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The political transition in South Africa, from a regime which catered largely for the needs of a racial minority to a democratically elected government that needed to meet the needs and aspirations of all its citizens, posed huge challenges for every sector and institution of society. In education, the scope of the transformation agenda has proven to be daunting.

Policy research and development processes began in the early 1990s with the National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI) and various other studies led by the Mass Democratic Movement.\(^1\) Not only was it necessary to dismantle racial barriers within and between institutions, it was necessary to establish a completely new platform for the governance of the education system. As a consequence, much of the first five years of the new government was spent in establishing the policy and regulatory framework for the system, including the establishment of the Higher Education Branch in the national Department of Education (DoE) and a Council on Higher Education (CHE), which was to serve as an independent advisory body to the Minister of Education.

The government’s 1999 *Tirisano Call to Action: Mobilising citizens to build a South African education and training system for the 21st century* prioritised a review of the institutional landscape of higher education, which had been ‘largely dictated by the geo-political imagination of apartheid planners’ (Asmal 1999). However, the goal of reconfiguring the institutions of higher education incorporated many different objectives and alongside the necessary structural changes much work was needed
to increase and broaden access to and success in higher education in order to meet the development needs of individuals, the economy and society more broadly.

South Africa’s reconstruction and development agenda attracted the attention of governments and agencies worldwide, especially those that had supported the anti-apartheid struggle and who now lined up to support the government’s transformation goals. International support, including development cooperation, was welcomed by the South African government which recognised the importance of mobilising international assistance and solidarity towards its goal of building a more equitable, just and prosperous society.

This book is an in-depth reflection on one such experience of development cooperation in the area of higher education: the South Africa Norway Tertiary Education Development (SANTED) Programme. The programme spanned a ten-year period between 2000 and 2010 and emerged as an example of best practice in partnerships for higher education development.

This chapter will provide the policy context in South African higher education within which SANTED was located and will situate SANTED within the broader experience of development cooperation to higher education. It will outline the genesis and structure of the programme, its key areas of engagement, as well as its alignment with institutional and national policy priorities. Finally, some of the distinctive features of SANTED, to which its success has been ascribed, will be identified. These themes will be expanded elsewhere in chapters on particular interventions.

The higher education policy context in South Africa

governments entered into a bilateral agreement to provide for the first phase (2000–2005) of development support to the Department of Education in support of its ‘objective of building a higher education system that is based on principles of social justice and equity and that has the capacity to operate effectively and efficiently to meet the educational, cultural and economic needs of a diverse society’ (Department of Education 1997).

This agreement was reached at a time when many development support partners and donors were still unwilling to support higher education systems in developing countries and reflected the Norwegian government’s understanding of the importance of higher education in social and economic development.

*White Paper 3* framed the policy environment for the entire period in which the SANTED Programme was active, and at the time of writing this chapter, it remains the key national government policy framework for informing the regulation of universities in South Africa. It could be argued that the *White Paper* has stood the test of time because it located South African higher education in the context of the dual challenge of redressing the legacy of apartheid and responding to the needs of higher education and the country in an increasingly globalised and knowledge-driven environment.

The three main roles of higher education, as identified by the *White Paper*, were:

1. **Human resource development**: the mobilisation of human talent and potential through lifelong learning to contribute to the social, economic, cultural and intellectual life of a rapidly changing society.
2. **High-level skills training**: the training and provision of person power to strengthen this country’s enterprises, services and infrastructure. This requires the development of professionals and knowledge workers with globally equivalent skills, but who are socially responsible and conscious of their role in contributing to the national development effort and social transformation.
3. *Production, acquisition and application of new knowledge*: national growth and competitiveness is dependent on continuous technological improvement and innovation, driven by a well-organised, vibrant research and development system which integrates the research and training capacity of higher education with the needs of industry and of social reconstruction. (Department of Education 1997:10)

Within the framework provided by the *White Paper* and the Higher Education Act, the newly established Higher Education Branch of the DoE confronted the challenges of policy implementation on a scale which was unparalleled in South Africa. Some of the priorities included the development and introduction of a new funding formula, a higher education management information system, a student financial aid scheme and a framework for student enrolment planning for the system. New governance arrangements were introduced at systemic and institutional levels, including the establishment of the Council on Higher Education (CHE) in 1998, the reconstitution of university councils in line with the Higher Education Act, the establishment of institutional forums and the approval of new institutional statutes. This was unfolding in a period of limited capacity within the DoE’s Higher Education Branch and uneven capacity in the higher education institutions to manage complex change processes. In addition, with the formal removal of barriers to the access of black students to historically white institutions, new student enrolment patterns emerged which resulted in serious declines in student numbers at many historically black institutions, especially those located in the former homelands. The fall in enrolment impacted on already strained budgets and a number of the affected universities spiralled into crisis mode fuelled by leadership, governance and management shortcomings.

It should also be remembered that the country’s macro-economic Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) policy framework that was adopted in 1996 and which focussed on maintaining government expenditure within stringent fiscal and monetary targets, placed serious constraints on the funding available from the national fiscus to support the transformation agenda in higher education in this period.
Although the report of the National Commission on Higher Education (1996) and *White Paper 3* had already pointed to the need for the fundamental restructuring of the institutional landscape in higher education, it was only with the release in 2000 of the Council on Higher Education’s report *Towards a New Higher Education Landscape* that the debate on the rationale and basis for institutional restructuring gained momentum. The report provided the Minister of Education with far reaching advice, including on the reconfiguration of the landscape of higher education through institutional mergers and incorporations. The DoE subsequently released its National Plan for Higher Education (NPHE) in 2001, in large measure in response to the advice received from the CHE. The NPHE addressed five key policy goals and strategic objectives:

1. To provide increased access to higher education to all irrespective of race, gender, age, creed, class or disability and to produce graduates with the skills and competencies necessary to meet the human resource needs of the country.
2. To promote equitable access and to redress past inequalities through ensuring that the staff and student profiles in higher education progressively reflect the demographic realities of South African society.
3. To ensure diversity in the organisational form and institutional landscape of the higher education system through mission and programme differentiation, thus enabling the addressing of regional and national needs in social and economic development.
4. To build high-level research capacity to address the research and knowledge need of South Africa.
5. To build new institutional and organisational forms and new institutional identities through regional collaboration between institutions. (Ministry of Education 2001:17-18)

It is this overall policy context that shaped the conceptualisation of SANTED from the perspective of the South African government and informed the projects that were formalised in the first business plan.
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for the five-year period which commenced late in 2000. As stated in the business plan the assistance from the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad) was to assist the South African government to address issues of ‘access, retention, institutional capacity and cooperation’ (SANTED 2000). This translated into five project components in this phase:

1. The University of Durban-Westville’s Upward Bound University-Wide Project, which addressed the interface between schooling and university in order to improve the chances of access and success in higher education of students from disadvantaged schooling backgrounds.

2. The University of the Western Cape’s Equitable Access through Enrolment Management Project, which aimed to support the university’s strategies to improve the access and success of non-traditional students to enable it to plan and manage student enrolment growth in line with its mission and national goals.

3. Formative research on the above access and retention projects, which was to be undertaken with a Norwegian partner university.

4. The promotion of cooperation between South African higher education institutions and higher education institutions in the Southern African Development Community (SADC) region.

5. Institutional capacity building.²

The broad themes of access, retention and success; institutional capacity building; and regional cooperation were carried into the second phase of SANTED which covered the period 2006 to 2009.

Later in this chapter, a reflection will be provided on the negotiations that took place between the DoE and Norad, which led not only to the agreements captured in the November 2000 business plan, but also to establishing the basis for ongoing engagements between the two principal parties. However, to understand these engagements, it is necessary to explore the DoE’s experiences with development cooperation, which, in addition to the prevailing higher education policy context, informed the genesis of SANTED.
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Experiences of development cooperation

Following the first democratic elections in 1994, the new government received development assistance from many countries, with much of it being channelled through the National Treasury under the broad umbrella of the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP). The DoE received extensive support in a number of areas including for its own organisational and capacity development and for policy development. It also negotiated grants for direct support to schooling at the provincial level. In higher education, support was received for a number of areas, including policy development (such as the work of the NCHE), capacity building, particularly of the historically disadvantaged institutions, and for student financial aid.

Particular priority was given to student financial aid, especially in the period 1994 to 2000 and, where possible, development assistance to higher education was directed to this area. As articulated in the NPHE, the Ministry was committed to ‘ensuring that academically able students who do not have the financial resources are not prevented from pursuing higher education studies’ (Ministry of Education 2001:42). The National Student Financial Aid Scheme (NSFAS) was established in 1996 and was administered by its precursor the Tertiary Education Fund of South Africa (TEFSA), which in 2000 was changed into a statutory body. In 1994, government’s contribution to the fund was ZAR10.3 million, compared to donor contributions of ZAR60.1 million in the same year. Donor contributions peaked in 1997 with ZAR153.3 million coming into the fund (Ministry of Education 2001:44). Some of the donors to NSFAS included the European Union, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), United Nations Education and Training Programme for Southern Africa (UNETPSA), Irish Aid, Department for International Development (DFID) and the Swiss government. However, by 2000, the government’s contribution of ZAR437.4 million far exceeded the donor amount of ZAR27.5 million (Ministry of Education 2001). There can be little doubt that the NSFAS has been the most successful (individual) redress intervention, and it has allowed large numbers of financially disadvantaged students to access...
higher education. The data presented here also demonstrate that the DoE was able to draw effectively on donor funding to build the NSFAS in the early years, allowing the government the opportunity to budget incrementally for significant increases to its own annual contributions. The NSFAS has grown considerably and in the 2012/2013 financial year, ZAR5 billion was available from the fiscus alone for loans and bursaries for university and further education and training college students.

In the post-1994 period, the Tertiary Education Linkages Project (TELP), funded by USAID, was a major intervention which spanned the period between 1995 and 2006. It was broadly intended to contribute to increasing access to and the quality of higher education for disadvantaged communities through the strengthening of the capacity of the historically disadvantaged universities. The project was governed by USAID, the vice-chancellors of the 17 universities and technikons deemed to be historically disadvantaged, and the DoE. The vice-chancellors were central to the identification of the focal areas for TELP, which included curriculum, research, staff, student, management and administrative development. The management of the project was contracted to the United Negro College Fund Special Programs (UNCFSP), which was largely led by staff from the United States, especially in the early phase. Approximately USD50 million was allocated to TELP for projects in South Africa, for administrative overheads of the UNCFSP and for project costs relating to the involvement of partner US universities affiliated to the UNCFSP.

TELP was conceptualised at a time when the DoE’s Higher Education Branch was in its infancy and pre-occupied with other urgent matters. This meant that much of the early negotiations with USAID took place without the full involvement of the DoE and the agenda was largely set by the vice-chancellors. This resulted in a somewhat ‘arm’s length’ relationship between TELP and the DoE, and meant that the DoE had relatively little influence in shaping project priorities or spending, especially in its first phase. Efforts were nevertheless made in the second phase of TELP to forge better synergies with the DoE’s priorities. However, by this time, the governance and organisational arrangements in TELP were well entrenched and the DoE had limited
success in influencing TELP’s interventions. It is worth noting that USAID and the contractor, UNCFSP, were both open to negotiating with the DoE to shift some of the priorities within the constraints of the operational and legal framework of TELP. Interestingly, some of the vice-chancellors resisted change, presumably as it might have impacted on their allocations.

The DoE had a number of concerns about the focus areas of TELP, some of the implementation modalities and, in some instances, the lack of sufficient accountability on the part of some of the beneficiary universities and technikons. One of the central concerns at the time was that resources were being channelled to some universities that had very little capacity to benefit from the investment. The DoE also wanted to see a greater focus on assisting the institutions to respond better to the new enrolment and other planning processes that were being introduced at the time. Some gains were made in this area, but the DoE continued to have reservations about the use of ‘once-off’ workshops for capacity building.

While a systematic reflection of the achievements and shortcomings of TELP is well beyond the scope of this chapter, there can be little doubt that some institutions, such as the former Peninsula Technikon, did draw significant benefit from TELP. This has been ascribed by some observers to the commitment of the institutional leadership (particularly the vice-chancellor) to capacity building, and the existence of well-functioning administrative, financial and management systems. Individual staff members also benefited from the training opportunities that were made available, especially at the partner US institutions.

The TELP experience undoubtedly influenced the way in which the DoE approached the negotiations with the Norwegian partners (Norad and the Norwegian Embassy in Pretoria), both in the conceptualisation of SANTED and in setting the framework for ongoing deliberations. From the outset, there was a determination on the part of the DoE to do things differently; in particular, to seek a better balance between the role of the DoE in shaping and monitoring the programme and respecting the autonomy of institutions to oversee implementation.

In the post-apartheid period, there were also a number of other
substantial development cooperation-funded initiatives in higher education. The Dutch, for example, focused support on the holistic development of a single institution, the former Technikon Northern Gauteng. While the DoE was supportive of this initiative and recognised its potential, it had no direct involvement in the project. The South African Netherlands research Programme on Alternatives in Development (SANPAD) has been a highly successful initiative that has supported research capacity building since 1997.

The DoE played an important role in shaping the European Union-funded project for building the capacity and holdings of the libraries of the historically disadvantaged universities. Good working relationships were forged between the key partners, the EU delegation in Pretoria, the DoE, the British Council (which was appointed as the implementing agency), and the beneficiary universities. While much of the energy of this project was absorbed in meeting the complex rules and regulations of the EU, especially for the procurement of library books and other resources, the project goals were clearly defined by the needs of the institutions, and largely met.

There were also many examples of development assistance grants which enabled the DoE to undertake various policy investigations, often with the assistance of international consultants and other experts.

**Negotiation of the development cooperation agreement and setting up the SANTED Programme**

The South African government valued its relationship with Norway, which was rooted in the Norwegian government’s support to the anti-apartheid struggle over many years. While this history set the very positive tone for the negotiations, as did the explicit commitment to joint agenda setting, it became clear that some work was nevertheless needed to understand each other’s priorities and objectives, and to build trust and joint ownership of SANTED.

An early decision was taken to offer support directly to selected higher education institutions. No provision was to be made for support to the DoE or any of its entities, such as the CHE or NSFAS. However,
Norad was explicit in its desire to ensure that the institutional-level interventions would be in line with the objectives and priorities of the DoE, and that this would be entrenched in SANTED’s governance arrangements.

Selecting institutions

The next step was to arrive at a decision on which institutions to support. Norwegian support to South African higher education was not new. There was therefore a request from Norad to provide support at universities where it had already established relationships. The University of Durban-Westville (UDW), University of the Western Cape (UWC) and the University of the North (UNIN) were earmarked for support. While the DoE was sympathetic to this history, there was, at the same time, a desire for flexibility in the choice of institutions.

The DoE was comfortable with the inclusion of UWC and UDW, but did not support the participation of UNIN, which at that time was experiencing serious governance, leadership and management problems and would not, in the DoE’s view, have been able to manage effectively or even benefit from a significant donor-funded project. The Norwegian delegation nevertheless decided to visit UNIN to make its own assessment. Sadly, the matter resolved itself as there was no capacity at UNIN to receive the delegation, let alone engage in discussion about potential project support.

The DoE then proposed the inclusion of the University of Fort Hare (UFH) in the initiative. This suggestion was not initially well received by Norad as Fort Hare, at that stage, was only just emerging from a serious leadership and management crisis of its own and the Norwegian delegation was rightly concerned that, like UNIN, Fort Hare would not be a viable partner. However, the DoE was determined that the time was right to secure support for the building of administrative and managerial capacity which was central to the turnaround strategy of the Fort Hare leadership headed by the newly appointed Vice-Chancellor Derrick Swartz, a highly respected academic with excellent standing in the broader community. Systems were clearly lacking at Fort Hare, but
the political will to embrace change was apparent and it was on that basis that agreement was reached to make a significant investment in the revitalisation of the university. The DoE was fully cognisant of the risks involved in this decision and, from the outset, took steps to complement the SANTED activities with targeted support, and closely monitored developments at the university. Similar arguments were made to include the University of Zululand (UNIZUL) in the first phase of SANTED and the University of Venda (UNIVEN) in the second phase, and they subsequently became part of the programme.

**Selecting themes**

Reaching agreement on the themes to be supported was relatively easy, especially given the commitment of Norad and the Norwegian Embassy to support the DoE’s transformation agenda for higher education.

In the first instance, the DoE looked to SANTED for targeted support to help achieve a number of its key objectives.

The Higher Education Branch in the DoE viewed SANTED as an important vehicle to provide earmarked support to the selected historically disadvantaged universities in order to strengthen, amongst other things, their core administrative and financial management policies and systems, and to improve the quality of teaching and learning provision. As stated in the business plan ‘the institutional projects aim to strengthen institutions by helping them to translate critical aspects of their strategic and/or business plans into reality’ (SANTED 2000:2).

Over the years, all three universities had received considerable redress funding from the DoE over and above their regular subsidy. However, much of this additional funding was used by these universities to meet pressing debt obligations and to supplement budgets in essential areas, such as salaries and maintenance. This meant that there was little left for building the capacity which was so necessary if these institutions were to stabilise and become more sustainable. It was therefore particularly significant that, through SANTED, the DoE, in close consultation with the universities, was able to earmark resources for the identified capacity-building initiatives. The DoE was also able, through the
SANTED office, to monitor progress and hold the leadership at these institutions accountable for the effective use of the grants. The close connections and inter-relationship between the DoE, the SANTED office, and the institutions proved to be one of the key features of the programme and contributed significantly to successful delivery. The SANTED contribution to capacity building also complemented the recapitalisation funding that was later received by these institutions as part of the restructuring process of the DoE. Furthermore, the capacity which was built through SANTED assisted the institutions to use the recapitalisation funding more effectively.

Following the early discussions which took place with UDW and UWC about areas that they wished to prioritise for potential support from SANTED, it became clear that the issue of enhancing student access and retention was a recurring theme, and this resonated with the policy objectives of the DoE. This theme became a key thread throughout the life of SANTED, although necessary shifts were made in response to the changing context and the best practice which emerged in the earlier phase. This will be discussed in Chapter 4.

As outlined above, it was agreed that SANTED’s resources (in the first phase) would be prioritised to drive capacity development at UFH and UNIZUL and to enhance student access and retention at UDW and UWC. But, both the Norwegians and the DoE wanted to use the grant to explore new ground. It soon emerged that the parties shared two interests. The first was to find ways to expand the reach of SANTED into SADC. Norad was no stranger to the region and in alignment with Norway’s development cooperation priorities in southern Africa, it was open to promoting higher education in the SADC region. On the South African side, the SADC Protocol on Education and Training had been ratified by the Parliament of South Africa in February 1999 and the South African government’s main contribution to the Protocol was to enable a growing number of SADC students to study in South Africa by treating them as ‘home students’ for subsidy purposes. However, few resources were available to promote collaboration between South African universities and universities in the rest of the region. This was to become a significant area of engagement for SANTED and straddled the
full duration of the programme (see Chapter 7). From the outset, both parties recognised that this was a unique opportunity to pilot activities in an area in which there was limited institutional experience.

The second area of joint interest was to explore ways in which SANTED could be used to strengthen links between South African and Norwegian academics. From the outset, it was understood that, in the course of time, development cooperation between Norway and South Africa would be replaced by other forms of bilateral relations, which in the area of higher education and research would be based on knowledge partnerships. It was therefore important to use initiatives such as SANTED to build sustainable partnerships as bridges to future bilateral cooperation arrangements. It was with this in mind that the Formative Research Project was conceptualised to understand what facilitates or obstructs successful outcomes of planned change. The intention was that researchers from the universities of Bergen, Western Cape and Durban-Westville would jointly work to undertake the formative evaluation of the access and retention interventions, and use this as a basis to reflect on project implementation, draw lessons for higher education, and advance knowledge of policy implementation and organisational change. Although this component yielded useful institution-specific findings, it was probably the weakest in SANTED and failed to generate any substantial systemic outcomes, and an early decision was taken to abandon the project. Despite this setback, within the larger framework of SANTED, lasting relationships have been established between researchers in the two countries.

In the second phase of SANTED, two new areas were added. The first was programmatically located under the institutional capacity-building theme. It was an ambitious and innovative collaborative project to assist two newly established comprehensive universities, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU) and the University of Johannesburg (UJ) ‘to address the development of a new academic structure and new curricula for comprehensive universities’ (DoE 2006:8). Both NMMU and UJ had been established through mergers of traditional universities with technikons and were designated as ‘comprehensive’ universities. This work provided the space to pilot new approaches and possibilities that
could, in turn, inform curriculum development at other comprehensive universities. The project is elaborated upon in Chapter 6.

The second new area was multilingualism (see Chapter 5). This project was intended to provide institutions with the opportunity to explore multilingual approaches to teaching and learning which could enhance student success. This new project area resonated with the need expressed by institutions to give practical effect to their language policies. It was also an area of common interest amongst researchers in Norway and South Africa, and was therefore seen as an opportunity to stimulate academic research into multilingualism in higher education.

**Selecting organisational structures**

There was much discussion about the best institutional location for the programme. Initially Norad was keen that the organisational structure for SANTED reside within the DoE to ensure optimal ownership by the Department. While the DoE had no in-principle objection to this proposal, it was acutely aware of the likely constraints that this would impose on the programme. In particular, the programme would be required to comply with the procurement, employment and other policies and administrative procedures of the DoE, which were not sufficiently flexible nor nimble to support the efficient and timely implementation of a donor-funded initiative. The DoE was also keen to secure strong ownership of the programme by the participating universities and to enable institutional autonomy in the implementation of projects and felt that these objectives would be better served if the programme was located at arm’s length from government.

In the light of these arguments it was agreed that the programme should be located outside of the DoE and the Centre for Education Policy Development (CEPD) was selected as the implementing agency for SANTED, based on its demonstrated track record of managing other donor-funded projects on behalf of the DoE. While the CEPD had good financial and other management systems in place, it had relatively little experience of working in higher education. Most of its focus was in the area of schooling.
It was therefore particularly important for the DoE to retain ownership and overall responsibility for the programme and this was formalised through the Director of its Management Support Directorate, Dr Sanette Boshoff. The DoE also took the lead in identifying the first Director of SANTED, the late Mr Derrick Young, who was seconded to SANTED from the University of the Witwatersrand. He came with a wealth of knowledge and experience of the higher education sector honed from his work as an academic and through active involvement in the development of higher education policy within the democratic movement. He was highly respected within the sector, as were the directors who succeeded him. Although administratively located in the CEPD, the SANTED directors managed the programme and were directly accountable to the DoE.

**What was distinctive about SANTED?**

Two major independent reviews of SANTED have been conducted (by Hansen, Africa and Boeren in 2005; and Smith and Cross in 2009), numerous project reports have been compiled, and there have been many opportunities for SANTED stakeholders to meet and reflect on challenges, achievements and setbacks, including the Close-out Conference in September 2010. The overall consensus is that SANTED has been astonishingly successful in avoiding many of the problems which are known to bedevil large-scale development cooperation projects. As stated by Smith and Cross (2009:6) in the Mid-term Review of SANTED II:

> The effectiveness of the programme may be measured by the extent to which objectives were achieved, whether SANTED was critical to this achievement and whether the changes brought about by the programme are sustainable. On all these measures SANTED II can be judged an effective intervention.

A number of key factors contributed to the success of SANTED. These are summarised below and will also be elaborated on in subsequent chapters.
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- Projects were well aligned with the policies and priorities of the South African government and beneficiary universities in South Africa and the region. Examples of this alignment have already been provided in this chapter.
- There was strong ownership and leadership of SANTED at all levels, i.e. the political principals in both countries; the Norwegian Embassy in Pretoria (including successive Norwegian ambassadors to South Africa who embraced the programme); the senior management of the DoE and Norad, who took joint responsibility for the governance of SANTED, and who convened for the annual programme meetings; the Management Support Directorate of the Higher Education Branch of the DoE which assumed overall responsibility for programme implementation; the director and staff of the SANTED office at the CEPD; and vice-chancellors and project staff at participating institutions.
- There were committed and identifiable champions for the programme at all of these levels. Of relevance also was that many of these champions were in office for much of the life of SANTED. This was particularly important in relation to the staff in the DoE who held the historical memory of the programme.
- Throughout its entire period of operation, SANTED was supported by strong organisational arrangements, including highly credible professional leadership within the SANTED office. Each of the successive directors of SANTED were highly respected leaders in higher education and came to the programme with a wealth of experience and knowledge of the sector. The SANTED office maintained close contact with projects through its monitoring and evaluation framework which included regular institutional visits.
- SANTED actively promoted networks and learning across the participating institutions and beyond. This took different forms, including seminars and meetings of staff from different institutions working in the same thematic areas, and the dissemination of best practice through reports and conference presentations.
- The programme arrangements were sufficiently flexible to allow
for changes in focus or direction if this was required. Problems at institutional level tended to be detected early on, especially given the close contact between the SANTED office and project staff. This meant that, with the support of institutional leaders, strategies could be developed to remedy shortcomings. Where there was little prospect of progress, decisions were taken at the Annual Programme Meeting to curtail initiatives, as was the case with the Formative Research Project in the first phase of SANTED.

• Unlike many development cooperation projects, SANTED was not bogged down by onerous and debilitating bureaucratic requirements. Both the Norwegians and South Africans recognised the need to account for the use of public funds, and agreements were reached to ensure that all projects were measured against clearly articulated objectives.

At a systemic level, and particularly for the DoE, the key legacy of SANTED was that it shaped the way in which the DoE approached other development cooperation partnerships. The lessons learnt from the SANTED experience allowed the DoE to be a more confident partner in negotiating and managing development cooperation agreements. The new strategies which evolved from SANTED were applied, for example, in shaping the grant provided by the Finnish government in support of the DoE’s restructuring priorities (with emphasis on the provision of ICT infrastructure and capacity in newly merged institutions and quality assurance in the newly designated universities of technology) and the large-scale support received from the European Union to support the higher education sector to develop its policies and programmes for the prevention and mitigation of HIV and AIDS.

The success of the institutional projects, which are elaborated upon in other chapters of this book, attest to the SANTED legacy at individual institutions and the broader influence these projects had on the South African higher education system as a whole.
Endnotes

1. The Mass Democratic Movement was an alliance of anti-apartheid groups formed in 1988, following restrictions imposed by the apartheid government on the United Democratic Front and other anti-apartheid organisations.

2. These were located at the universities of Fort Hare and Zululand.

3. Technikons were formerly institutions which offered technical and vocational qualifications at higher education level. They were re-designated as universities of technology in 2003 as part of the overall restructuring of the institutional landscape of higher education in South Africa.

4. These new institutions, as a consequence, offered a range of programmes that spanned the vocational, professional and general academic, and qualifications that ranged from diplomas to doctorates. There were no precedents for this institutional type in South Africa.