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CHAPTER 7
KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE

Johann Mouton, Robin Pocock and Lauren Wildschut

7.1 Introduction

The ultimate goal of the three HELM programmes was to effect positive change in the leadership and management practices at HEIs in the respective countries. The aim was to raise awareness of current issues and challenges in HE leadership and management (HELM) and to thereby encourage various layers of leadership and management in the universities to change and improve their practices in diverse fields, such as academic leadership, university governance, student governance, research and scholarship management, human resources management, financial management, quality assurance and others. In order to affect the desired changes, the HE councils in Tanzania, Uganda and Ghana developed new course materials and delivered a wide range of courses, utilising a wide array of delivery modes, to a large number of university staff. In essence this was an exercise in knowledge transfer or knowledge exchange.

The term ‘knowledge transfer’ traditionally referred to a rather linear process whereby experts (scientists/academics) would transfer (using various modes of communication) knowledge to lay or non-expert audiences. But various criticisms have been raised against this assumption of linearity and uni-directionality. The so-called ‘transfer’ of knowledge is rarely a one-directional process, and more often than not involves various exchanges, feedback loops and iterations. It is, therefore, not surprising that the term ‘knowledge exchange’ has become more generally accepted to describe this process. Knowledge exchange is defined as collaborative problem solving between researchers and decision makers that happens through linkage and exchange. Effective knowledge exchange involves interaction between decision makers and researchers, and results in mutual learning through the process of planning, producing, disseminating and applying existing or new research in decision making.

A review of the way in which the different HELM courses were designed and implemented shows that a more interactive and collaborative knowledge-exchange process occurred. All three councils utilised a variety of mechanisms (needs assessments, internal peer review of course materials, internal monitoring of course modules, external mid-term evaluations, interactive feedback sessions during training sessions, and a final round of summative evaluations) to inform the process of knowledge exchange.

In Part Two we discussed in some detail how the programmes in each country were developed, how these were delivered (utilising different implementation models) as well as how ERA conducted external monitoring and evaluation studies of the outcomes. In the final analysis, the question that needs to be addressed is how the knowledge exchanged in these programmes were taken up (adopted) and used, and what impact these programmes have made.

In the knowledge-exchange literature clear distinctions are made between knowledge uptake (which requires a deliberate, intentional decision or action on the part of the intended beneficiary/recipient to adopt the knowledge or skills that are being transferred); knowledge use (the different uses that knowledge are put to); and knowledge impact (the changes in behaviours and practices by individual and organisations that result from using the knowledge gained during this process).
The relationship between uptake, use and impact is illustrated in Figure 7.1.

Figure 7.1: A framework for knowledge uptake and impact

In the case of the HELM programmes, the respective councils produced new knowledge and synthesised existing knowledge around HE leadership and management. This was packaged in different programme modules and courses and delivered to the target audiences. The knowledge ‘outputs’ in this instance refer to the course materials, case studies, presentations and other supporting materials that were distributed at the different training sessions.

In the remainder of the chapter we discuss how the knowledge thus produced and delivered was taken up (adopted) and used, and what its impact has been in the respective countries.

7.2 Training uptake and use of knowledge

Delegates from the three programmes were invited via email to participate in an online survey to evaluate the impact of the respective programme. Thereafter, a sample of programme stakeholders was purposefully selected to obtain more detailed insights into the results of the surveys. Fifty-one percent of NCHE delegates, 46% of NCTE delegates, and 51% of TCU delegates participated in the online survey. Survey participants were asked if they had been able to make any changes to their leadership and management practices as a result of the training programme. The proportions of respondents answering “Yes” are presented in the chart below. The chart also shows which of these respondents provided examples of ways in which their practice had been changed.¹

¹ Some respondents did not provide examples of how their practice had changed, either by not answering the question or by just stating that the training had changed their knowledge, skills or attitudes (KSAs). The latter was not considered as a change in practice, as changes in KSAs do not necessarily equate to changed behaviour.
The chart above shows that the large majority of respondents from all councils felt that the training had had an impact on their job practice. However, a substantial portion of the respondents did not provide suitable examples. The chart below presents the three most common areas of impact as reported by respondents.

In the following subsections these areas are discussed in more detail, with reference to the survey and interview results.

**Impact on leadership**

Delegates from the NCTE and TCU training commonly mentioned changes in their leadership practice. Non-specific changes in leadership were fairly common in the respondents’ comments, for example:

NCHE: Changes in [my] leadership …

TCU: I became aware of effective leadership and therefore followed those principles and changed small things …

NCTE: [My] leadership style … improved.
The most frequently identified change in leadership across the three councils was the adoption of participatory or democratic styles of leadership. Some respondents simply stated that they had adopted these principles but did not explain how they had done this:

**TCU:** [I] have experimented [with] democratic and decentralised approaches to management at faculty level. 
[I] improved in the participatory kind of leadership. 
In terms of leadership, I have been able to practice [a] participative leadership style in my department.

**NCTE:** [I have] adopted democratic leadership as a personal leadership style. 
My leadership style is now more open and participatory.

Other respondents gave examples of how they had adopted participatory leadership skills, especially in terms of involving staff and sometimes students in their decision making:

**NCHE:** [I adopted] a mix of qualities for leadership and management, especially in terms of ... involving colleagues in decision making 
[I began] involving all in the work to enhance ... ownership and belonging to decision making. 
Designing of academic programmes is now more inclusive ... top management more consultative.

**NCTE:** Improved all inclusive decision making. [I] organised [a] retreat to brainstorm on matters concerning my school and the outcome was fantastic. 
Involving subordinates in decision making: consensus building with superiors and others in management. 
Increased involvement of staff and lecturers in decision making through monthly meetings and annual workshops to review previous and prepare new strategic plans.

**TCU:** [I now] involve students in decision making in the dept. 
More involvement of staff and students in decision-making process in [the] running of my university. 
A change in a style of leadership and the way people can become involved in decision making has [made it] more participatory ...

**Impact on management**
The most commonly reported changes in management were of a general nature, for example:

**NCHE:** Good management practices have been recommended and implemented. 
Improved on the management of university processes. 
Demonstration of role of new management strategy in higher education.

**NCTE:** Enhancing my ... management practices. 
After the programme I made serious contributions to management decisions. 
Managing people.

**TCU:** I am applying management principle[s] in day-to-day activities. 
I can see changes in ... [my] approach to various managerial duties.
Many of the comments referred to more specific examples of management practices that have changed, such as delegation, team work, staff meetings and time management. The following quotations are examples of these more specific changes.

**Delegation**

NCHE:  [I am] more efficient in apportioning tasks to colleagues.
       I have learnt how to delegate some of my activities.
       Initially I used to concentrate most [of] the work onto myself; currently I do a lot more delegation where necessary.

NCTE:  [My] responsibilities are shared.
       I am able to act in firm ways and delegate some aspect of my functions.

TCU:   I delegate more.

**Time management**

NCHE:  Change in time management and in beating deadlines.
       Time organisation.
       Working on deadlines.

NCTE:  I can now prepare my monthly job schedules [for] NCTE … More time conscious.
       [I] instituted and enforced punctuality and time management at work.

TCU:   Time management.

**Team work**

NCHE:  Yes, especially ensuring teamwork …
       Working together.
       We have been able to work as a team.

NCTE:  Working with team spirit and understanding.

TCU:   I am ensuring … [the] development of team work.

**Staff meetings**

NCHE:  [I] organised regular meetings for our department.
       Holding of regular meetings
       Hold regular meetings with subordinate staff.

NCTE:  Structured and more timely/regular engagement of all levels of employees has been introduced.
       Regular meetings with faculty to know challenges and how to overcome them.

TCU:   I changed my management style by introducing weekly meetings for all academic and operational HODs to find out what went wrong or where do we need to strengthen our attention and find way[s] forward for the next week.
       More meetings, sharing ideas.
**Impact on interpersonal skills**

Respondents – particularly those from the NCTE SALT programme – reported improved interpersonal skills in the areas of communication and working relations with colleagues. The following quotations are examples of these reported changes.

**Working relations**

**NCHE:** Respecting each other.
- I can now ... adopt a fair and firmer attitude to staff working under me.
- I [learnt] that other people are as important as I am.

**NCTE:** How to relate [to] fellow academics and support staff in the university to get the optimum productivity and cooperation from them.
- I have been able to accommodate more divergent views and reaction[s] from my peers and subordinates.
- Used the knowledge to improve my relationship with those staff members I am leading in the university as Head of Department/Vice-Dean of my Faculty.
- As a head of department, I learnt to be more firm without worrying much about pleasing all my subordinates, because I learnt that as a head or supervisor you will not be able to please everyone.

**TCU:** Cultivate trust and credibility.
- I could make some changes in the workplace by the gained confidence, for example dealing with some difficult people diplomatically ...
- I have allowed staff to [express] more criticism of me and the management.

**Communication**

**NCHE:** Adapt a mix of qualities for leadership and management especially in terms of communication ...
- Listening to all members ...
- [D]ialogue with colleagues and subordinates.

**NCTE:** I have now made communication and information very important among subordinates, peers and colleagues.
- I improved my communication style.
- Communicating more effectively.

**TCU:** Ensuring communications flow.
- Develop[ed the] art of listening. Persuading others.
- Different means of communication (email, mobiles, hardcopy papers were used to communicate with my members of staff instead of using only a hard copy paper).

**Impact on strategic planning**

Delegates from all councils reported changes in their strategic planning as a result of the training, but those from the NCHE and TCU programmes were the most likely to report changes in this area. Such changes included developing strategic plans for the first time, reviewing current plans, or being more strategic in planning in general. The following quotations are examples of these:
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General planning
NCHE: I certainly plan better and with a more holistic view of how the different pieces tie in together in terms of high-quality service delivery in higher education. It is easy to get bogged down by the daily grind of administration at a faculty. This training helps you keep the bigger picture in mind as one plans; having a strategic vision, etc.
NCTE: Planning ... became more effective.
TCU: Improved setting of goals and visions, better strategic planning.

Creating new strategic plans
NCHE: Making strategic plans for my department to guide me in the management of the department.
NCTE: We have a departmental development strategy in place ...
TCU: Involvement of staff, including junior academic members of staff in conceiving plans and developing the implementation process.

Reviewing current plans
NCHE Initiated [a] review of the University's strategic plan.
NCTE Increased involvement of staff and lecturers in decision making through monthly meetings and annual workshops to review previous and prepare new strategic plans.
TCU [R] edesigning the institutional strategic plan.

Impact on capacity building
Delegates from all councils reported that capacity building was receiving attention at their home institutions as a result of training. Some of the capacity building was clearly linked to sharing knowledge from the workshops; however in some other comments the content or purpose of the capacity building was not specific, for example:
NCHE: [I] facilitated capacity building programmes for District Planning Units and many others.
NCTE: Have workshops for HODs.
TCU: To provide my staff with frequent trainings to improve their performance.
Efforts to initiate a training programme that will be housed in my department.
The following section goes into more detail of how knowledge from the workshop has reportedly been shared by delegates.

Sharing knowledge from workshop
The following quotations from the survey show how some delegates have shared knowledge and skills from the workshop with their colleagues.
NCHE: I have trained fellow staff in educational leadership skills. They [gave a] very good evaluation from my training. This means I can enable others with my knowledge. At [my] work place I have 52 staff members and 3,000 students in my department — leadership skills [are] important to administer all this.
Reports of workshops were always prepared and submitted to top managers and these were subsequently adopted at management level and sent out to respective line managers for implementation.
We rolled out the skills to other university departments and faculties.
NCTE: In relation to the topic of academic leadership, I decided to serve as a ‘training coordinator’ to my younger colleagues. I circulated higher education articles for their reading and review. I also gave them a written assignment with some guidelines to be submitted for discussion on a given date.

Been able to organise presentations on leadership and research methods for a faculty of 80.

TCU: I will keep on sharing the lessons from the workshop with my colleagues.

It must be noted that the NCHE was the only council that assisted some of their institutions to hold dissemination training meetings. NCHE respondents to the survey described how the NCHE had helped them with this. Their responses show how the NCHE encouraged and reminded them to hold dissemination workshops, provided funding, attended the workshops and, in some cases, assisted with facilitation: Specifically, the NCHE provided financial support (USD 320 per institution) for participants to run their own training. On this small budget seven out of 14 universities cascaded elements of the training to at least 481 university employees. They used staff who had attended the MLP as presenters, or paid for some of the original MLP presenters to facilitate, and used the training materials from the original workshops. Some developed their own presentations based on the hard copies of PowerPoints provided to them. These dissemination workshops are an impressive sign of training uptake by NCHE delegates. The dissemination workshops have ensured a far greater programme reach; while the NCHE originally trained 150 delegates, the dissemination workshops have ensured that at least another 481 university employees have been reached.

The NCHE urged participating universities to organise similar workshops within their universities.

I facilitated at an in-house training to the staff of Islam University in Uganda (IUIU) that was partly funded by the NCHE.

[The NCHE] gave some fund[s] to the tune of USD 350 dollars to supplement the preparations … of our dissemination workshops to our staff …

It was very useful because the NCHE also came over as observer and intervened wherever possible.

One or two officials from the NCHE were present for the seminars and they address[ed] us at the end …

[O]rganised management and leadership workshop for staff who did not participate in the NCHE training.

[T]hey also facilitated one of our follow-up workshops at the university, with other administrators who [did not] attend the NCHE workshop.

NCHE interviewees also detailed how their institutions disseminated the training:

Nkumba University has designed it in such a way that they would want to have it as a quarterly event. The entire staff went there for the training [and] it was very interesting … [There were] about 60 or more [attendees] but the head of the institution, the Council members, all of them were there … They issued certificates to participants.

[MLP staff]

[A]fter the trainings we organised local trainers at the university. It was attended by like 60 staff members, heads of departments, senior lecturers … [It] was positive, they appreciated their training. Three of us conducted the training … [T]hey were very happy and they recommended the training to continue.

[Kyambogo participant]

[A]fter the entire training we organised a three-day training for all the teaching staff and the administrators and we went through all the modules. [W]e covered all the modules and we invited a representative so each one of us was given a topic …
or all the three days we had a packed programme but we managed to cover all the questions … [B]ut we tailored it to the needs of our institution so that is what we did – but we covered all … My topic was on Equity and Access Social Justice, that’s what I teach. I have a passion for that … We had also group work – we used almost the same method. After group work we give them some questions or maybe give them a test. [W]e focused on Bugema issues, everything was on our institution.

[Bugema participant]

[T]he first cohort came back and disseminated the workshop which included the HODs, members of the university council and top management … They brought a colleague from Nkumba to present on Globalisation in Higher Education … After the second and third cohort ([there] were about 12 [of us]…) two people got a topic each … and put it in the context of Ndeje University. We presented amongst us so as to decide what we should leave out and what we should include before we [gave] it to the general public of the university.

[Ndeje participant]

This kind of post-workshop support to the delegates by councils is important as it helps to monitor whether delegates are implementing or sharing the skills and knowledge from the training. Such support is vital for sustaining the impact of the training. Survey respondents were asked to indicate whether they had been contacted by the councils after the workshops for any reason. The chart below shows that the overwhelming majority of NCHE delegates were contacted after the workshop, but this was not the case for the NCTE and TCU delegates.

Respondents who indicated that they had been contacted by the councils post-workshop were asked to specify the nature of this contact. As to be expected from the results already reported, many NCHE delegates said that the council had offered them support in holding dissemination training following the MLP. Other more common types of post-workshop contact reported by all councils included monitoring and evaluation activities, and electronic or physical follow-ups, however, the nature of these was not always specified. It should be noted that the monitoring and evaluation activities reported for the NCTE and TCU usually consisted only of the online survey (which the councils reminded them to complete), whereas the monitoring and evaluation reported by NCHE delegates was more likely to consist of monitoring visits or discussions about the impact of the training.

**NCHE dissemination workshops**

One of the most evident benefits of the NCHE training was the ability of delegates to conduct their own dissemination workshops at their home institutions. During these workshops they shared the knowledge and skills they had acquired during the MLP. According to the report submitted by the NCHE to Carnegie, financial support was provided by the NCHE for participants to run their own training:

Aware of the fact that only a few members of the university management had the opportunity to be trained in the just concluded MLP, it was decided that all participants who had successfully completed the programme be required to return to their respective universities with an agreed reform project that would aid the initiation of what was learnt over the three years (2009–2013) at their institutions. The MLP organised some funds worth eight hundred thousand shillings (UGX) equivalent to three hundred twenty thousand US dollars ($320) [that] each institution could use for facilitating an expert. The funds were appropriated from the MLP main grant.²

The following sources of data were provided by the NCHE regarding the implementation of dissemination workshops by institutions:

---

Table 7.1: Sources of data on dissemination workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Document name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCHE</td>
<td>1. Carnegie Management and Leadership of Higher Education workshops held by universities</td>
<td>Document from the NCHE detailing dissemination workshops held by five of the universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugema</td>
<td>2. Action Point Tracking Plan 2011</td>
<td>Modules, aims, objectives, lessons learnt, target areas for improvement from Bugema’s dissemination workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Bugema workshop leadership training</td>
<td>Attendance register from quality assurance workshop held by Bugema university on 5 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam University in Uganda (IUIU)</td>
<td>4. IUIU leadership workshop</td>
<td>Workshop programme for workshop held by IUIU on 12 to 13 August 2013 Attendance registers Example of certificate provided to participants of IUIU's dissemination workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkumba</td>
<td>5. Nkumba University workshop participants</td>
<td>Nkumba workshop attendance register, programme for training held from 5 to 7 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndejje</td>
<td>6. Ndejje University workshop attendance list</td>
<td>Ndejje attendance register for workshop held on 16 July 2013 Workshop programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Workshop programme</td>
<td>Four documents providing details on workshops held by UMU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Martyrs University (UMU)</td>
<td>8. NCHE-Management and Leadership Training – UMU list of participants</td>
<td>Four documents providing details on workshops held by UMU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Workshop write-ups</td>
<td>Four documents providing details on workshops held by UMU.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although we collected additional sample data from five universities, seven of the universities (of 14) involved in the MLP ran their own versions of the MLP training programme, generally using staff who attended the MLP or paying for some of the original MLP presenters and training materials that were used at the original workshops. It must be noted that at times, university staff developed their own presentations based on the hard copies of presentations provided to them.

The details provided for the seven institutions’ workshops are outlined in the table below.

Table 7.2: Dissemination workshop details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>N participants</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Modules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bugema University</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5–6 Sept 2013</td>
<td>African higher education in a globalising world Leadership and management of academic processes Strategy and its roles in enhancing academic excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic university in Uganda</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12–13 Aug 2013</td>
<td>Strategy and its roles in enhancing academic excellence Leadership and management of academic processes The corporate governance of universities Leadership, innovation and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala International University</td>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>20 Aug 2013</td>
<td>Globalisation and its challenges in African higher education (presented by Mr Mutegeki Patrick) Strategy and its role in enhancing academic excellence (presented by Dr Joseph Bada)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyambogo University</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Globalisation and its challenges in African higher education Leadership and management of academic processes Strategy and its role in enhancing academic excellence Strategic human-resource management role in institution of higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndejje University</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16 July 2013</td>
<td>Strategy and its roles in enhancing academic excellence Financial management and resources mobilisation in universities Access, equity and social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkumba University</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4–6 Sept 2013</td>
<td>Globalisation and its challenges in African higher education Leadership and management of academic processes Strategy and its role in enhancing academic excellence Strategic human-resource management role in institutions of higher learning Financial management and resource mobilisation (Note that no modules were covered in Day 1. There was a discussion to propose amendments to the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act of 2001.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Martyrs University</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>22–23 April and 4 Dec 2013</td>
<td>Community-based learning Learner-centred teaching and learning Problem-based learning Strategic planning and leadership of higher education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table above is an impressive statement of MLP training uptake. Originally only 150 participants were trained using Carnegie Corporation funds. On a fairly small budget (USD 320) the seven universities were able to cascade elements of the training to at least a further 481 university employees (based on figures from six universities at the time of writing this report). It is interesting to note that “Leadership of academic processes” is the most frequently cascaded training session and that additional innovations have been brought into the cascading there, for example:

- Leadership, innovation and development (IUIU)
- The corporate governance of universities (IUIU).

7.3 Are the HELM training programmes sustainable?

During the three summative evaluation studies we probed on different future strategies and approaches that could be put in place to ensure, or at least optimise, the sustainability of these training programmes. Several very innovative and useful proposals were recorded:

- Institution-based training
- Certification of training
- Cost sharing
- Broadening the training base by using participants as trainers.

Institution-based training

A first proposal from many respondents was that the training courses be offered under a decentralised model at the delegates’ home institutions. This would have the dual benefit of involving more local participants and cutting the costs of distant travel and accommodation.

People in a certain area [could] go to [an] institution and run through the programme and get out. [Because] you find the biggest cost you [are] going to have is hotel [accommodation] and because you use the institution the cost would not be as much. The institution will host you and then you only cater for the food and other thing[s], and then you have [an] institution[al] environment. [If we picked that one it would be affordable and I think] the institution where we hosted would benefit and would have reason to account to the rest of the community what these group of people [were] learning. I think … that is what I would want to change – from the hotel to the institution, so cost-cutting so that the money we use for [an] hotel [could] be used to bring as many participant[s] as possible] and the[n] use to bring in a lot of more. [That is what I would do.]

[MLP staff]

I think the training is organised … if we got other people to facilitate outside as well, the training [would] continue.

[MPL participant]

One presenter suggested offering some courses and discussions online to make them available to more people at less cost and to ensure the programme’s sustainability.

[There are] other ways to ensure that this approach has sustainability in itself – and one of them is to diversify the ways of provision. If, for instance, you are using workshops, there are some of us that have grown up on distance learning and might enjoy just taking our time. I woke up at 4 this morning and put in some two hours of reading … [There are those that will be able to do that. So if the same materials were made available] online and … the facilitators … who are willing [to] look into what they are doing give them feedback – encourage discussions online and so on and certify at the end.

[MLP presenter]
The obvious downside with a decentralised model is that it would not create the opportunity for delegates to meet their counterparts from other institutions and hence lose the value of such additional networking.

[I]t is good to train us [as] institutions – that would reduce the costs but the challenge would be we need to interact with each other … So again if we bring it to the institution level we are going to miss out. [T]hat networking was good and I really felt that this training brought all of us on board. [W]e now have contacts … from different places.

[MLP participant]

[T]he question is how are we going to proceed? [W]ill it be an institution organising its own training with the staff who are trained, or [could] it work better if somebody from Bugema maybe goes to Gulu university, and the one from Gulu goes to Musitema, and so on … [S]o what approach [would] work? … [P]ersonally I would say those who [have] been trained should be able to move on to other universities …

[MLP participant]

[If] you developed a pool [of] regular trainers or training workshops here -follow up and we see how we can rotate them one place to the another – that could be good.

[MLP presenter]

Most interviewees said that they would feel comfortable facilitating this cascade training at their own institutions, but some noted that the NCTE should be the umbrella organisation to oversee the training, or that some of the original presenters should also present. Concerns were raised about the possible lack of quality and standardisation that could result from decentralised training sessions:

Delegate: You could take it from what you have learnt … My university has a lot of institutions that could also benefit … The NCTE could be the umbrella …

Interviewer: Would you personally feel that you are well prepared enough from the training you attended to actually share the information in the form of a workshop?

Delegate: Yes, not in everything, not in finance, but I could share in the one on governance because I have been in committee work, the research aspect, [and] academic leadership.

Delegate: It could be organised by another body but in all the instances … there should be other ones who are in charge of setting the standards necessary for the institutions in Ghana.

Interviewer: So you wouldn't feel comfortable to run your own training?

Delegate: I feel very comfortable, but it would be too localised. For example, if I run my own training, unless I invite other people, it would be just in relation to what I do in my institution … [The] NCTE as the umbrella organisation [carries] part of the responsibility [for] all the tertiary institutions.

Delegate: If possible, maybe the universities will be advised by the NCTE to pick specific topics, and we’d use the resource persons at the training from the various institutions. It could also beef up their knowledge and strengthen their presentation skills.

Delegate: Yes, since it would be decentralised then people don’t have to travel all around. What I’m thinking is that they can select people from the group of facilitators, and they can select people who have received the training, and they would team up …

Interviewer: So, would you personally feel able to be one of the presenters? Do you feel that the training prepared you well enough to take that role?

Delegate: Yes, when you [are] going to be a presenter, even as a lecturer, I would still have to prepare. But I should be able to do that.
A Nigerian delegate felt that it was important for the Nigerian National Universities Commission (NUC) to facilitate further workshops in Nigeria, as this Council is better equipped to design training that is relevant to the Nigerian context.

In our country we have the National Universities Commission, in Ghana the NCTE, all African countries have such bodies. So why not use those bodies to run the workshops in their countries? Because each country has its own peculiarities, my experience of those in Nigeria may not be the same as those in Ghana. So they should use those bodies who really know the challenges faced by their national universities, they are in a better position to really address ... Even the examples they give would be more applicable than from somebody speaking from another place, because they know the challenges facing that particular country ... So if ... possible, Carnegie [should] use resource persons in these countries at that high level of leadership to organise such conferences and workshops.

[Nigerian delegate]

Certification of training

Training programmes such as these may be more attractive to future delegates if they are in some way accredited or certified by the councils. This would in itself encourage more people to attend.

[And if it’s an accredited course I [could] see the National Council [getting to] a position where they [could] actually insist that – before people are appointed as managers in this – they should have participated in a similar course to prepare themselves ... [It] [could] begin gently before it becomes mandatory. It [could] actually be an advantage – [S]ay I underwent the training, so you [could] do a number of these modules and get a National Council certificate for that preparation through workshop[s] but you can also do it online and still obtain your certification and ... utilise that for promotion purposes.

[MLP presenter]

Cost sharing

A few respondents suggested that the universities themselves should share in the costs of future training institutions, as it is unlikely that external funding would be available in the future. Hence it is imperative that the universities, if they value such training, also contribute.

If you cannot afford the high profile hotels ... [you] could do it in another way.

[And then another thing – cost sharing. The institutions can decide to pay a little part of it ... The institutions [could] pay for each of the participants ... something small ... That also bring[s] commitment because sometimes we just invite somebody [for] training and [if] they have not paid anything [they] will just sit there and go. But if you know the [management will] question them [on] what they have learnt, then definitely they will focus.

[MLP staff]

[If we take [it] to hotels and say ... not a very high profile hotel, but institution pays for individuals who [are] coming there, like for instance each participant is paid two hundred thousand to come on the programme and then [the institution] tops up, take[s] them to a hotel. Then it’s still affordable. [MLP staff]

... I don’t think [my college] would be willing to pay money but [maybe willing to] be involved in cost sharing.

[MPL participant]

I don’t think we really have a serious problem because if ... the training ... is very relevant, the university would be very willing to cost share, because there is a need for capacity building in the university, especially if they taking on more numbers ... [If] this cost sharing was bring[ing] in more people ... to get their training, then I think it won’t be a problem.

[MPL participant]
Participants as trainers
Given the success of the first round of training and the fact that a number of university delegates have participated in multiple courses, a potential pool for future trainers has been created. These delegates are now well placed to present in any future training courses, particularly on their own campuses.

These other universities who are actually very good and [have] mastered the modules – we could use them as facilitators. [W]e actually did use some, if you remember? [T]he human resource module [in which] that lady from Ugandan Christian University was a participant and when you picked her … to help with the modules, she was able to deliver. [S]o we could even use some of the participants who have [been] identified … to roll out these other institutions.

During interviews some delegates spoke about how they thought the programme should be run in the future, should more funding be made available. In particular, they were asked whether the NCTE’s strategy should be altered if the programme were to continue. Interviewees felt that it was necessary to have workshops with additional participants from the same institutions and other institutions:

Delegate:  If possible, every time new staff is appointed to positions they [should] be taken through the kind of training that we had … for all the public institutions and, if possible, the private institutions that [are] willing to go through this kind of training. Because you will notice that some take on positions … and their output – they can’t publish … This kind of training will help them to balance their work together [with] their publications. It shouldn’t be once-off, it should be regular, so that if new heads are appointed then the NCTE could organise to bring them together and take them through this kind of training.

Delegate: The programme targeted people at a certain rank, like HODs. A lot of people … they’re not selected for this programme. Meanwhile these are the people you are dealing with [as an HOD]. You can disseminate some information to them, but maybe the programme [could] be extended.

7.4 Conclusion
There is ample evidence that the three HELM programmes in Tanzania, Uganda and Ghana have had substantial and widespread impact on the university sectors in the respective countries. We have shown that there has been general appreciation and uptake of most of the training materials in all three countries. Although the uptake and ultimate impact is varied – as one would expect – there is no question that these training programmes have resulted in widespread benefits and learnings to delegates.

Although Carnegie Corporation’s funding of these programmes has come to an end, there are already positive signs that the respective councils (and individual universities) have begun to address the future sustainability of these programmes. Very good proposals to this effect have been made by delegates in all three countries.

It is fair to say that the leadership and management challenges for the top echelons of African universities will only become more pronounced in the future. The continuing internationalisation of higher education, the pervasive imperatives for competitiveness which are fuelled by international rankings and the ever-present resource constraints require creative and bold leadership, and efficient and effective management at all levels of the modern-day university. This study has documented important lessons about training university leaders and managers to address these challenges in a responsible and responsive manner.