In return, the institution undertakes to improve its performance in certain activity areas. By using this funding model, government hopes to encourage the universities to carry out necessary changes to make the higher education system in Senegal more effective and competitive. This is because it believes that, in spite of all the efforts made to fund them, the performance of the public universities does not meet its expectations. Several stages characterise the introduction of the performance contract.

**Stage 1. Diagnosis of the System and Strategic Action Proposals**

In order to implement the thrusts set by the authorities, and as part of a participatory approach, a steering committee and a national commission made up of six technical groups handling the various strategic thrusts set by the authorities were established. Each group was made up of representatives from public and private universities. The strategic thrusts selected by government are:

- Access to higher education
- Switch-over in the Bachelor’s-Master’s-Doctorate system (LMD)
- Short professional training programmes
- Information and communication technology and distance learning
- Management, governance and financing
- Quality assurance

The participation of grassroots stakeholders was organised as part of knowledge-sharing seminars in the public and private universities. Diagnosis have been made and strategic actions have been proposed for each of the thematic areas.
Stage 2. Formulation of a Strategy Document for Higher Education

The work of the national commission was used by the Ministry of Higher Education and Research to prepare a strategy document for the development of higher education in Senegal. Seven thrusts are contained in this document:

- Access to higher education
- Adoption of the Bachelor’s-Master’s-Doctorate system (LMD)
- Research management
- Incorporation of ICT and distance learning
- Governance
- Quality assurance
- Financing of higher education

Stage 3. Formulation of the “Governance and Results-Based Financing of Higher Education” Project

Based on this strategy document on higher education in Senegal, government formulated a project entitled “Governance and Results-Based Financing of Higher Education in Senegal”. The State of Senegal and the World Bank allocated USD 101.3 million into the financing of this project. The objective of the development of the project is to enhance the effectiveness and quality of the higher education system as well as the governance of higher education institutions and accountability. The project consists of two components:

Component 1: Strengthening of the Governance of the Higher Education System: This component is structured into four sub-components:

- Strengthening of governance in the higher education sector through the establishment of the Higher Education Division, the National Quality Control Authority and Boards of Trustees of the Universities.
- Support for the implementation and management of the project.
- Development of a project monitoring and evaluation system.
- Conduct of other specific studies to generate knowledge on the higher education system.

Component 2: Improvement of the Efficiency of Higher Education Institutions: This component is made up of the following sub-components:

- Financing based on performance contracts signed between the government and the universities.
• Diversification of the higher education system and increase in access to short higher professional training through the establishment of a new advanced higher education institute and the introduction of an Internet network to support distance learning.
• Rehabilitation and expansion of higher education institutions in Senegal.

Government has provided the “Contract Performance-Based Financing” sub-component with an amount of FCFA 21.5 billion (USD 43 million) and informed the public universities that this resource will only be allocated to them on a contractual basis. This implies negotiations between the government and the universities which must be established through a document in which the government indicates its main concerns, and a strategic plan formulated by the institution in which it defines its objectives relating to training and research.

Stage 4. Formulation and Validation of the Strategic Plans of Public Universities

In order to prepare for negotiations with government, each of the public universities first drew up its own strategic plan for the period 2012-2016. The methodology used by the public universities in the process of formulating their strategic plan was based on a participatory approach which ensured the involvement of all the components of each university and society in the brainstorming process. The plans have been adopted by the University Councils (Boards of Trustees).

Stage 5. Formulation and Validation of the Performance Contract Document

In order to enable Senegalese universities formulate their contract document with full knowledge of the facts, government selected a set of performance objectives and indicators which the universities must factor into their proposals. These are as follows:

• improvement of the internal efficiency of the institutions measured by the rate of promotion of 1st year students (L1), the overall pass rate of undergraduate students (L1, L2, and L3), the repeater rate (L1) and the undergraduate student dropout rate (L1, L2, and L3);
• improvement in the use of ICT measured by the percentage of personal computers per student, the proportion of lectures given for an explicit use of ICT and the number of lectures given online;
• improvement in the quality of teaching measured by the percentage of courses offered in accordance with the requirements of the LMD system, the percentage of teachers who have undergone training in the LMD system, the number of courses subject to ANAQ accreditation and the implementation of a functional quality
control mechanism in the universities;

- improvement in the diversity of courses measured by the percentage of two-year programmes at the undergraduate level compared to the total number of undergraduate courses and the number of science courses available to arts students;
- strengthening of links with the labour market measured by the percentage of professional training courses and the percentage of courses offered by professionals;
- improvement of governance within the institution measured by the percentage of administrative staff with training in performance contract management and the LMD system, percentage of resources generated in the institution’s master budget, implementation of a system to finalise registration a week before the commencement of lectures and the implementation of a monitoring system to reduce the number of students who have not regularised their situation (defaulting students).

Based on their strategic plan and the concerns of government, the universities formulated their performance contract document in which they defined the objectives to be attained in 2016, the strategies and actions to be implemented to attain these objectives, the financial resources necessary for the realisation of the set actions and the performance indicators which will ensure the assessment of the execution of the contract.

The methodology used by the public universities in their contract document formulation process was based on a participatory approach which ensured that all components of each university were involved in the brainstorming process. This approach is important because the implementation of the contract requires the participation of all the components of the university. The contract documents were adopted by the University Councils (Boards of Trustees).

All Senegalese universities made the government’s concerns indicated above their objectives. For example, we have indicated below how the Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar (UCAD) took on board the government’s concern relating to the improvement of internal efficiency. UCAD made the improvement of internal efficiency its No.1 objective. The strategies and actions set forth to improve its internal efficiency, i.e. an increase in the pass rate of its undergraduate students as well as the performance indicators linked to this objective are indicated in Tables 3 and 4.
### Table 3. Strategies and Actions of the Objective Relating to the Improvement of Internal Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Projected Budget (in millions of FCFA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in the supervision of students</td>
<td>Support to the Education and Reform Directorate for the implementation of the LMD system</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction of a tutorial segment for students</td>
<td>606.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in teaching and learning conditions</td>
<td>Provision of digital closed-circuit television facility for the lecture theatres</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide students with various multimedia learning aids and access terminals</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of university education</td>
<td>Training of students in university education</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement of the monitoring of students undergoing training and evaluation</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation of the influx of students when the universities reopen</td>
<td>Introduction of mechanisms for the selection of students when the universities reopen on the basis of criteria of excellence and the number of vacancies available</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimisation of access to library resources</td>
<td>Improve library services at the UCAD through the generalisation of direct access to resources and the implementation of activities for the training of students in desk-based research.</td>
<td>681.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**                                         **2,481.4**
Table 4. Indicators on the Objective relating to the Improvement of Internal Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Initial Value 2011</th>
<th>Value 2013</th>
<th>Value 2014</th>
<th>Value 2015</th>
<th>Value 2016 (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion rate for 1st year students (L1)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall pass rate for undergraduate students (L1, L2, and L3)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeater rate (L1)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout rate for undergraduate students (L1, L2, and L3)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students registered at the Common Documentation Department</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 6. Evaluation and Negotiation of the Performance Contract

The contract proposals submitted by the universities have been analysed by the Ministry of Higher Education which ensured the following:

- proposal contains an exact and complete description of each item of the contract;
- objectives and targets fixed by the institution are measurable and realistic, and will bring about real progress with regard to performance;
- strategies proposed to attain these objectives are effective and adequate and appropriate indicators have been identified; and
- proposals take the thrusts and priorities of government into account.

The institutions can react to this analysis, ask for explanations and, where necessary, improve their proposal. With this stage over, Ministry appointed a negotiator to finalise the contract with the institution. The objective was to agree on the target indicators, the amounts to be paid to the institution and the rate of disbursement. At the end of the
negotiation, the draft contract is submitted for approval by the Minister of Higher Education and the Minister of Finance. After they have approved it, the performance contract, which will run for five years, is signed by the Minister of Higher Education and the Vice-Chancellor of the University. This contract defines the actions to which the universities commit themselves and the financial resources the government must provide.

**Financing of Performance Contracts**

The financing of performance contracts is ensured by the State and the World Bank (IDA). The amount of the allocation is FCFA 21.5 billion (USD 43 million) for the period 2012-2016. The operating budget of the State, as indicated in Table 5, will, as time goes on, replace the resources of the World Bank (IDA) as from the third year (2014) in order to make this mode of financing a sustainable resource allocation mechanism.

| Table 5: Financing of Performance Contracts in Billions of FCFA |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Sources         | 2012            | 2013            | 2014            | 2015            | 2016            | Total           |
| World Bank (IDA)| 4 (8 million USD)| 4 (8 million USD)| 3.5 (7 million USD)| 2.5 (5 million USD)| 52.5 (5 million USD)| 16.5 (33 million USD) |
| State           | 0               | 0               | 0.5 (1 million USD)| 1.5 (3 million USD)| 3 (6 million USD)| 5 (10 million USD) |
| Total           | 4 (8 million USD)| 4 (8 million USD)| 4 (8 million USD)| 4 (8 million USD)| 5.5 (11 million USD)| 21.5 (43 million USD) |

After negotiations with the universities, government allocated a master budget to each university for its performance contract, as indicated in Table 6. This budget was included in the budget Act.
Implementation of Performance Contracts and Monitoring-Evaluation Procedures

Management of Performance Contracts

Each university has set up a performance contract management team which is answerable to the Vice-Chancellor. It includes a coordinator, a specialist in contracting, an accountant and a monitoring-evaluation specialist.

Financial Management Modalities

A manual on the administrative, accounting and financial management procedures was prepared and adopted by all the universities. This manual determines the financial management and internal control modalities as well as the budgeting process. It also clarifies the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders.

Disbursement Modalities

Bank accounts have been opened in commercial banks for each university. Before the beginning of 2012, each university prepared a detailed and budgeted plan of action covering output and expected outcomes. The plans were submitted for approval by the Ministry of Higher Education and the World Bank. The plans of action were approved and monies were put into their accounts. The allocation only covers expenditures for a year. The allocation for the next year will be based on the performance of each university measured through the indicators agreed upon.
Performance Contract Monitoring-Evaluation Procedure

The Ministry of Higher Education and Research is responsible for the monitoring of the contract. To this end, the institutions must submit to it after every six months, a brief report on the activities undertaken as part of the execution of the contract. The Ministry also pays an annual visit to the institution in order to assess progress made. If the execution of the contract is unsatisfactory, the Minister of Higher Education and Research may suspend the payment of the entire expected amount or part thereof. If it turns out that the institution is not taking its commitments seriously, the Minister may invalidate the contract and the institution must refund all or part of the amounts already received.

At the end of the contract, the Ministry of Higher Education and Research will conduct a final evaluation which will hinge on self-appraisal conducted by the institution. The self-appraisal will focus on the following:

- outcomes obtained with regard to each of the objectives and target indicators;
- impact of the contract on the practices of the institution;
- financial statement, and
- difficulties encountered in the execution of the contract.

Based on the self-appraisal, the Ministry of Higher Education will pay a visit to the institution in order to discuss the self-appraisal report and, where necessary, additional information could be provided. At the end of the visit, the Ministry will prepare the final report. In the final report, the Ministry will state its conclusions with regard to the success of the contract and draw the necessary lessons from this operation, and also indicate whether it should be repeated or not. The Ministry of Higher Education and Research is now analysing the levels of performance attained by the universities on the basis of the evaluation reports produced by independent evaluators.

Issues Relating to New Financing Approach

Performance contract in the higher education sector is the application of the results-based management method in the area of budgeting. This public finance management approach aims at attaining the development objectives, empowering credit administrators and ensuring transparency and accountability. This system of financing ensures the enhancement of the efficiency of the institutions, their administrative independence to produce results, accountability and the harmonisation of their objectives with those of government. The system makes it impossible to invest funds without producing results because disbursements are practically tied to results.
Stakeholders and their Involvement

The performance contract is a modality of financing which involves several stakeholders. The key stakeholders are:

- the government which must, on the one hand, adopt the results-based management method in the area of budgeting and the performance contract-based system of financing and, on the other hand, conduct the evaluation of the institutions under contract; and
- higher education institutions which must involve all their components (research teachers, administrative and technical staff as well as students) in the formulation, implementation and self-appraisal stages of the performance contract.

Problems and Prospects

The financial crisis higher education is going through in many African countries is basically due to the inflexibility of the regulations and the inadequate level of autonomy in financing and management of higher education institutions. For example, tuition is fixed by the state in most African countries. However, giving the institutions more latitude in the determination of tuition fees and ensuring at the same time that the institutions respect the fundamental objective, which is enhanced equality of access to higher education, will have the dual advantage of procuring new resources for the institutions as well as empowering the students.

Furthermore, the financial regime of many public establishments in Africa imposes line budgeting and requires the consent of the Minister of Finance before any change can be effected in the budget. These provisions of the financial regime do not encourage the adoption of medium-term development strategies. Today, everything favours an increase in the level of autonomy of the institutions of higher learning. Many countries in the world are working to promote greater autonomy in the area of financing and management of institutions of higher learning in order to enable the institutions to enjoy more freedom in the generation and management of their resources and to formulate proactive income-generating policies. However, for this autonomy to be properly exercised, it should be hinged on credible governance and provided with accountability mechanisms because that is the \textit{sine qua non} condition for genuine autonomy.

Priority Options

The political, social and economic environment has a direct impact on the revenue of
institutions of higher learning. That is why it will be wishful thinking to expect that many African countries would attain the level of resources and dynamism of the big universities under the international model. Nevertheless, there are some options to be explored as a matter of priority in order to ensure sustainable, adequate and predictable financing of higher education.

**Contractualisation of State Subvention:** State subvention currently constitutes most of the resources of public institutions of higher learning in many African countries. Often, this subvention is automatic in nature and merely proportionate to quantitative parameters like the number of students and teachers. This mode of funding has shown its limitations. That is why it is proposed that State subvention should be made part of a contractualisation process which could be rolled out in three phases:

- **Phase 1:** Government formulates a policy document in which it sets forth its objectives in the areas of training, research and governance, and communicates same to the institutions.
- **Phase 2:** The institutions formulate a strategy document which takes the government’s objectives into account, and in which they define their objectives and assess the resources they deem to be necessary.
- **Phase 3:** The negotiation is conducted on the basis of the two documents and leads to the signing of a contract between the State and the establishment which defines the activities to which the latter commits itself and the resources promised by the State.

Contractualisation is a powerful tool which could serve as an incentive for a national higher education strategy, even though it does not provide the higher education establishments with all the resources they really need.

**Creation of legal environments giving more freedom to higher education establishments for the generation and management of internally-generated resources:** These environments will enable the higher education establishments to diversify their resources and to use them in accordance with their objectives.

**Creation of legal environments encouraging the contribution of society to the financing of higher education:** Donations are an excellent tool to ensure harmony between higher education and society. The State should therefore encourage society (companies and sponsors) to make progress on the issue of donations by creating adequate and attractive legal environments.
Conclusion

Globalisation and the knowledge economy have introduced the following into higher education:

- new objectives – attracting research teachers and talented students, mobilise adequate financial resources, occupying a good position in international ratings and supporting the innovative efforts of the country;
- new activities – competition, entrepreneurship and conquest of new territories; and
- new stakeholders – companies and society.

In this environment, higher education establishments in Africa can only prosper if they have the capacity to procure the resources necessary for the attainment of their objectives. How do we get there? Certainly by diversifying resources, but also by enjoying a climate in which their efforts can lead to an increase in each of these resources. This is why the quality approach should occupy an important place in the training, research and service provision strategies by taking three essentials into account: the need to ensure the performance of the institution; the need to enhance the credibility of degrees awarded and research outcomes, and the need to continuously improve the confidence of society and the job market vis-à-vis the institution.

Furthermore, it is not enough for higher education establishments to introduce innovative resource mobilisation mechanisms. These mechanisms must be incorporated into the government’s overall higher education policy. This policy should become a plan of action in which the government would set the objectives to be attained, indicate the financial resources necessary for the attainment of these objectives and specify the indicators which would enable it to analyse the disparities between the set objectives.
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Introduction

It is easy to appreciate the widespread interest which the funding of higher education and research is currently eliciting globally. Massification in higher education has meant an increase in unit or student per capita costs. Attention to basic education has, in some cases, seen reductions in the quantum of resources previously available to higher education. Cuts in public spending have made the search for alternative funding sources inevitable, thus increasing attention to a range of previously neglected mechanisms of funding: public-private partnerships in the development of infrastructure, user-fees, commercialisation of research, cost-recovery, and so on. Although public funding is declining in real terms, the reins are being tightened on expenditure, and the accountability structures appear to be more numerous than in previous periods. Increasing levels of competition for talent (students, academics) and concerns about ranking have in some environments introduced new funding priorities.

From an African standpoint in particular, South Africa’s funding strategies for higher education are especially of interest, given the achievements in the sector post-1994. South Africa has the highest share (46%) of scientific publications in sub-Saharan Africa (UNESCO 2010); it has the highest African country share in world publications – 33rd position in 2010 (Pouris 2012); its cutting-edge research laboratories and facilities are choice destinations for
Researchers from other parts of Africa; and the country’s universities dominate in the top 20 league of research-related rankings in Africa. Although South Africa continues to seek ways to address its own challenges in the sector (e.g. redressing inequities, enhancing participation rates, responding to issues in student funding, enlarging the workforce for research and development), the question arises as to what funding mechanisms have undergirded acknowledged achievements. This chapter describes the funding of higher education and research in South Africa. Subsequent sections attend to the following in turn: organisation of the higher education sector under apartheid, the new funding framework introduced in 2004, funding for research nationally, and the impact of the funding arrangements.

**Background to Current Funding Policies for Higher Education in Post-Apartheid South Africa**

As funding takes place typically within a structural and strategic framework, it is perhaps important to provide some insight into the pre-1994 structure of higher education and post-1994 aspirations. In the 1980s, as an integral part of state policy, the apartheid government divided South Africa into five ethnic/racial republics: Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda, Ciskei (collectively referred to as the TBVC republics), and the Republic of South Africa (RSA). Each republic had and managed its higher education institutions (which were divided into universities – concerned with fundamental research, and technikons focusing on applied knowledge). In the racially diverse RSA, the management of higher education institutions for the various races (whites, coloureds and Indians)\(^2\) was entrusted, respectively, to the corresponding arms of the tri-cameral legislature existing at the time. However, because there was no legislature in RSA for blacks, black institutions were considered a ‘general affairs’ matter and managed by the Department of Education and Training of RSA (Bunting 2002a). The corollary of these divisions was that at the end of apartheid in 1994, the higher education landscape was a fragmented system operated by eight different authorities (the four TBVC republics, the three racial legislatures in RSA and the Education Department of RSA). Funding mechanisms differed. In fact, one of the subsidy funding formulas discussed below (the South African Post Secondary Education subsidy funding for universities) was developed initially for white universities.

From at least the 1950s, different mechanisms of formula subsidy funding have been applied in higher education in South Africa (Steyn and Villiers 2007). These authors provide an account of these various formulae. The Holloway formula (1953) provided for state funding of basic items (e.g. remuneration of lecturers in ‘basic’ academic departments)

\(^2\) These terms continue to be used to date. Coloureds refer to people of mixed white, African and Asian descent; whites refer to descendants of the Dutch and British settlers as well as other Europeans; Indians refer to descendants of people brought to the country from the Indian sub-continent.
independently of institutional size. Funding for several other items (e.g. library) that were dependent on student numbers or number of courses was based on cost-sharing between the state and the institution. Over time, it became evident that universities were exploiting loopholes (for instance, subdividing courses to earn more subsidy). The formula did not take into account annual inflation.

The funding framework that followed, the Van Wyk de Vries formula (1977), introduced a number of elements into the Holloway scheme. Besides attempting to capture more realistically the range of cost factors in running institutions, another innovation was the use of weighted student numbers as input. There were two bases of weighting: level of study (Undergraduate = 1, Honours = 2, Master’s = 3, PhD = 4), and mode of delivery (Undergraduate full-time = 1, Undergraduate part-time = 0.77, non-residential/distance education = 0.33). For any given year, projections of weighted student numbers are made on the basis of figures for the preceding two years. The de Vries formula did not equally take inflation into account.

A third framework, the South African Post Secondary Education (SAPSE) formula for universities, was introduced in the early 1980s and was applied until 2003. Operated only within white universities, it was to be later extended to the black universities which had hitherto been run on negotiated budgets (Bunting 2000b: 120). Within the SAPSE framework, market forces (that is, student choices) were expected to determine the enrolment size and shape of the higher education system, with funding following students. According to Steyn and Villiers, the fundamental input parameter for the SAPSE subsidy formula is the Effective Subsidy Students (ESS), which makes use of, among others, the following inputs: Full Time Equivalent enrolments, the total credits for all modules which enrolled students have successfully completed, course level weightings (building on the de Vries formula), classification of education subject matter (CESM), and so on.

The SAPSE was based on an even more granular description of higher education activities and cost categories. It provided for subsidies for maintaining residences, other infrastructure, and for acquiring new furniture and equipment, depending on movements in FTE enrolment figures. It was self-adjusting, thus able to accommodate annual inflation rates. Steyn and Villiers note that it was the first formula to be based on both input (enrolments) and output (module completion rates and research productivity).

The end of apartheid and the advent of a democratic dispensation in 1994 saw a re-examination of funding and other structural arrangements in the higher education sector that had been designed to, in part at least, foster the ideology of the apartheid regime. Between 1996 and 2001 there was a raft of initiatives analysing the difficulties in the higher education structure inherited from the apartheid system, offering government views, enacting positions into legislation and charting an implementation course.

In 1996, a report of the National Commission on Higher Education offered a framework for transforming higher education (NCHE 1996). Documents such as the Education White Paper 3 on a Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education...
(Department of Education 1997), the Higher Education Act, 1997 (as amended in 2011; Republic of South Africa 2011), and the National Plan for Higher Education (Ministry of Education 2001) took forward the ideas and proposals in the 1996 NCHE report.

Some of the themes in these policy initiatives included: establishment of a single and nationally coordinated higher education system (in view of the fragmentation sketched above); redressing inequities (or apartheid-era disparities in opportunities for access, participation and success at the level of individuals of the black race or female gender); restructuring the higher education landscape (especially, rethinking the types and mixes of institutions); alignment of higher education offerings to societal needs or greater responsiveness of the sector; development of human capacity; enhancement of capacities in teaching and research; quality assurance; information and strategy-driven governance; funding mechanisms that avoid the weaknesses of funding policies current at the time, while being undergirded by such notions as affordability, sustainability, shared costs. For some of these issues, the Education White Paper 3 on a Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education (Department of Education 1997) set goals and targets. These are discussed later in this chapter dealing with assessing the impact of the new funding framework.

One concern with the South African Post-secondary Education Funding Framework (SAPSE) was that it saw government’s responsibility in financing higher education as being to simply contribute to institutional costs. Market forces (student choices) were expected to determine the size and shape of the higher education system. A thrust of the new initiatives was to allow for more state steering of the sector.

A New Funding Framework

One outcome of the initiatives around restructuring the higher education system was a new funding framework announced in 2003 (and introduced in phases over the period 2004 – 2007). This framework allows the state to intervene more in the sector. The funding formula is embedded within a steering framework which has other instruments, notably quality assurance (e.g. accreditation of programmes) and planning (e.g. enrolment figures, graduation rates). The framework relies on quality data, and as a result the Higher Education Management Information System (HEMIS) into which universities feed data is central to the operation of the framework. Some of the premises of the new framework are as follows:

- There are national development and transformation goals (access, redress, human resource) which the higher education system needs to address;
- the higher education system needs to be planned, governed and funded as a single national coordinated system; and
• funding will be for core activities (rather than meeting all institutional costs), and it will increasingly have an output orientation.

On this latter point, with the new funding system, government predetermines what resources it has for the sector, then these resources are basically divided according to values set for the various formulae. Although a review of the funding framework has just been published (Department of Higher Education and Training 2014), the report recommends that the broad architecture of the framework be retained, while proposing adjustments to a number of individual components. The broad architecture is presented in the next section, with an occasional indication of recommended adjustments in the review report.

Components of the new funding framework

The national budget for universities is divided into two major grant categories, namely, block grants (approximately 70%) and earmarked grants (about 30%). The former is for institutional operating costs (determined by indicators), and the latter for steering the system (further) to enhance access into the system and performance in designated areas. On average, both of these grants account for 50% of the public funds available to the system within a budgetary framework. The system gets the balance from private income (approximately 25%) and from tuition fees (another 25%). The sub-components of these major grant categories are presented in figure 1.
As Figure 1 shows, the decision on block grant allocation is based on planning data on the basis of which institutions and the Department of Higher Education and Training would have engaged (to determine performance patterns in a preceding time frame) and agreed on targets or benchmarks (for a following funding cycle) set by the Minister of Higher Education and Training. The teaching input grant is payment for expected services in teaching and in the supervision of postgraduate students. The teaching output grant rewards institutions for students who have completed their studies. The research output rewards institutions for research by staff members that is published in accredited journals, as scholarly books and for the number of research masters and doctoral students graduated. The institutional factor grant is of two kinds: the grant for size gives extra resources to institutions that do not enjoy economies of scale (because of their small student numbers), so that they are able to provide a full complement of student services; the grant for

Figure 1: Grant categories with figures for 2012/2013. Source: Department of Higher Education and Training (2014: 127).

22 The government ministry responsible for education generally was previously called the Department of Education. There are now two departments in charge of basic education and higher education and training respectively.
disadvantage rewards institutions whose student population comprises 40% and more of South African black and coloured students. This grant is added to the teaching input grant (Ministry of Education 2004:16).

Figure 1 also shows the subcategories of the earmarked grant, from funding made available to the National Student Financial Aid Scheme (NSFAS) to give indigent students access to higher education, to teaching and research development grants to enhance performance in these areas, especially for institutions that have not met performance benchmarks. From this overview, it is obvious that the new funding framework is both input and output based, and sets premium on teaching and research. It is hardly surprising that South African universities have elaborate structures driving the agenda in teaching/learning and in research. In the next section, we consider how teaching and research functions are funded within the new framework.

**Formulae for teaching grant subcategories**

The new funding framework is a formula-based funding model. Formula funding models in principle reduce the margin for lobbying that compromises system goals. Let us first consider the teaching input grant, allocated according to the following formula: \( i = \frac{a}{A} \times I \)

- \( i \) = a given institution’s teaching input grant
- \( a \) = units derived from number of FTE (full time equivalent) enrolled students in the institution. This number is derived by placing students in subject matter (CESM) categories – see Table 1 – and applying weighting factors by funding group, course level and delivery mode – see Table 2
- \( A \) = ‘a’ at level of all higher education institutions in the system
- \( I \) = sum allocated in the national budget for teaching input grant

To elaborate on ‘a’, it is important to note that in environments where disciplines are categorised for funding purposes, it often is the case that the grouping is based on a blend of cost profiles (i.e. the cost of educating a student in that discipline) and national priorities. In Table 1, we see disciplines assigned to different funding categories based on the Classification of Education Subject Matter (CESM).

**Table 1: Funding groups by CESM categories. Source: Ministry of Education (2004: 7)**
Still on ‘a’ in the formula, weighting factors (derived from level of study programme and mode of curriculum delivery) are then applied to the CESM categories. The weighting factors are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Weighting factors for teaching inputs by funding group, course level and delivery mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding group</th>
<th>CESM categories included in funding group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>07 education, 13 law, 14 librarianship, 20 psychology, 21 social services/public administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>04 business/commerce, 05 communication, 06 computer science, 12 languages, 18 philosophy/religion, 22 social sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>02 architecture/planning, 08 engineering, 10 home economics, 11 industrial arts, 16 mathematical sciences, 19 physical education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>01 agriculture, 03 fine and performing arts, 09 health sciences, 15 life and physical sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To take an example (cf. Ministry of Education 2004: 8), suppose institution X’s enrolments converted into weighted total of teaching input (‘a’ in the formula) generates 24 650 units as shown in Table 3.
Table 3: Data for determining teaching input grant in an institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding group</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Honours equivalent</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 x 3500</td>
<td>2 x 200</td>
<td>3 x 600</td>
<td>4 x 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5 x 2500</td>
<td>3 x 100</td>
<td>4.5 x 500</td>
<td>6 x 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5 x 1000</td>
<td>5 x 150</td>
<td>7.5 x 300</td>
<td>10 x 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5 x 500</td>
<td>7 x 50</td>
<td>10.5 x 100</td>
<td>14 x 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total weighting</td>
<td>24 650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Education (2004: 8)

- Suppose also that the weighted teaching input for the entire system in year Y, that is, ‘A’ in the formula, is: 870 000
- Suppose, finally, government’s allocation for teaching input for year Y for the entire system, that is ‘I’ in the formula, is Rands 5 500 000 000
- Then, institution X’s teaching input allocation for year Y, that is ‘i’ in the formula, is: 24650/870000 x 5 500 000 000 = Rands 155.8 million

In passing, it may be noted that the recent review of the new funding framework makes a number of recommendations related to the CESM groups and to the use of levels of study. A proposal is made for regrouping of disciplines, and for using levels in the National Qualifications Framework in place of the undergraduate, honours, masters and doctoral levels (cf. Department of Higher Education and Training 2014: 28). Let us now turn to the teaching output grant, which was earlier described as payment for non-research students successfully completing their studies.

The formula for teaching output is expressed as follows: o = [c/D] * O
- Where:
  - o = an institution’s teaching output grant;
  - c = an institution’s actual weighted total of teaching outputs for year Y. This is determined by multiplying non-research graduate totals by weightings for each qualification category. See Table 4. NB: Aggregating ‘c’ from all institutions gives system-wide C;
  - D = Aggregated ‘d’ from all institutions, where ‘d’ is the normative weighted teaching output for one institution. Small ‘d’ is derived by multiplying headcount enrolment totals per qualification category in an institution by graduation benchmarks approved by the Education Minister for a 3-year rolling period. See Table 5;
  - O = sum allocated in national budget for teaching outputs.
Table 4: Calculation of an institution’s actual weighted total of teaching outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual weighted teaching output for institution X (i.e. ‘c’ in formula)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st certificates or diplomas of 2 years</td>
<td>0.5 X 0 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st diplomas and bachelor’s of 3 years</td>
<td>1.0 X 1600 = 1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional bachelor’s: 4 years or more</td>
<td>1.5 X 750 = 1125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate diplomas</td>
<td>0.5 X 200 = 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate bachelor’s degrees</td>
<td>1.0 X 350 = 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours degrees</td>
<td>0.5 X 200 = 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research masters</td>
<td>0.5 X 200 = 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Ministry of Education (2004: 11)

Table 5: Calculation of an institution’s normative weighted teaching output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative weighted teaching output total for institution X (i.e. ‘d’ in formula, which needs to be aggregated to obtain ‘D’)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark x Contact total</td>
<td>Benchmark x Distance total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-year diplomas and bachelor’s degrees</td>
<td>22.5% x 8000 = 1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year professional 1st bachelor’s degrees</td>
<td>22.5% x 4000 = 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate diplomas</td>
<td>18% x 1000 = 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate bachelor’s degrees</td>
<td>18% x 500 = 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours degrees</td>
<td>18% x 500 = 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research masters</td>
<td>54% x 1000 = 540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>4252.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Ministry of Education (2004: 11f)

Continuing with the example from the Ministry of Education (2004), let us assume the following system-wide totals:

- normative total of weighted teaching outputs (i.e. ‘D’ in the formula) = 121 000
- actual total of weighted teaching outputs (i.e. ‘C’ in the formula) = 90 000
- budget allocation for teaching outputs (O) = Rands 1 378 000 000

Then institution X’s teaching output grant is:

\[
c \text{ (actual output = 3375) } /D \text{ (system normative output = 121 000) x budget (Rands 1378 000 000) = Rands 38.4 million.}
\]

Besides being a sub-head under block grant, the teaching function also appears under earmarked grants (see Figure 1). A surplus (disbursed as teaching development grant) becomes available when the normative total of teaching outputs for the entire system (i.e. ‘D’ in the formula) exceeds the actual weighted total for the system (i.e. ‘C’ in the formula).
This surplus is then distributed to universities whose ‘c’ (actual weighted teaching output) is lower than their ‘d’ (normative weighting). For such a university, the teaching development grant is its output shortfall ‘e’ (i.e. d – c), divided by the system shortfall ‘E’ (i.e., D – C) multiplied by the surplus ‘S’.

**Formulae for research grant subcategories**

Like the teaching function, research is a sub-head under both block and earmarked grants. As an item under block grant, research funding is allocated to an institution based on the following formula: \( r = \left[ \frac{f}{G} \right] \times Q \)

Where
- \( r \) = research output grant allocated to an institution;
- \( f \) = total of actual weighted research output in the institution. Determined thus: institution’s output of research graduates and publications for preceding 2 years multiplied by weighting. See Table 6;
- \( G \) = total of weighted normative outputs for the entire system; thus an aggregation of ‘g’ in all institutions, where ‘g’ is determined as follows: institution’s total of permanently employed academics for preceding two years multiplied by annual publication unit approved by Minister of Education for rolling period (see Table 7);
- \( Q \) = amount allocated in national budget for research outputs.

**Table 6: An institution’s weighted normative research output**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weightings for research outputs</th>
<th>Institution’s output x weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication units = 1</td>
<td>70 x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research masters graduate = 1</td>
<td>80 x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral graduate = 3</td>
<td>10 x 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Ministry of Education (2004: 15)*

**Table 7: Weighted normative research output for an institution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weightings in 2004/5 – 2006/7</th>
<th>Permanently employed academic/research staff in university X</th>
<th>Weighted normative research output (g) for university X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universities 1.25</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.25 x 200 = 250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on Ministry of Education (2004: 15).*

Suppose the following system totals:
- weighted normative total of research outputs (i.e. ‘G’ in the formula) is: 15 500;
budget allocation for research output (i.e. ‘Q’ in the formula) is: Rands 1 123 000 000;

Then institution X’s research output grant for year Y is:

\[ f(180)/G(15 500) \times 1 123 000 000 = \text{Rands 13 million.} \]

Where normative total of research outputs for the entire system (G) exceeds actual weighted total, the amount disbursed as research output grant will be less than the amount provided for in the national budget. The surplus is then distributed as research development grants to all institutions whose ‘f’ is lower than ‘g’. An eligible institution X’s research development grant is its output shortfall ‘h’ (the difference between ‘f’ and ‘g’) relative to the entire system shortfall H multiplied by surplus Q. Thus: \([h/H] \times Q\).

The recent review of the funding framework recommends, among others, that for purposes of disbursing research development grants universities be grouped into three categories, from very research-intensive to least-research intensive. Although a system of subsidies for articles in accredited journals is already in place, the review recommends a classification of accredited journals according to impact factor.

**National Funding of Research and the National Research Foundation (NRF)**

As was seen earlier, public funds channelled to universities ‘statutorily’ comprise approximately 50% of requirements, with the balance coming from student fees and generated income. As research and innovation performers, and as an integral part of the national system of innovation, universities get research funds from various other actors in the national system of innovation, including government departments, the Science Councils and Institutes, the National Research Foundation, industry and international donors.

A major research support agency involved in the funding and organisation of research in South Africa is the National Research Foundation (NRF). According to the Act setting it up, “the object of the Foundation is to promote and support research through funding, human resource development and the provision of the necessary facilities in order to facilitate the creation of knowledge, innovation and development in all fields of science and technology, including indigenous knowledge and thereby to contribute to the improvement of the quality of life of all the people of the Republic” (Republic of South Africa 1998: 2). The Act commits the Foundation to a lengthy list of functions, including the following:

“(a) promote the development of appropriate human resources and research capacity in the areas of science and technology;
(b) stimulate, promote, support and protect research in the field of indigenous
technology;
(c) obtain funds for research, both locally and abroad;
(d) allocate funds for research and promote multi-disciplinary collaboration through the divisions;
(e) promote and support research by the awarding of contracts, grants, scholarships or bursaries to persons or research institutions;
(f) evaluate the status and needs of research; and
(g) provide financial support for the acquisition or establishment of research facilities by research institutions.” (Republic of South Africa 1998: 2).

The NRF receives more than 90% of its funding from government in three forms: a baseline allocation that is used to fund programmes and operations; ring-fenced funds earmarked by the Department of Science and Technology for particular projects, e.g. equipment, Centres of Excellence); and contract funds from a range of government sources for specific projects to be carried out. Over the years, and consistently with its statutory functions, the Foundation has emerged as a nationally valued and an internationally respected agency, supporting research through initiatives that focus on human capital, knowledge, infrastructure, quality within a strategic framework provided by such instruments as the National Research and Development Strategy (Republic of South Africa 2002) and the complementary 2007 Ten-Year Innovation Plan (Department of Science and Technology 2008). Let us illustrate a few of these initiatives.

Its human capital (development) initiatives include a range of funding instruments for various researcher categories and for exploring new frontiers (see Figure 2).

![Figure 2: Human capital funding initiatives of the NRF. Source: National Research Foundation (2012-15: 53).](image-url)
Arising from national strategic research frameworks (such as the National Research and Development Strategy (NRDS) of 2002 and the 2007 Ten-Year Innovation Plan) are a range of knowledge projects funded by the NRF. These are projects for which South Africa is by virtue of its geographical position eminently position to lead (e.g. space sciences, human paleontology) or projects in the so-called ‘grand challenges’ dealing with bio-economy, e.g. biodiversity, tuberculosis (National Research Foundation 2012 – 2015). In terms of infrastructure, the NRF maintains a number of national research facilities which universities, with their limited financial resources, would otherwise have been unable to run. These facilities are categorised according to knowledge areas. Thus, there are facilities for the Astro/Geosciences, Biodiversity and the Nuclear Sciences.

Besides the NRF, it is also worth noting the role of other players in the national system of innovation in supporting research and development. For instance, there is the Research and Development (R&D) tax incentive introduced in 2006 and managed by the Department of Science and Technology and the South African Revenue Service. The tax incentive was introduced so as the private sector can be encouraged to invest in R&D. Companies are able to obtain a “150% deduction of all expenditure relating to R&D activities from the company’s taxable income, i.e. R1,50 tax deduction for every R1 spent” (Venter 2014, non-paginated electronic resource). On expenses related to machinery, buildings or equipment used for R & D purposes, companies can also be offered an accelerated depreciation deduction. The logic behind offering these deductions is that although tax revenue is initially lost, in the long term these losses will be recouped as these R & D-intensive companies grow, make more money and create job opportunities.

Impact assessment

Part of the state’s interest in evolving a new funding framework was to be able to steer the higher education system in directions that would enable the attainment of goals such as specified in the Education White Paper 3 on a Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education (Department of Education 1997). The White Paper outlined eight goals in three categories as follows:

- enrolment (improving opportunities for entry into higher education, improving the participation of persons from historically disadvantaged groups, improving the participation of females, growing enrolments in science, engineering, technology and business/management fields, increase in masters and doctoral enrolments);
- staffing (improving staff qualifications); and
- teaching and research outputs (improving graduation rates, increasing high level research outputs).
Measurable indicators are attached to each of these eight goals. Now, in its review of the new funding framework, the ministerial committee (Department of Higher Education & Training 2014) also assessed the performance of universities in relation to the goals and targets spelt out in the Education White Paper 3. Of course these goals and targets were not specifically formulated for the funding framework (alone to deliver on). Mindful of this caveat, we might consider the performance of the university system in relation to a subset of these goals and corresponding targets that are arguably most directly linked to the funding framework.

With respect to the goal category on enrolments, it might be recalled from the components of the funding framework that, apart from the teaching input grants which are based on approved full time equivalent places as well as the earmarks for student loans, there is also a part of the institutional factor grant that rewards universities for the segment of their student population that is from previously disadvantaged groups. Commenting on the target for Goal 1, the report observes that “the overall GER [growth enrolment rate] in South Africa grew from 14% in 2001 to 18% in 2010. Goal 1, reaching a GER of 20% for public higher education by 2010, was thus not attained, although progress was made” (Department of Higher Education and Training 2014: 100). The report further notes that progress “was made with regard to the changes in the racial profile of the students (Goal 2) but there remains huge inequality with regard to participation rates. However, it is evident that with regard to increased participation of females in higher education, Goal 3 was attained” (Department of Higher Education and Training 2014: 101). As for Goal 5 on increasing the enrolments of masters and doctoral students, the target set was that 15% of university enrolments should be at these levels by 2010. Progress here has been minimal as a 4.6% growth was recorded (Department of Higher Education and Training 2014: 103).

Provisions in the new funding framework on teaching output and research output are obviously directly related to corresponding goals in the White Paper 3. One benchmark for Goal 7 on increasing the output of graduates was that graduation rates should exceed enrolment rates. Although the picture was not even for all qualification types, the report notes that the “total number of graduates grew at an average annual rate of 5.7%, compared to the average annual growth rate of 4.9% for headcount enrolments” (Department of Higher Education and Training 2014: 105). On Goal 8 related to improving the high level knowledge outputs of the system (in terms of doctoral graduates and research publications), the view is that the doctoral graduate figures grew by 4%, while the output for research publications on average grew annually by 5.2%. In both cases, however, the specific targets set were not achieved (Department of Higher Education and Training 2014: 114).

The import of the funding framework in consolidating strengths and effecting change should not be diminished by the observation that its success is not unqualified as far as the achievement of set targets is concerned. At the beginning of this report, attention was drawn to the achievements of South Africa on the continental and global research
productivity landscape. The view by Pouris (2012) is that the funding framework has been central to the phenomenal growth in the research outputs of institutions within the system. Not only are institutions able to claim subsidies for accredited publications through a scheme that has been in place since 1987, they are also able to obtain a research output grant under the new funding framework. Of course, the quantum of resources obtained under research output grant is based on the performance profile of the institutions. The effect of this added incentive is graphically captured by Pouris (2012) who shows how different policy measures seem to correlate with patterns in South African publications (see figure 3).

It is noteworthy from figure 3 that in the 11-year period between policy interventions A – C, the figure for the highest increase in published papers was about 600. However, in the comparatively shorter 5-year period between C (the introduction of the new funding framework) and D (the indexing of more South African journals by ISI), there was close to a 3000 increase in the unit of published papers.

Finally, it is also worth noting that there have been concerns about the very design of the funding framework. These concerns are discussed by Steyn and de Villiers (2007). To comment on one such concern, the view is that the incentives in the funding framework are potentially counterproductive in the sense of ‘rewarding’ underachievers. According to

Figure 3: Trend in South African publications (1981 – 2010) amidst policy interventions. Source: Pouris (2012: 3)

A, sanctions were lifted; B, social sciences were incorporated under the National Research Foundation; C, the new funding formula was introduced; D, the number of South African journals indexed by ISI was increased.
Steyn and de Villiers, there is the real spectre of “money not allocated to ‘under-performing’ institutions that have not met the norms [being] re-channelled to the same institutions in the form of development grants” (Steyn and de Villiers 2007: 39).

Conclusion

The choice of a funding mechanism for a higher education system must ultimately be seen as context-specific. The South African funding framework described in this chapter was conceived as a response to a specific set of historical factors that had left a deep imprint on education and society. Be that as it may, and disarticulating from the specifics of the South African situation, the funding framework underscores how funding can be pressed into servicing a set of clearly elaborated strategic goals.

The use of funding as the operational tool for strategy would seem to explain a number of observations. Firstly, there is the relative transparency of the funding mechanism. Although concerns have been raised about the values or norms for the formulae being set by the Minister responsible for Higher Education, in principle the use of formulae and the heavy reliance on quality data limit the opportunities for lobbying, which can sometimes seek to undermine system-wide goals. Secondly, the model is transparent in another sense, that is, making clear what system functions are prioritised. It is worth noting from figure 1 (which presents components of the new funding model) just how dominant the teaching and research functions are in the model. Through such transparency, a goal context is created for institutions to develop systems that are aligned to funding priorities and that position them to harness resources. Thus, system-wide initiatives around teaching and learning can be seen in part at least as strategic from a funding perspective. Thirdly, servicing strategy has in this case meant that the commitment has been more towards an eclectic mix of funding orientations (e.g. input and output) which is not uncommon in higher education systems.

References


Contributors

**Mahama Duwiejua** was the Executive Secretary of the National Council for Tertiary Education, Ghana, from October 2010 to July 2015. With a cumulative service of 30 years experience in academia and tertiary education administration, Professor Duwiejua has extensive knowledge of higher education in Ghana, working closely with the Ministry of education, development partners and other agencies in education. He has facilitated the development of policy documents on higher education in Ghana including policy documents on sustainable funding of education in Ghana, Differentiation and Diversification of tertiary education in Ghana and a bill for establishing a tertiary education research fund for Ghana.

**Crispus Kiamba** is currently faculty in the School of the Built Environment, College of Architecture and Engineering, University of Nairobi, Kenya. He has previously served in many capacities in both the University of Nairobi and the Government of Kenya, including: Vice Chancellor of the University of Nairobi; Secretary/Chief Executive Officer of the Commission for Higher (now University) Education; and Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology.

**Peter A. Okebukola** is a specialist in quality assurance in higher education and Professor of Science and Computer Education at the Lagos State University, Nigeria. He is the immediate past Executive Secretary of the National Universities Commission (NUC) of Nigeria. He has been Chairman of Council of several universities including Osun State University and currently Chairman of Council of Crawford University. He has been awarded a number of honorary D.Sc degrees. He is the current Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Caleb University and Chairman of the Advisory Council of the CHEA International Quality Group (CIQG).

**M. Bhen Sikina TOGUEBAYE** is Professor of Parasitology at University Cheikh Anta DIOP of Dakar (Senegal) and Director of Research of this University. From 2011 to 2013, he was the National Director of Academic and Legal Affairs at the Ministry of Higher Education and Research of Senegal. He is member of the National Academy of Sciences and Technology of Senegal, The African Academy of Sciences and of The World Academy of Sciences.

**Bassey E. Antia** is Professor of Linguistics at the University of the Western Cape (South Africa). He holds a PhD from the University of Bielefeld (Germany), and has other qualifications from institutions and centres in France, Nigeria, Germany and Austria. He has recently been involved in various initiatives in the area of higher education management, and has facilitated training around strategic management, teaching and learning, financial management, among others. He is associated with two initiatives of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD): the International Deans’ Course Africa and Training in Quality Assurance.
# Regional Conference on Innovative Approaches to Funding Higher Education & Research in Africa

**Hotel EDA OBA, Lome, Togo**  
26-28 November 2014

## Attendance List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution/Organization</th>
<th>Contact/Email</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.  | Prof. Abdel Aziz Fatouh       | Director of University Development Center / Coordinator of Pathways to Higher Education Project | Mansoura University                            | P.O. Box: 35516 Mansoura, Egypt  
Fax: +2050 224 67 81, Tel (W): +2050 222 37 86, Mobil: +2 0100 876 444 5  
Email: afaziz@mans.edu.eg  
azizafaziz@yahoo.com | EGYPT    |
|     | ABDEL AZIZ MOHAMEDC            |                                                    |                                                 |                                                   |          |
| 2.  | Honourable Samuel Okudzeto    | Deputy Minister in charge of Higher Education      | Ministry of Education, Ghana                    | minister@moe.gov.gh  
diasporagh@gmail.com  
agraham2001@yahoo.com | GHANA    |
|     | ABLAKWA                       |                                                    |                                                 |                                                   |          |
| 3.  | Mr. Might Kojo Abreh          |                                                    | University of Cape Coast                        | might.abreh@ucc.edu.gh | GHANA    |
|     | ABREH                         |                                                    |                                                 |                                                   |          |
| 4.  | Prof. Nicholas Akise Ada      | Deputy Vice Chancellor Administration              | Benue State University                          | adaagia@gmail.com | NIGERIA  |
|     | ADA                           |                                                    |                                                 |                                                   |          |
| 5.  | Professor Bernard O. Aduda    | Principal of the College of Biological and Physical Sciences  
Department of Physics | University of Nairobi                           | Nairobi, Kenya  
boaduda@uonbi.ac.ke | KENYA    |
|     | ADUDA                         |                                                    |                                                 |                                                   |          |
| 6.  | Mr. Seth Adu Agyei            | Journalist                                         |                                                 | Ghana                                             | GHANA    |

113
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>INSTITUTION/ORGANISATION</th>
<th>CONTACT/EMAIL</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Prof. Musbau Adewumi AKANJI</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Federal University of Technology, Minna</td>
<td>PMB 65, Minna, Niger State Nigeria +2348034725751 <a href="mailto:vc@futminna.edu.ng">vc@futminna.edu.ng</a></td>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Yaa Oforiwa ASARE PEASAH</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>Ghana News Agency(GNA)</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Pr. Tiyo ASSIH</td>
<td>Directeur</td>
<td>Min. Enseignement Supérieur,</td>
<td>Lomé-Togo <a href="mailto:mesrtogo@yahoo.fr">mesrtogo@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Kokou AMOUZOUVI</td>
<td>Education Economist</td>
<td>African Development Bank AFDB</td>
<td>Lome, Togo 90951251 <a href="mailto:K.AMOUZOUVI@AFDB.ORG">K.AMOUZOUVI@AFDB.ORG</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Mr. Jacob Paarechuga ANANKWARE</td>
<td>PhD Candidate and Researcher</td>
<td>Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>Kumasi Ghana <a href="mailto:janankware@gmail.com">janankware@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Mr. Fred AWAAH</td>
<td>Secretary General</td>
<td>All Africa Students Union</td>
<td>P.O. Box M274 Accra, Ghana <a href="mailto:akaphari@yahoo.com">akaphari@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Prof. Charles AYO</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Covenant University</td>
<td>Ota, Nigeria Tel:+2348033235 737 <a href="mailto:charles.ayo@covenantuniversity.edu.ng">charles.ayo@covenantuniversity.edu.ng</a></td>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Prof. Moussa BARAGES</td>
<td>Vice-Recteur, Chargé de la Recherche et des Relations Extérieures</td>
<td>Université Abdou Moumouni de Niamey/ CAMES</td>
<td>à l'Université Abdou Moumouni de Niamey BP: 10896 - Niamey - Niger Tel. Bureau: (227) 20 31 55 62 Cel : (227) 96 98 17 07 / 90 66 24 01 E-mail: <a href="mailto:moussa.barage@yahoo.fr">moussa.barage@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>NIGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>INSTITUTION/ ORGANISATION</td>
<td>CONTACT/EMAIL</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Prof. Bassey ANTIA</td>
<td>Professor of Linguistics</td>
<td>University of Western Cape</td>
<td>South Africa <a href="mailto:bassey.antia@gmail.com">bassey.antia@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Prof. Barthélemé BIAO</td>
<td>Recteur</td>
<td>Université de Parakou (UP)</td>
<td>BP 123 Parakou, Benin Tel (Bur.): +229 23 61 15 41 Tel/FaBur.): +229 23 61 07 12 Cell (privé): +229 97 49 51 97 / 90 02 91 24 <a href="mailto:babiao@yahoo.fr">babiao@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>BENIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Dr. Kadidiatou BOUARE</td>
<td></td>
<td>USJPB /Bamako – MALI</td>
<td>Tel: 0022373395154 Bamako, Mali <a href="mailto:kadisebela@yahoo.fr">kadisebela@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>MALI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Prof. Dr. Ir. Jean T. Claude CODJIA</td>
<td>Recteur</td>
<td>Université d'Agriculture de Kétou (UAK), BENIN</td>
<td>B.P. 43, Kétou Tel: (229) 20 25 33 50 Mobile: (229) 97 51 02 10 <a href="mailto:jtcodjia@yahoo.fr">jtcodjia@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>BENIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Prof. Jan E. CRAFFORD</td>
<td>Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)</td>
<td>University of Venda</td>
<td>Private Bag XS050 Thohoyandou 0950 South Africa <a href="mailto:Jan.Crafford@univen.ac.za">Jan.Crafford@univen.ac.za</a></td>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dr. Ibrahim DIARRA</td>
<td>Directeur du Centre Ivoirien de Recherches Économiques et Sociales</td>
<td>UFHB.</td>
<td>e-mail <a href="mailto:diarraib@gmail.com">diarraib@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Cote D’IVOIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dr. Mohamed Cherif DIARRA</td>
<td>Regional Bureau for Education in Africa, Dakar</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mohameddiarra@hotmail.com">mohameddiarra@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>SENEGAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Prof. Mahama DUWIEJUA</td>
<td>Executive Secretary (Paper Presenter)</td>
<td>National Council for Tertiary Education</td>
<td>NCTE Accra, Ghana <a href="mailto:mduwiejua54@gmail.com">mduwiejua54@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Prof. Dr. Eltayeb Idris EISA</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Sudan Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>Tel.: +249912345604 Email: <a href="mailto:profeisa2@gmail.com">profeisa2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>SUDAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>INSTITUTION/ORGANISATION</td>
<td>CONTACT/EMAIL</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 24. | Dr. Therrezinha FERNANDES  | Head, Regional Office for West Africa                | AVU                      | Nairobi, Kenya
  "Therrezinha tffernandes@avu.org"               | KENYA     |
| 25. | Dr. Olusegun FOLORUNSO      | Director, CISLT                                      | FUNAAB                    | Abeokuta, Nigeria
  folorunsoo@funab.edu.ng                           | NIGERIA   |
| 26. | Dr. Paul GINIES             | Education/Training Committee Coordinator             | French Council of Investors in Africa, CIAN | 45, Rue de la chaussée d'Antin;
  tel: +33 (0)1 45625576
  Mobile: +33 (0) 667848899
  E-mail: pginies27@gmail.com                       | FRANCE    |
| 27. | Prof. Germain GOURENE       | Député au Parlement                                  | CEDEAO                    | 02 BP 801, Abidjan 02
  Abidjan Côte d'Ivoire
gourene@hotmail.com                                | COTE D'IVOIRE |
| 28. | Prof. Ane Turner JOHNSON    | Assistant Professor, Educational Services & Leadership Coordinator, Women's & Gender Studies | Rowan University | Rowan University
  Glassboro, New Jersey; USA
  856.256.4500 x.3818
  johnsona@rowan.edu
  RowanWGS@rowan.edu
  @researcher_prof                                   | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA |
| 29. | Mr Joseph Pierre KAMANO     | Sr Education Specialist                              | The World Bank, Mali Country Office | Bamako, Mali
  Office Tel: 00 223 20 22 22 83
  Direct line: 00 223-20 70 22 53;
  Dama: 5351+2253
  pkamano@worldbank.org                              | MALI      |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>INSTITUTION/ORGANISATION</th>
<th>CONTACT/EMAIL</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Prof. Crispus Makau KIAMBA</td>
<td>School of the Built Environment, College of Architecture and Engineering,</td>
<td>University of Nairobi</td>
<td>P.O. Box 47970-00100, Nairobi, KENYA. <a href="mailto:crispuskiamba@gmail.com">crispuskiamba@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>KENYA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Professeur Gilles KOUNOU</td>
<td>Ingénieur en Systèmes d'Information Gestionnaire de Projets Systèmes d'Information Spécialiste du PGI Cocktail ScolarIX OPEN SI CEO</td>
<td>NREN</td>
<td>Cotonou, BENIN <a href="mailto:gilles.kounou@mshriso.com">gilles.kounou@mshriso.com</a></td>
<td>BENIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Prof. Domwini Dabire KUUPOLE</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>University of Cape Coast</td>
<td>Tel: +233/03321-32050/32378 Fax: +233-[03321]-32485/32484 Cell: +233-208123506 Email: <a href="mailto:vc@ucc.edu.gh">vc@ucc.edu.gh</a>, <a href="mailto:vc_ucc@yahoo.com">vc_ucc@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Prof. Felix Chiedu MAFIANA</td>
<td>Deputy Executive Secretary &amp; President, African Quality Assurance Network, NUC</td>
<td>National Universities Commission</td>
<td>26, Aguiyi Ironsi str, Maitama, Abuja Nigeria 234-803-344-4595 <a href="mailto:chiedu.mafiana@gmail.com">chiedu.mafiana@gmail.com</a>; <a href="mailto:cfmafiana@nuc.edu.ng">cfmafiana@nuc.edu.ng</a></td>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Fred Masagazi MASAAZI</td>
<td>Principal College of Education and External Studies</td>
<td>Makerere University Uganda</td>
<td>+256 2 772369930 <a href="mailto:fremas@cees.mak.ac.ug">fremas@cees.mak.ac.ug</a></td>
<td>UGANDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Stéphane MEERT</td>
<td>Chef de la Section Gouvernance-Economie Déléguée de l’Union européenne au Togo</td>
<td>Union européenne</td>
<td>Tél. : (+228) 22 53 60 00/fax : (+228) 22 26 57 20 e-mail : <a href="mailto:stephane.meert@ge.europa.eu">stephane.meert@ge.europa.eu</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Prof. Bonaventure MVE-ONDO</td>
<td>Directeur de la prospective,</td>
<td>StratConseil</td>
<td>Région de Bordeaux France <a href="mailto:bmveondo51@gmail.com">bmveondo51@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>FRANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>INSTITUTION/ORGANISATION</td>
<td>CONTACT/EMAIL</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Prof. Lindela NDLOVU</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor and AAU Board Member</td>
<td>National University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>Bulawayo, ZIMBABWE Tel: +263 9286669/712 221683/77373 9156 (Cell) /09289061(PA) Fax: 263 928-6669 <a href="mailto:lindela.ndlovu@nust.ac.zw">lindela.ndlovu@nust.ac.zw</a> <a href="mailto:portia.ngwenya@nust.ac.zw">portia.ngwenya@nust.ac.zw</a></td>
<td>ZIMBABWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Roger H. Ch. NÉBIÉ</td>
<td>Directeur de recherches en chimie organique Délégué Général du CNRST</td>
<td>Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique</td>
<td>03 BP 7047 Ouagadougou 03, Burkina Faso +226 50326046; 50315869</td>
<td>BURKINA FASO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Dr. Jeanne NTAIN</td>
<td>Enseignant chercheur en Science et Gestion de l’environnement</td>
<td>Université Nangui Abrogoua</td>
<td>Adresse postal: 02 BP 801 abidjan 02 Cote d’Ivoire +22507803681 Email: <a href="mailto:ntainjeanne@yahoo.fr">ntainjeanne@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>COTE D’IVOIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Emeritus Prof. PAI OBANYA</td>
<td>Emeritus Professor, Univ. of Ibadan &amp; WAEC Chairman</td>
<td>University of Ibadan</td>
<td>Lagos, Nigeria Email:</td>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Prof. Peter OKEBUKOLA</td>
<td>Professor of Science and Computer Education at the Lagos State University, Chairman Of Council, Crawford Univ &amp; Former Executive Secretary, NUC</td>
<td>Lagos State University</td>
<td>Lagos, Nigeria <a href="mailto:pokebukola@yahoo.com">pokebukola@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Dr. Alain OUEDRAOGO</td>
<td>Directeur Général</td>
<td>FONRID</td>
<td>03 BP 7047 Ouagadougou 03, Burkina Faso <a href="mailto:alainoued1@yahoo.fr">alainoued1@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>BURKINA FASO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Pr. Dieudonne OYONO</td>
<td>Recteur</td>
<td>Universite de Douala</td>
<td>Douala, Cameroun <a href="mailto:oyonodieudonne@yahoo.fr">oyonodieudonne@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>CAMEROUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>INSTITUTION/ ORGANISATION</td>
<td>CONTACT/EMAIL</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Pr. Macki SAMAKE</td>
<td>Recteur</td>
<td>Université Lettres et Sciences Humaines,</td>
<td>Bamako, Mali</td>
<td>MALI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Université Lettres et Sciences Humaines,</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mackisam@hotmail.com">mackisam@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Dr. Yaya SANGARÉ</td>
<td>Secrétaire Exécutif</td>
<td>PASRES</td>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>COTE D'IVOIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PASRES</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yayasangci@yahoo.fr">yayasangci@yahoo.fr</a> <a href="mailto:annetteouattara@yahoo.fr">annetteouattara@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Prof. Francisco Komlavi SEDDOH</td>
<td>Représentant du TOGO au Conseil Exécutif de l'UNESCO</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>26 Avenue de la Providence</td>
<td>FRANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>92160 ANTONY FRANCE <a href="mailto:francisco-seddoh@orange.fr">francisco-seddoh@orange.fr</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Prof. Sorho SIAKA</td>
<td>Conseiller DG INP-HB</td>
<td>Institut National Polytechnique Félix Houphouët-Boigny (INP-HB)</td>
<td>Yamoussokro (Côte d'Ivoire) <a href="mailto:ssiaka@yahoo.fr">ssiaka@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>COTE D'IVOIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Dawn Shamble SINGLETON</td>
<td>Research Student, Educational Opportunity Fund Program</td>
<td>Rowan University</td>
<td>Glassboro, New Jersey; USA 856.256.4500 x.3818 <a href="mailto:singletond@rowan.edu">singletond@rowan.edu</a></td>
<td>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Prof. Wondwosen TAMIRAT</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>St. Mary's University College</td>
<td>Addis Ababa, Ethiopia</td>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Mary's University College</td>
<td><a href="mailto:preswondj@smuc.edu.et">preswondj@smuc.edu.et</a> <a href="mailto:misganaw_solomon@smuc.edu.et">misganaw_solomon@smuc.edu.et</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Prof. Komi P. TCHAKPELE</td>
<td>Président/ AAU Board Member</td>
<td>Université de Kara</td>
<td>BP 404 - Kara - TOGO</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Université de Kara</td>
<td>Tél.: Mob. (228)-90-04-58-39 Bur. (228)-26-61-02-55 Std.: (228)-26-61-02-85 Dom. (228)-26-68-81-51 Fax. (228)-26-61-02-55/56 <a href="mailto:komtchak@yahoo.com">komtchak@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>INSTITUTION/ORGANISATION</td>
<td>CONTACT/EMAIL</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Prof. Bhen Sikina TOGUEBAYE</td>
<td>Professeur Titulaire &amp; Directeur de la Recherche, Faculté des Sciences et Techniques, Université Cheikh Anta Diop UCAD</td>
<td>Dakar, Senegal <a href="mailto:bstoguebaye@gmail.com">bstoguebaye@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>SENEGAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Honourable Daniel Doméné ZADI</td>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
<td>National Assembly of Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>Mobile: 00 225 45 97 82 20 Office: 00 225 20 20 96 53 Fax: 00 225 20 20 82 96 <a href="mailto:rolando.akissi@yahoo.fr">rolando.akissi@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>COTE D'IVOIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Prof. Etienne EHILE</td>
<td>Secretary General</td>
<td>Association of African Universities</td>
<td>P.O.Box AN5744 Accra-North <a href="mailto:secgen@aau.org">secgen@aau.org</a></td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Dr. Pascal HOBA</td>
<td>Director of Knowledge Management Information and Communications</td>
<td>Association of African Universities</td>
<td>P.O.Box AN5744 Accra-North <a href="mailto:phoba@aau.org">phoba@aau.org</a></td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Mr. Ransford BEKOE</td>
<td>Ag. Project Officer/University Industry Linkages</td>
<td>Association of African Universities</td>
<td>P.O.Box AN5744 Accra-North <a href="mailto:ransford@aau.org">ransford@aau.org</a></td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mr. Abednego CORLETEY</td>
<td>IT Specialist</td>
<td>Association of African Universities</td>
<td>P.O.Box AN5744 Accra-North <a href="mailto:acorletey@aau.org">acorletey@aau.org</a></td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Mrs. Yvette QUASHIE</td>
<td>Human Resource and Administrative Officer</td>
<td>Association of African Universities</td>
<td>P.O.Box AN5744 Accra-North <a href="mailto:yaquashie@aau.org">yaquashie@aau.org</a></td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Mrs. Gabrielle HANSEN</td>
<td>Assistant Project Office/World Bank ACE Project</td>
<td>Association of African Universities</td>
<td>P.O.Box AN5744 Accra-North <a href="mailto:ghansen@aau.org">ghansen@aau.org</a></td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Ms. Agnes APEDOE</td>
<td>Executive Assistant to Secretary General</td>
<td>Association of African Universities</td>
<td>P.O.Box AN5744 Accra-North <a href="mailto:aapedoe@aau.org">aapedoe@aau.org</a></td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>INSTITUTION/Organisation</td>
<td>CONTACT/EMAIL</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Ms. Charlotte GARDINER</td>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
<td>Association of African Universities</td>
<td>P.O.Box AN5744 Accra-North <a href="mailto:cgardiner@aau.org">cgardiner@aau.org</a></td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Ms. Judith MYERS</td>
<td>Office Administrator</td>
<td>Association of African Universities</td>
<td>P.O.Box AN5744 Accra-North <a href="mailto:jmyers@aau.org">jmyers@aau.org</a></td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Ms. Abigail NYAMSON</td>
<td>Office Administrator</td>
<td>Association of African Universities</td>
<td>P.O.Box AN5744 Accra-North <a href="mailto:anyamson@aau.org">anyamson@aau.org</a></td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Ms. Rose NINTIN</td>
<td>Bilingual Secretary</td>
<td>Association of African Universities</td>
<td>P.O.Box AN5744 Accra-North <a href="mailto:nintin@aau.org">nintin@aau.org</a></td>
<td>GHANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Fumey Y.K. KOMBÉ</td>
<td>A.DG</td>
<td>ESGIS</td>
<td>90323566</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Amivi AYAH</td>
<td>Chef section secrétariat principal</td>
<td>Préfecture du Golfe</td>
<td>91916631</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>ASSIMTOKE Somiéaleeu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Préfecture du Golfe</td>
<td>90137561</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Ayou Akoétique KOUEBLENOU</td>
<td>Secritare General</td>
<td>Commission Nationale UNESCO</td>
<td>90206347 <a href="mailto:akouble55@yahoo.fr">akouble55@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Prof. Kofi AHADZI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90094122 <a href="mailto:koffi_ahadzi@yahoo.fr">koffi_ahadzi@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>KoKou AWOKOU</td>
<td>Secriteria General CEST</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90277760</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>NOTOKPE Koffi Séto</td>
<td>Directeur</td>
<td>ENS</td>
<td>90223839</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>AJAVON KANLIGAN</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>CPN</td>
<td>90976735</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Prof. Mocter L. BAWA</td>
<td>Directeur, Ecole ESTBA</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90184564 <a href="mailto:bawamokter@yahoo.fr">bawamokter@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Prof. Ampah Kodjo JOHNSON</td>
<td>Directeur de la Recherche</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90043982 <a href="mailto:christoph_johnson@yahoo.fr">christoph_johnson@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Prof. KETOH Guillaume</td>
<td>Directeur COUL</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90024663 <a href="mailto:gketoh@hotmail.com">gketoh@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>INSTITUTION/ORGANISATION</td>
<td>CONTACT/EMAIL</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>BANDJE Yaovi</td>
<td>COUL</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90894560</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>ESSIZEWA K. Essowe</td>
<td>V.Doyer</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td><a href="mailto:koukou.essizewa@gmail.com">koukou.essizewa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Ekoué M. GBADDOE</td>
<td>Directeur RUL</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>92161420</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Pr BALOGOU Agnon A. Koffi</td>
<td>Directeur Adjoint EANG</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90047231</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>GANDE Assimio</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>91350814 98135468</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>SAGBA Kossi</td>
<td>Enseignant</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90131511</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>KODZO Komla</td>
<td>Chargé de communication</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>92616409</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Prof. TCHANGBEDJI Gado</td>
<td></td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90113834</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>AMOLISSOU K. Gabire</td>
<td></td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>92100903</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>QHASHIE Maryse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90014840 <a href="mailto:marysep@voila.fr">marysep@voila.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>GBENOUGA Martins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90064518</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>KPONOR G. Mawuli</td>
<td></td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90057895 <a href="mailto:mkponor@yahoo.fr">mkponor@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>MAPO Kossi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90325493</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>JONDA Koffi</td>
<td>Directeur DAAS</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90149480</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Mme Awovi Kafui Essimé KPEGBA</td>
<td>2ème Vice-Présidente</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90041255</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Pr. SANDA Komla</td>
<td>1er Vice-Président</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>91141220</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>TSIFOTU K. Justin</td>
<td>Secrétaire du club Gréo</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>91508664</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>KOUROUPARA Ayety Mourtala</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Club UNESCO Université de Lomé</td>
<td>9187616 98225873</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>DOSSEH David</td>
<td>Directeur Coopération</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td><a href="mailto:daviddohk@yahoo.fr">daviddohk@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Prof. BATAWILA Komlavi</td>
<td>DRH</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90122668 <a href="mailto:zitaauline@yahoo.fr">zitaauline@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
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<td>POSITION</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>AYWEAOUADAN Akodah</td>
<td>Enseignant-Chercheur</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90414544</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>KOVAWO Achille</td>
<td>CRIQ</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>92535911 <a href="mailto:kovawo@clepnoir.org">kovawo@clepnoir.org</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>ADONSOU Komla Sefia</td>
<td>Delegue General Adjoint des étudiants</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90129991 <a href="mailto:ad.carlos@yahoo.fr">ad.carlos@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>KETEHOULI N’GO</td>
<td>DGA/UL</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ngoketehouli@yahoo.fr">ngoketehouli@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>ATTIPOU KOMA</td>
<td>Doyen/FSS</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>90045263</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>ALODZI KOUKOU Dzidzyo</td>
<td>FDB</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td>92475876</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>ABBEY Abbevi Georges</td>
<td>Enseignant</td>
<td>Université de Lomé</td>
<td><a href="mailto:george_abbey@yahoo.fr">george_abbey@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>MENSAH A.</td>
<td>1er Doyen</td>
<td>FASEG</td>
<td>90355751</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>NEGLO Kouma</td>
<td>Directeur</td>
<td>ENSL-UL</td>
<td>90052595 <a href="mailto:neglokouma@yahoo.com">neglokouma@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>BOKO Komivi</td>
<td>Representant du PAT FLESH</td>
<td>FLESH-UL</td>
<td>91320307 <a href="mailto:clauddebok@yahoo.com">clauddebok@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>H.E.Kwesi Ahoomey-Zunu</td>
<td>Prime Minister</td>
<td>Republic of Togo</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Prof. Koffi N. AGBENOTO</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Ministère de l’enseignement supérieur et de la recherche (MESR)</td>
<td>0022890143406 <a href="mailto:mlaurenta@yahoo.fr">mlaurenta@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Miss Kafui KUTOOWGBE</td>
<td>Personal Assistant of the Minister of Higher Education of Togo</td>
<td>MESR</td>
<td>91122982 <a href="mailto:kafukutowogbe@yahoo.fr">kafukutowogbe@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>DJABIRISAM Nassina</td>
<td>Secretaire</td>
<td>MESR</td>
<td>91148506 <a href="mailto:NassinaDjabirisa@yahoo.fr">NassinaDjabirisa@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>ZOGBENA Jervis</td>
<td>Directeur</td>
<td>DPPE/MESR</td>
<td>90072202 <a href="mailto:zogbemajerais@yahoo.fr">zogbemajerais@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Massan V. GAH</td>
<td>DBS</td>
<td>MESR</td>
<td>90168424</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>SEIDOU Bidjotime</td>
<td></td>
<td>MESR</td>
<td>90180100</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>BAOUTOU A.B. Bahama</td>
<td>D A INSE UL</td>
<td>INSE</td>
<td>90054329 <a href="mailto:baoutou@yahoo.fr">baoutou@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>SOGBADJI Y. Mawulolo</td>
<td></td>
<td>MESR</td>
<td>91975700</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>COULIBALEY Maboulah W. A</td>
<td>DBAN</td>
<td>MESR</td>
<td>90090513</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>ATTISOH Kangni</td>
<td>Chef Dir. RH</td>
<td>MESR/DAAF</td>
<td>90360080</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>DOGBO Yawotse</td>
<td>Responsable des Marchéés Publics</td>
<td>MESR</td>
<td>90983362 <a href="mailto:dobgo1233@yahoo.fr">dobgo1233@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>ABALO Atafeinam</td>
<td>Analyste de Projet</td>
<td>Présidence de la République</td>
<td><a href="mailto:atafeinamabalo@presidence.gov.tg">atafeinamabalo@presidence.gov.tg</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Koakou Agbéko</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministère du commerce</td>
<td>90865801</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>GAZERE Damigou</td>
<td>S.G</td>
<td>Chambre Régional de Métiers</td>
<td>90378774</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>MENSAH Naxime A.</td>
<td>Directeur de Etuds</td>
<td>ESGIS</td>
<td>90052271</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>BIRREGAH Charles</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td>EGA</td>
<td>90959547</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Sr. SUKA</td>
<td>Directrice ESAC-NDE</td>
<td>ESAGNDE</td>
<td>90124533</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Sr SUKA Afi PK</td>
<td>DG.C</td>
<td>ESAG-NDA</td>
<td>90124533 zita <a href="mailto:pauline@yahoo.fr">pauline@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>SOUDI Kodjo</td>
<td>Chef Dept.</td>
<td>BIEI</td>
<td>99477931 <a href="mailto:joseph.soudi@bie.it">joseph.soudi@bie.it</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Léon KABERUKA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Université de Kara</td>
<td>90182092 <a href="mailto:kaberukaleon@hotmail.com">kaberukaleon@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>DJOSSOU Kodjo</td>
<td>Délégué Général des étudiants</td>
<td>90598233</td>
<td>djoossouso@yahoocom</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>ALOFA Abel</td>
<td>Journaliste</td>
<td>TOGO BREAKINGNEWS</td>
<td>90184946 <a href="mailto:johalofa@yahoo.fr">johalofa@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Gilles OBLASSE</td>
<td>Journaliste</td>
<td>Afrique Revelation</td>
<td>90059783 <a href="mailto:gillesoblasse@gmail.com">gillesoblasse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Justin ABIDJI</td>
<td>Journaliste</td>
<td>Afrique Revelation</td>
<td>91374125 <a href="mailto:justinabidji@gmail.com">justinabidji@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Charles DJADE</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:djademoderan@yahoo.fr">djademoderan@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Thierry AFFANUKOE</td>
<td>Journaliste</td>
<td>Metropolys</td>
<td>92425178</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>TSATSOU Missan</td>
<td>Journaliste</td>
<td>PANORAMA</td>
<td>24457441</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>AQUDEZ</td>
<td>Cadre Banque</td>
<td>BOATG</td>
<td>90686868</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>ABGEKAPONOU Sibi</td>
<td>Cadre</td>
<td>BIDC</td>
<td>90053132 <a href="mailto:sagbekponou@bidc-esid.org">sagbekponou@bidc-esid.org</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>MAZNA Aimée</td>
<td>Représentante du DG de l'ANPE</td>
<td>ANPE</td>
<td>90840248 <a href="mailto:mazmakilaim@gmail.com">mazmakilaim@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>BOSSOU Kodzo Messan Gilles</td>
<td>Representant du Président de l'UCAO UUT</td>
<td>UCAO-UUT</td>
<td>90234516 <a href="mailto:bossougilles@gmail.com">bossougilles@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Aissatou Ndiaye</td>
<td>Charge de Programmes</td>
<td>ANCEFA</td>
<td>93318296 99964947</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>JOHNSON Patrick</td>
<td></td>
<td>LINKS CONSULT</td>
<td>91493470 22560168</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>GAKA Kossi</td>
<td>Cadre de Banque</td>
<td>BSIC</td>
<td>90232353</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>GAFA Teih</td>
<td></td>
<td>ORABANK</td>
<td>90045575</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Cocini TAMEGNON</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>ASOZOF</td>
<td>90042329 <a href="mailto:lautame@gmail.com">lautame@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>DAYO Ama</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASOZOF</td>
<td>22712784 <a href="mailto:asozof2005@yahoo.fr">asozof2005@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>TCHINI Kodjo</td>
<td></td>
<td>EARAU DGPI</td>
<td>90125392</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>TONGNEVI Landry</td>
<td></td>
<td>ESAUL</td>
<td>91596064</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>TSOLENYANU Koffi</td>
<td>Notaire</td>
<td>Chambre National des Notaires</td>
<td><a href="mailto:toaledodzi@hotmail.com">toaledodzi@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>JOHNSON Kudwo-Assau Daniel</td>
<td>Doyen</td>
<td>FASEG U.K</td>
<td>90045395 <a href="mailto:dan_kjohns@yahoo.fr">dan_kjohns@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>TANASSI Bakouaui</td>
<td>Technicien</td>
<td>TOGO-PRESS</td>
<td>90326856</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>TAKPONOU Joël</td>
<td>Journaliste</td>
<td>Journal &quot;le Progrès&quot;</td>
<td>0022997084802 00229966570101 <a href="mailto:joeltokponou@yahoo.fr">joeltokponou@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>BENIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>ANONARIN Babatoundé Afissou C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Press du Jour</td>
<td>0022997582739 <a href="mailto:tounddelaye@yahoo.fr">tounddelaye@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>BENIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Esther VIDZRAKA</td>
<td>Technicien</td>
<td>Radio Lomé</td>
<td>91599372</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Alice BARANDAO</td>
<td>Journaliste</td>
<td>Radio Lomé</td>
<td>90242746</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>BAGAH Denis</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>TVT</td>
<td>90854630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>ASSIH Luc</td>
<td>Journaliste</td>
<td>TVT</td>
<td>91696162</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Herivé Abiéci</td>
<td>NTUC</td>
<td>Radio Lomé</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>ADRAKU Koffi</td>
<td>Photographer</td>
<td></td>
<td>99211640</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>ZOUEME S. David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00229 97882948 <a href="mailto:zoueme@yahoo.fr">zoueme@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>BENIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Dr. TOSSADI, LUCB</td>
<td>DRH</td>
<td>Groupe BK</td>
<td>90155347</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>DJEUEMA Koukou K.</td>
<td>Charge de Project</td>
<td>MEF.DNA</td>
<td>93107173 <a href="mailto:creta.nade@yahoo.com">creta.nade@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Abdel-Fatah AMADOU</td>
<td>Chef Division</td>
<td>SPPRPF</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abdelamoudou@yahoo.fr">abdelamoudou@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Ako SOWAH</td>
<td>Rapporteur</td>
<td>Chambre Nationale de Huission de Justice (CNHJ)</td>
<td>90315811 <a href="mailto:leecemso@yahoo.fr">leecemso@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Djan Kotou GRATI</td>
<td>Directeur</td>
<td>INJS</td>
<td>90037671</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>KPOGLO Serge</td>
<td>Président</td>
<td>Club Psycho</td>
<td>90782071 <a href="mailto:serekpoglo@gmail.com">serekpoglo@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>AKAKPO Marcel</td>
<td>Président DG</td>
<td>CEPES ESGIS</td>
<td>90045139 <a href="mailto:macyakakpo@yahoo.com">macyakakpo@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Pr. BABA Gnon</td>
<td>Enseignant Chercheur Doyen</td>
<td></td>
<td>90223765</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Dr. Rosaline Dado WOROU HOUNDEKON</td>
<td>Rectorat Enseignant-Chercheur</td>
<td>Université d'Abomey Calavi</td>
<td>Benin +22995848961 <a href="mailto:worour@yahoo.fr">worour@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>BENIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>GDI GBEDJI Christopher</td>
<td>GDC Recteur UAK</td>
<td>Université de Bénin</td>
<td>96203023</td>
<td>BENIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>AYATOME Tamzgnon Yves</td>
<td>CVA</td>
<td>Université de Bénin</td>
<td>97147567</td>
<td>BENIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>BIAOU Awossou</td>
<td>Recteur</td>
<td>Université de Parakou</td>
<td></td>
<td>BENIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Bréhima TOUNKARA</td>
<td>UEMOA, Ouagadougou</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:btountkara@uemoa.a.inl">btountkara@uemoa.a.inl</a></td>
<td>BURKINA FASO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>AMOUZOU Sabiba Kousanta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Université de KARA</td>
<td>90025699 sabibakousanta@</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>POSITION</td>
<td>INSTITUTION/ORGANISATION</td>
<td>CONTACT/EMAIL</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>MEBA</td>
<td>Président</td>
<td>CCIT</td>
<td>22232900 yahoo.fr</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>ATTA KOFFI Rachide</td>
<td></td>
<td>CFUL</td>
<td>90799333 <a href="mailto:rachisdeatta@gmail.com">rachisdeatta@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>VONO Ekoue Djifa</td>
<td></td>
<td>CECO Group</td>
<td>91448509 <a href="mailto:vonful1973@gmail.com">vonful1973@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>PAGNIOU Maliouzila</td>
<td></td>
<td>CECO Group</td>
<td>91935619</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>ADJEODA Komlanvi</td>
<td></td>
<td>FNAFPP</td>
<td>90939514</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Conseiller Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ambassiede de France</td>
<td>22234600</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Anne BOENARE</td>
<td>Chargée mission Cooperation</td>
<td>Amasiede de France</td>
<td>22234600</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>SAIDA BUNK</td>
<td></td>
<td>L’ambassade d’Akemagne</td>
<td>228 22233232</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Arnoud AMELINA</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTL</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arnoud.amelina@auf.org">arnoud.amelina@auf.org</a></td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>PELINGUE Pohognoki</td>
<td></td>
<td>UTB</td>
<td>90909090</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>LARE Lalle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Directeur OBTS</td>
<td>90157668</td>
<td>TOGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Prof. KETOH Guillame</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.Doyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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