

PHD PROGRAMS IN AFRICAN UNIVERSITIES: CURRENT STATUS AND FUTURE PROSPECTS

A Report to the Rockefeller Foundation

**David L. Szanton and Sarah Manyika
University of California, Berkeley**

Introduction

In the late 1970s much of Sub-Saharan Africa was suffering from economic crises caused by various combinations of falling commodity prices, OPEC price increases, Cold War politics, trade barriers, civil conflict, and frontline struggles with apartheid South Africa. Compounded by the debt crisis of the early 1980s, over the following decade, nearly all the states north of the Limpopo turned to the World Bank and the IMF for temporary or long-term economic relief. In turn, the Bank and the IMF demanded that these states submit to a variety of “structural adjustment programs” (SAPs), designed to radically reduce government expenditures on social programs.

In this context, a series of World Bank Staff Working Papers (e.g., Colclough 1980, Psacharopoulos 1980) argued that the economic and social returns on primary and secondary education were substantially higher than the returns on tertiary education. African governments seeking support from the Bank and the IMF were therefore pressed to reduce, sometime drastically, funding for their national universities. As a consequence, for the following 12 to 20 years, depending on the country, working conditions deteriorated dramatically. University faculty salaries remained flat or declined, research funding dried up, faculty could not maintain memberships in professional organizations or attend international conferences, university libraries stopped purchasing books and journals, physical facilities (classrooms, laboratories, student hostels, etc.) crumbled, and new building was terminated. For the same reasons, student scholarships and both local and overseas faculty development funds were largely eliminated, pensions declined and became uncertain. New faculty hiring was curtailed, in some cases halted for many years, often producing a generation gap and an aging faculty. All this also occurred in a period of nearly universal “massification,” of the universities in which tertiary enrollments in Sub-Saharan Africa rose nearly six-fold from some 350,000 in

1975 to nearly 1,700,000 in 1995, vastly over-stretching the remaining faculty¹, and university resources (World Bank, 2000).²

By their insistence that these universities become increasingly self-financing on something like a corporate model, the Bank, the IMF, and their government disciples ran directly counter to powerful political commitments made during the 1950s' and 1960s' anti-colonial struggles - maintained well into the post-colonial decades - that higher education was a national responsibility and should be free, at least for the most highly qualified students.³ Student and faculty protests and strikes in response to these neo-liberal moves and the decline of state support for the universities disrupted studies and often led governments to close the universities for weeks or months at a time. To make matters worse, the military-authoritarian political regimes that took power in many countries in the 1970s and 1980s saw the universities as hotbeds of political opposition and resistance, often established a heavy military presence on the campuses, or simply closed them down, long-term. These military regimes, together with continuing economic crises and civil conflicts and wars, jointly wreaked havoc on conditions of service, academic freedom, intellectual life generally, and at times, on the physical facilities of the campuses as well. Under these trying circumstances, postgraduate programs shriveled, and many highly skilled, energetic and previously committed faculty members turned to more remunerative external consultancies (rarely contributing to their course materials or pedagogies), effectively minimizing their teaching, research, and publishing. Others left the universities entirely for better funded and less frustrating government, private sector, or NGO employment at home, or international agency or university positions abroad.

In this dismal context, many international agencies and donors also reduced or withdrew whatever institutional support and training funds they had been providing for these universities. If donors remained active in these countries, they tended to shift their resources to NGOs and civil society organizations providing direct services to local populations. In the process, many of the former or remaining university faculty members were drawn into applied or policy-oriented projects or service programs essentially defined by donor agendas and NGO concerns. Basic research suffered; in effect, the donors were drawing on, and drawing down - whatever intellectual capital remained in the universities - while no longer helping to replace it (Mushi et. al. 2001).

By the late 1990s, and clearly by 2001, at least some elements of the situation had begun to change. Across the continent some of the worst civil wars were settled or had abated, and several more democratic regimes had come to power. South Africa had finally shed its apartheid regime such that its comparatively well endowed universities might perhaps play a new and constructive role on the Continent. In many though not all countries, the most overt threats to academic freedom had at least declined (Sall 2000). In addition, several African universities and units within them began to engage in serious internal reviews, strategic planning, and to make innovative efforts to obtain

major institutional support from beyond their still small and shrinking state budgets -- mostly from new full-fee paying students and re-interested foreign donors.⁴

At the same time, both nationally and within the international development and donor communities, including the World Bank, there was a growing recognition that in a knowledge-based world, no society can develop effectively without a serious capacity to generate, transmit, and consume new knowledge.⁵ Clearly, every complex modern society requires numerous technically trained people in a wide range of fields, a citizenry and leaders with a liberal education capable of critical analyses of local and national problems, policies, and opportunities, and an ability to train the next generations. Serious and productive universities with strong teaching and research capacities - in effect, well supported and engaged intellectual communities - are essential for all these functions. More broadly still, as Mala Singh (2001) has compellingly argued, higher education must go beyond a concern for labour market issues or individual or national economic competitiveness, and engage in - and stimulate others to engage in - broader social and philosophical issues and debates concerning the “public good.”

The new (or re-) recognition of the university as a crucial source of social transformation is clearly positive. But it is also producing a powerful and often contradictory array of demands on universities - still relatively starved for both financial and human resources - simultaneously tugging them in different directions. In no particular order these demands include:

- produce highly skilled graduates able to meet global competition, but who will not simply become part of the brain drain
- relate the curriculum to local labor demand, but retain strong critical and liberal arts traditions
- reduce externally derived irrelevant elements in the curriculum, and reconstruct it with relevant African knowledges and experience
- increase equity for underrepresented populations, e.g., women and minorities, and reduce class and urban/rural inequities while maintaining high standards
- protect academic freedom, but also provide governments with policy advice, research, and training programs relevant to national economic development, welfare, governance, education, human rights, etc.
- support critical basic research, theory building, experimentation, and teaching, but operate more like a corporation generating its own income
- democratize their own internal governance structures, decentralizing or devolving power to lower units, while also expanding external ownership of the institution by larger publics
- deal effectively with the HIV/AIDS crisis
- lead in social transformation, rather than act as a conservative or elitist break upon it

No doubt more demands could be added, but this is at least indicative of the complex expectations and challenges now facing most universities on the Continent. Unfortunately, the neglect and trauma they have suffered over the past decades have left numerous multi-faceted questions about how best to rebuild them in order to meet these daunting mandates.

This report, commissioned by and written for the Rockefeller Foundation, begins to deal with just four related issues having to do with current PhD programs in African universities, and possible means of strengthening them, specifically in the Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities. With this in mind the report is divided into four Sections:

Section I focuses first on (a) the universities of Sub-Saharan Africa north of the Limpopo, thus excluding the South African universities, and then turns to (b) the universities of South Africa.

Section II deals with the experience of “sandwich” programs as elements of the PhD in both sets of universities.

Section III describes several current or planned innovative multi-national inter-institutional collaborative PhD programs.

Section IV suggests several structural, intellectual, and funding initiatives that would seem necessary to create a set of African universities capable of producing significant numbers of their own PhDs in the Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts by drawing on complementary strengths and carefully constructed and mutually beneficial linkages.

Before proceeding it is important to emphasize four key points that frame this report:

1. The geographical focus is Sub-Saharan Africa. The universities of North Africa and the Middle East (and others elsewhere) have not been included although they certainly might play a role in any subsequent studies or follow-up activities.
2. This report is specifically concerned with PhD programs, as opposed to academic or professional MA programs (in Law, Education, Public Health, City, Town or Regional Planning, etc.) which are much more numerous and varied, and which would require far greater time and resources to catalogue and describe.⁶
3. The focus in Section IV narrows to the Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities and potential means to strengthen the capacity of African universities to generate PhDs in these particular fields. (Some of the recommendations might be relevant to other fields as well, but that is outside purview of this report.)

4. The observations, ideas, and recommendations contained in this report derive almost entirely from exchanges and discussions with or publications by scholars, administrators, and students in African universities - or with (or by) others in Europe and the US who have been deeply engaged with African universities. Our role has been to synthesize and re-articulate what we have heard and read. To the extent that this report has value, it derives from the hundreds of Africans and Africanists who contributed to it.

Inevitably, this report is couched in very general terms. There are now over 200 universities in Africa and every university has its own particular character, history, strengths, weaknesses, and contexts, and these have evolved, often dramatically, over time. They thus have quite diverse past, possible, and probable trajectories. Nevertheless, for our immediate purposes we will be speaking of broad arrays or clusters of universities, and the general features, issues, problems, challenges, and opportunities they are collectively facing. To further complicate matters, but for fairly obvious reasons, the universities in South Africa have had a distinctly different (though also deeply problematic) history than those north of the Limpopo River that geographically separates South Africa from the rest of the Continent. With that in mind, and simply as convenient shorthand, we will initially distinguish and speak of the universities north of the Limpopo, collectively, as the “NLUs,” and the universities in South Africa as the “SAUs.”

A Note on Method

We began this project by contacting -- primarily by e-mail and telephone -- well over 100 people in Africa, the UK, Europe, and the United States based in universities, international organizations, foundations, all of whom have long been centrally involved with African universities as faculty, administrators, or funders. Initially, we posed to them three very general questions seeking judgments and evaluations based on their own personal experience with regard to the NLUs. We also hoped to use their responses to identify those universities we might visit for more intensive discussions and information gathering on both the general issues and for the eventual recommendations that would follow in Section IV. The three questions we initially raised were: (1) in which African universities, and in which fields, have there been in the past strong PhD programs in the social sciences, arts, and humanities? (2) where are there continuing strengths today in these fields? and (3) given new resources, where might you imagine strong PhD programs in these fields could be developed – or further developed where they already exist? The response rate and the responses were extraordinary; nearly everyone replied, some briefly, but many at length, with a rich array of observations, comments, ideas, and suggestions. No one claimed to be able to speak to the African university situation generally, and most prefaced their comments with claims of modesty noting that they really only had limited knowledge of particular institutions. What was

evident, however, was that there is widespread concern about the issues, great interest in the general subject, and specifically in the state and possible (re)development of the social sciences, arts, and humanities in the African universities.

In no sense did we conduct (or attempt) a scientific sample. But with over 100 responses a strong consensus nevertheless emerged as to which universities had historically been strong in the social sciences, arts, and humanities, and on nine universities which currently seemed the most promising in these fields. The nine universities repeatedly cited were Cheikh Anta Diop in Dakar, the University of Ghana, Legon, Yaounde II in Cameroon, the University of Ibadan, and the University of Lagos in Nigeria, Makerere University in Uganda, the University of Dar es Salaam, Eduardo Mondlane University in Mozambique, and the University of Zimbabwe. Other universities that were mentioned, but with less frequency or certainty, or else in terms of a single discipline, included the University of Addis Ababa; Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife; the University of Jos, the University of Nigeria, Nsukka; Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, all in Nigeria; and the University of Botswana.

Following up on these initial suggestions, we then asked our respondents, plus an array of additional people they had also recommended we contact, a second series of questions. In this second round we asked for people's judgments regarding a variety of specific means or mechanisms that, based on their own experience, they thought would be most useful in (further) developing universities' capacities to offer strong PhD programs. The responses were again numerous, serious, and substantial, and provided the initial basis for many of our subsequent meetings and discussions with university and foundation personnel in Africa.

More or less simultaneous with these initially largely e-mail exchanges, we began contacting key institutions that might have systematic data on the first two issues in our charge, the general production of PhDs in African universities, and their experience with sandwich programs. As described more fully below, comprehensive data on PhD production has been spotty and hard to come by, but responses regarding sandwich programs have been rich and quite consensual. Armed with and building on all these responses, we personally visited for several days eight of the nine most promising universities (missing only Yaounde II) indicated above. At each of these universities we discussed the suggestions and issues raised by our correspondents in dozens of intensive and extensive face-to-face meetings with faculty, administrators, and sometimes with students. A full list of the people we met with is attached as Appendix I. These meetings led to the elaboration, transformation, and concretization of the information, interpretations, and recommendations outlined in the following sections.

Over the entire course of this project we have also been collecting published and unpublished literature on the state and fate, crises, problems, curricula, finances, opportunities, and goals of the African universities, as well as program material from the

various donor agencies. Despite a substantial and growing literature on the African university, it is almost entirely focused on various aspects of undergraduate programs. There have been several discussions and proposals put forward for the development of regional graduate programs⁷, but relatively little has been written on the actual substance of existing graduate programs on the Continent, and what has been written is mostly on various professional or applied Masters Degree programs. Aside from several African Economic Research Consortium (AERC) studies in the early and middle 1990s on the desired but extremely limited production of PhDs in Economics, hardly anything has been written specifically on PhD programs. For example, none of the 100+ papers on African higher education at the March 2001 Cape Town conference on Globalization and Higher Education, nor any of the 15 “tracer” studies sponsored by the AAU since 1996, dealt with postgraduate studies, no less the PhD. Likewise, the recent report of the distinguished World Bank/UNESCO Task Force on “Higher Education in Developing Countries; Peril and Promise,” contains a brief (worried) discussion of developing country research universities and their declining research capacities. But it is totally silent - and provides no data – on the production of PhD degrees, or the substance, quality, or relevance of the research generated by the dissertation projects leading to the PhDs. The one publication that seems by its title to come closest to the subject is Donald Heisel’s 1998 report on “PhD Training for Africans in Population Studies,” written for and published as a pamphlet by The Population Council. But while Heisel notes the capacity in selected African universities to provide adequate first year graduate training or even MA degrees, when he shifts his attention to the PhD, it is entirely in terms of overseas study.

The lack of prior attention to PhD programs in African universities is understandable for reasons discussed below. But it is our hope that this report will provide at least a baseline for, if not provoke, more intensive studies of the current state of PhD programs in African universities - and possible means and prospects for their further development.

1. The Production of PhDs in Sub-Saharan African Universities

According to the Association of African Universities’ 1999 “Guide to Higher Education in Africa,” the 40 countries of Sub-Saharan Africa have among them 174 institutions officially designated as “universities.” Of these, 82 indicate that they offer the PhD, or the more or less equivalent Francophone Troisième Cycle Doctorate, in unspecified fields. Only one country, The Gambia, does not list a university in the Guide, although it is currently in the process of establishing one. Clearly, having a university is both a symbolic marker and a structural necessity for a modern state and society. Of the 40 countries covered in the 1999 Guide, 26 indicate they have only one or two universities, almost all public or state institutions.⁸ At the other extreme, Nigeria cites 36 universities, 24 of which offer PhDs, South Africa has 21 universities, 19 of which offer

PhDs, and the Sudan claims to have one public university but 24 private (mostly Islamic) universities, 7 of which offer PhDs. But that is as far as it goes. There is no consolidated information on the actual production of PhDs in these 82 institutions – for example, numbers, patterns of change, disciplines, topics, quality, “relevance” – in the 1999 “Guide,” nor does it seem to exist anywhere else.⁹

This project has therefore required patching together bits and pieces of information from a wide variety of sources. In the process, however, and as noted above, it became clear that the vast differences in the histories, resources, political settings and roles - and current capacities - between most of the universities in Sub-Saharan Africa down to the Limpopo River, and the universities in South Africa, it made sense to begin by discussing them separately. They are then regrouped in Section II, III, and IV.

a. The Universities South of the Sahara -- but North of the Limpopo (the NLUs)

Sources, Numbers, and Contents At the moment, current or even recent information on PhD programs in the NLUs is at best partial and scattered. Furthermore, given the large number of institutions involved, problems of communication, and limited concern in recent years for long-term systematic data collection at many of these institutions, we could not address the totality or even take a scientific sample of the universe.¹⁰ There are however, four relatively systematic if selective sources of information on the recent production of PhDs in the Sub-Continent: (1) the annual reports and strategic plans (where they exist), and the Registrar’s offices at individual universities themselves; (2) various projects of the Association of African Universities (AAU); (3) regional research, training, networking, publishing, and funding organizations like CODESRIA and OSSREA; and (4) specialized studies or data sets from regional and national professional associations, e.g., the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC), and the Social Science Council of Nigeria. For the purposes of this study, we have attempted to draw on all of these potential sources, with special emphasis on the subset of universities which our informants identified as the most productive, highly regarded, and promising.

With this as background, it should not be surprising that the exact number of PhDs currently being produced in sub-Saharan African universities remains uncertain. Perhaps most striking and heartening is our finding that despite two decades of massive institutional trauma, there nevertheless remain in these universities, and sometimes in affiliated research institutes, significant numbers of truly impressive scholars, teachers, and intellectuals – who would be a credit to universities anywhere in the world. And out of deep personal commitment they continue to supervise and produce PhDs. Indeed, these committed, but often relatively isolated, scholars have been able to

continue producing PhD students precisely because all of their universities still essentially follow the UK and European system of granting PhDs largely or entirely based on the dissertation alone. At the moment, few NLUs have the capacity to mount US-style PhD programs also including advanced course work, comprehensive exams, and multi-person and often interdisciplinary supervisory committees. Nevertheless, the numbers of new PhDs being produced remain small and clearly inadequate to meet national needs for professionally and analytically trained individuals in government, the private sector, the NGO community, international agencies, and the higher educational system itself. Even in the relatively well (internationally) funded field of Population Studies, Heisel (1998:7) notes “few training institutions in sub-Saharan Africa issue PhDs, and the number of doctoral degrees granted is small.” Recent campus-based, national, and international dynamics described below suggest the numbers may grow in the coming years, but only very slowly unless some major new initiatives accelerate the process. But first some indication of the current numbers and intellectual trends.

In general, it was clear from our visits to the universities that there has been little emphasis in recent decades on the careful collection, consolidation, no less analysis, of information on PhD production. Given resource constraints, record keeping of this sort (numbers of degrees, disciplines, completion rates, topics, no less tracer studies, etc.), has not been a high priority, and what information that does exist at the university level is limited, collected in different locations, and sometimes contradictory. (If confirmation were needed, D. N. Tarpeh’s 1994 AAU Overview Report on a “Study on Cost Effectiveness and Efficiency in African Universities,” based on detailed case studies of four major universities in Cote d’Ivoire, Ghana, Nigeria, and Zambia, specifically emphasizes and elaborates the need for “Strengthening the statistical data base of the universities,” (p.54). In our discussions, the Dean of Arts at Makerere made a similar plea. Likewise, in a July 2001 preliminary presentation of a commissioned study of “The Status of Agricultural Economics in Selected Countries in Eastern/Southern Africa,” the authors¹¹ spoke of the great difficulty they had in obtaining reliable numbers for even that one quantitatively oriented discipline!)

It is true that university libraries are generally mandated to retain copies of locally completed MA theses and Doctoral dissertations, but they seem not to provide university administrators, no less larger publics, with current statistics on them. And when three years ago the Dean of Arts at the University of Ghana, Legon, was asked by an American university he would be visiting for copies of some of the outstanding doctoral dissertations produced at his university, he could find “no mechanism for accessing post graduate research anywhere in Africa.” (Yankah 2000:17) At our request, several individuals have kindly collected some of this information for their home institution, but this is hardly systematic, and it cannot be expected everywhere.¹² Indeed, the recent strategic planning efforts and documents at several of the universities visited specifically call for, among other things, far better record keeping on this and a

wide variety of other issues. Nonetheless, here are some indicative numbers – for various time periods:

-Cheikh Anta Diop University in Dakar, approved 88 3rd Cycle (doctoral) theses during the 16 years between 1983-84 and 1998-99. This is an average of 5.5 per year, although 19 were approved in the last two years.

-At the University of Ghana, Legon, official figures indicated that 15 PhDs had been awarded across all disciplines during the four years 1998 to 2001, but only one in the Faculty of Arts in recent memory. Yet another Legon source indicated that 12 PhDs had been granted in 2001 alone, although there was no breakdown by discipline or topic. Legon has never produced a PhD in Economics. In 1998 it was seeking eight additional PhDs in Economics. During the period 1991 to 1999 Legon had nine junior faculty who had completed or were anticipating these degrees in universities in the UK (5), the US (2) and Canada (2) (Jebuni 1998). Unfortunately, of those nine, only four were on the faculty in 2001.¹³

-According to figures provided to the AAU, Makerere University granted 43 PhDs in the 9 years between 1990 and 1998, almost all in the Sciences, with only about one a year in the Arts.

-At the University of Dar es Salaam, the available figures indicated that 56 PhDs had been awarded in all fields over the nine years, 1990 to 1999, an average of six per year. During this period there were two PhDs in History and five in Linguistics. In contrast, 22 PhDs were awarded, nearly twice the rate of production, during 2000 and 2001. In the last five years there has been one PhD in Political Science and one in Swahili – by a Japanese scholar. It has not yet been possible to identify the disciplines or topics of the remaining studies.

-In 2001, the University of Zimbabwe granted 32 PhDs, mostly in Agriculture, but including eight in the Arts and Social Sciences.

-The University of Malawi produced 6 PhDs in all fields during the 12 year period 1989 to 2000.

-At the University of Ibadan, Economics, the strongest department in the social sciences (with nine full Professors) produced only six PhDs during the 10 year period, 1979 to 1988. During the following decade, CODESRIA has supported 11 PhD projects in Economics and Agricultural Economics at Ibadan.

-More broadly, over the six years 1995 to 2000, CODESRIA supported a total of 82 PhDs in 22 universities. These included 30 PhDs in eight Francophone

universities (Cheikh Anta Diop and Yaounde II accounting for 14 of the 30), and 52 PhDs at 14 different Anglophone universities (Ibadan, alone, accounting for 17).

Discussions with various Vice Chancellors, Deans, and Department Chairs suggested that at the Anglophone universities many more PhDs were being awarded in the natural and physical sciences, agriculture, and economics – fields generally favored by outside donors -- than in the arts, humanities, or the other social sciences. In contrast, the Francophone universities seem to have a higher proportion of doctorates in the humanities. But it was also clear that few people had much control over the numbers, no less their distribution across the universities or the distribution of topics being studied.

Fortunately, we should have much better information on these issues in the near future. Aside from the calls for better information systems in the various universities' strategic plans, the Association of African Universities (AAU), with Ford and Rockefeller foundation support, is currently constructing a preliminary Database of African Theses and Dissertations, known as the DATAD project. Starting with 11 universities (Cheikh Anta Diop, University of Ghana, Ibadan, Yaounde I, Addis Ababa, Makerere, Dar es Salaam, Kenyatta, Eduardo Mondlane, Zimbabwe, and Ain Shams), the DATAD project is providing standard templates, hardware, software, and training for systematic and comparable data collection. Once up and running, with some additional funding, the system will include author, title, date, degree, department, supervisors, keywords, and abstracts of all existing MA theses and PhD dissertations. Entries for new theses and dissertations will be added as they are produced. Final decisions are now being taken on remaining technical and copyright issues. The AAU expects the core of the DATAD program will be up and running by March 2002, and that it will be fully operational by the end of the year. Participating institutions will have free access to this information, and once DATAD is up and running, it is hoped that many other universities will join in the project.

As part of the feasibility study for the DATAD project, AAU staff collected whatever relevant data were available from 18 institutions in a Table attached as Appendix II. As is evident from this more systematic effort than we could attempt, the readily available information at the participating universities is at best partial. However, it reconfirms – with the exception of the massive Ain Shams University in Egypt (with a 1997 enrollment of over 167,000 students!) -- that the numbers of PhDs currently being produced in the NLUs are generally small. However, assuming that the DATAD project proceeds more or less on time, sometime later next year it should be possible to do some useful analyses of PhD production, including countries, disciplines, topics addressed (and not addressed) across the Continent. For the moment, short of spending months in individual university libraries, going through the collected dissertations one at a time (or perhaps sampling in a few cases) – with no guarantee that they are all there, it

is not possible to address in systematic detail, no less evaluate, the contents of the dissertations that have been produced in recent years.

Shifting from mere numbers it is nevertheless possible to say something still quite informal about the contents of the dissertations currently being produced NLU's based on their titles, discussions with faculty and postgraduate students, and publication lists. Most immediately, whether in the Natural or Social Sciences or the Arts and Humanities, and especially in the Anglophone institutions, the topics seem to be almost exclusively concerned with local or national development issues. Thus during the 11 years between 1988 and 1998, of the 361 social science dissertations completed in 27 Nigerian universities (117 at Ibadan alone), 352 dissertations focused on issues within Nigeria (Social Science Council of Nigeria, 1999). Of the remaining nine dissertations, seven dealt with the West African region, one focused on European (Marxist) political theory, and one was on contemporary Zimbabwe. In effect, even if some of the faculty supervisors have done their own PhDs in the UK, Europe, or the US on topics at some distance from Africa, for example, Vietnam, Japan, or even medieval France, their home universities in Africa are unlikely to have current or historical library resources that would enable local doctoral students to do dissertations on subjects related to more distant countries or time periods. And today only rarely do local doctoral students with academic careers in mind have the institutional backing or personal financial resources to travel and live for extended periods of research in other such locations.

There may however be one significant exception to this generalization that almost certainly requires further examination. Despite similar financial obstacles, a large proportion of the dissertations at some of the Francophone universities of West Africa in fact focus on European history and literary and philosophical texts. Such studies, for example, accounted for 35 (or 40%) of the 88 doctorates granted at Cheikh Anta Diop University between 1984 and 1999.¹⁴ Again, this same pattern emerged when looking across the titles of the 82 PhDs supported by CODESRIA between 1995 and 2000. Nine of the 30 Francophone dissertations (30%) dealt with topics beyond the borders of their own country (European philosophy, international and global relations, and distant parts of Africa). In contrast, only 2 of the 52 Anglophone dissertations were on topics that went beyond the national boundaries (one on ECOWAS, and one on an adjacent country). It might appear that some combination of the more inclusive or incorporative nature of French colonialism and the continuing economic, political and cultural ties between France and its ex-colonies have left a stronger intellectual, indeed cosmopolitan, residue in the post-colonial universities. In contrast, and again simply based on their titles, nearly all of the CODESRIA supported Anglophone university dissertations seem to be empirical studies focused on and relevant to very local conditions, processes, problems, and expressive forms, mostly contemporary, occasionally historical. Clearly, all these dissertations reflected legitimate research cultures, research agendas, as well as the materials locally available for research. One

might wish, however, that the PhD students at the Anglophone universities might be able to write dissertations on more far-flung topics as well.

Libraries and ICT Issues

Part of the problems described above have to do with access to relevant literature, materials, and data. Because African university libraries have suffered such tremendous financial losses, neither the doctoral students nor their local faculty supervisors are likely to have access to current theoretical and comparative literature that might bear on or provide new insights in their dissertation projects. Libraries, essential to any university and especially in the Arts and Humanities, have been decimated. This is even more of a problem for postgraduate students doing dissertation research who need access to the current comparative and theoretical literature. A few departmental or university libraries have been able to maintain or begin to rebuild their collections in particular topic areas thanks to donations from abroad, e.g., the Gender Studies Library at Makerere University, but even these collections seem far from current. In several libraries visited books were few and ancient, and in some, where books were available, they were in fact simply shells: the key articles or chapters had been ripped out. Based on our limited observations, it would appear that libraries are primarily being used as undergraduate study halls rather than as accessible repositories of knowledge, new or otherwise.

It has of course been frequently suggested or at least hoped that African university libraries might “leapfrog” the need for hard copy volumes and build broad and accessible collections of electronic books, international journals, and databases through the Internet. These possibilities have been laid out in considerable detail in a series of volumes jointly edited or written by Lisbeth Levey, initially as Director of the AAAS Project for African Research Libraries (1994, 1995, 1996), then as Director of the Rockefeller and Ford Foundation funded Project for Information Access and Connectivity (1998), and now still working on these issues from the Ford office in Nairobi. Clearly, the new ICT systems could make a great difference in providing access to a vast array of databases, bibliographies, networks and information sources from around the world. Unfortunately, so far, connectivity in nearly all the NLUs is still extremely limited, unreliable, expensive, and an unfamiliar tool. Visiting or glancing into departmental or faculty offices it was clear that many faculty do not have computers at their desks, and where they do exist they are often very old and slow and/or are being used for administrative rather than academic purposes. Although improving, bandwidth is everywhere inadequate for the rapid transmission of substantial bodies of data. Very few students have their own computers, and departmental and campus-based computer centers are small, difficult of access, and tightly scheduled. As a result students often must stand in line for hours to get a brief period on a computer – and when they do get on-line their primary use seems to be for

e-mail. The DATAD feasibility study (Appendix II) also includes reasonably current information on the Internet Status of the 18 surveyed universities, and tends to confirm this picture.

Finding and retaining technical staff is likewise proving equally, if not more, frustrating. Over and above the substantial costs of obtaining, installing, and troubleshooting departmental and campus networks, hardware, and software, the difficulties and costs of training and retaining essential technical support staff are already large and are growing very rapidly.¹⁵ A wide range of technical staff are absolutely essential for maintaining the equipment and systems, for training faculty, staff, and students, for dealing with constantly needed upgrades, and for evaluating new programs and possibilities. Unfortunately, people who can do this kind of work can also find jobs in the private sector at many times their university salaries.

Clearly, some substantial ICT facilities do exist and progress is being made in expanding access thanks to among others, Lisbeth Levey's continuing efforts; the increasingly frequent (decentralized) inclusion of computers and software in grants to research centers and individual scholars; and small numbers of privately run but still relatively expensive Internet cafes. In addition, various countries and donor agencies such as the Dutch government, SIDA/Sarec, NORAD, and the African Development Bank have been providing institutional grants for basic equipment, networking, and computers for research and administrative applications. The Carnegie Corporation alone is providing \$3.5 million to the University of Dar es Salaam for a variety of projects, including several related to information technologies, the provision of computers, training, library cataloging, etc. Carnegie has also made a \$2+ million grant to Makerere University, some of which is also going to ICT development on campus. Likewise, the USAID funded LELAND Initiative for Internet connectivity; plans for an African Virtual Library; an innovative Danish Aid project providing Legon with access to journals in Danish universities; Highwire@Stanford; the University of California's new international electronic publishing program, and no doubt others, are or will all be contributing to increase the connectivity and utility of the Internet in many African universities. Nevertheless, there is still a long way to go; the current goal at the University of Dar es Salaam is simply to reach one computer for every 25 students.

In this connection, it seems worthwhile to mention three current and substantial efforts to use ICT for distance education in African universities:

1. Starting with a pilot phase in 1997, the World Bank's ambitious African Virtual University (AVU) began delivering via satellite undergraduate and professional courses from overseas to fee-paying students in selected universities in 15 Anglophone and Francophone countries. A November 1999 conference of leading figures from the participating universities agreed that while much had been learned, many changes in the program were needed, and that the

AUV should be re-established as independent non-profit organization based in Nairobi and Washington DC. Peter N. Materu, Interim Executive Director of the AVU, in a paper presented at the October 2001 Nairobi conference on Innovations in African Higher Education, spelled out a number of these problems; “AVU was overwhelmed with responding to educational needs...selecting areas of curricula focus; sourcing class content, delivering the content over a proprietary satellite network, and handling the administration.” He also noted that it had suffered from perceptions of being in competition with the universities, and a lack of “financial resources, operational capacities, technical expertise, and breadth of geographic presence.” More concretely, participants at the Nairobi Conference and others in prior discussions, severely criticized the AVU courses as limited and often inappropriate in subject matter, difficult to insert into existing curricula, pedagogically problematic, technically difficult to receive, and very expensive for the participating universities in terms of immediate costs for equipment and technical staffing and tutoring, as well as in terms of opportunity costs – that is, what else could be accomplished with the same amounts of funding. Its programs, structures, relationship to the universities, and sponsorship are currently being reorganized. The goal now is shift from being a direct service provider, to facilitating networking among universities (Materu 2001).

2. In contrast, the “Metacourse” in African International Relations (Kiondo 2001, Robinson 2001), among Dar es Salaam, Makerere, and Tufts universities seems much more promising in getting faculty and groups of students from the three universities seriously engaged with each other and their various perspectives over a six week period. It has however been extremely labour intensive, travel and time consuming. It has also suffered from differences in time zones, numerous technical glitches, and has proved very expensive. Although it may (or may not) turn out to be a highly replicable pilot for other such courses, so far it has cost well over \$300,000 for a single undergraduate course for a total of 75 students in the three countries.

3. The installation in 1998 of advanced instrumentation (for Nuclear Magnetic Resonance and Mass Spectrometry) under the auspices of the Network for Analytical and Bioassay Services in Africa (NABSA) based at the University of Botswana has already contributed sophisticated analyses of various materials for a number of Natural Science dissertations at several African universities. Still today, the samples and resulting data and analyses have to be transmitted by courier or mail. However, it is anticipated that starting in 2002, additional computerization will enable the electronic transmission of data from Gaborone to Dar es Salaam - and eventually to other laboratories across Africa. This should further encourage and accelerate the production of highly sophisticated doctoral dissertations in those institutions (Abegaz 2001).

American scholars, donors, and universities have come to recognize the enormous capabilities, potentials, and research value of computerization and information technologies, generally. But they should not forget these capacities are the result of decades of experience and many hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars invested. African universities simply do not have this base on which to build. Thus despite substantial, selective, and hopefully continuing progress, it will probably be another 5 to 10 years, or more, before ICT and the Internet are widely and inexpensively accessible and broadly useful for doctoral dissertation research purposes in these institutions.¹⁶

Intellectual Issues

Still more subtly problematic but perhaps even more damaging, the lack of access to current international journals and intellectual discourse often has a demoralizing and debilitating effect as both faculty and doctoral students come to feel they are falling ever further behind the leading international intellectual currents, ideas, and approaches. Among other things, it means that potential doctoral students are often uncomfortable about even asking for advice from local faculty supervisors. Likewise, local faculty supervisors often feel uncomfortable working with their doctoral advisees because they are painfully aware that they are literally “out of date” in terms of the current literature, findings, methods, and debates. One result is that local supervisors often feel it necessary to defer to foreign outside examiners, even if they in fact know more about the subject than their overseas counterpart.¹⁷ Students and other faculty of course pick up these demoralizing and demeaning disparities in power, status, and prestige.

Equally problematic, and perhaps systemically even more so, is the loss of intellectual self-confidence, and the feelings of frustration and defensiveness created by a sense of being “out of date” and out of touch with the relevant international, i.e., Western, literature. Demobilizing as this is, it also almost inevitably undercuts the willingness or ability to draw alternatively on African experience, knowledges, and ideas that might challenge or recast, received Western analytic concepts and theories. Indeed, the post-colonial but continuing external “occupation of the mind” means that African systems of knowledge, wisdom, and experience in aesthetics, agriculture, astronomy, botany, cosmology, engineering, medicine, music, languages, law, literature, philosophy, political institutions, social relations, etc, are being lost, need to be recovered and brought back to consciousness. This does not mean that Western (or other) knowledge is to be ignored. Rather, it means that African and Western systems of knowledge need to interact, engage with each other, seeking both new syntheses and insights into each other’s strengths and limitations. This is of course particularly important in the social sciences, arts, and humanities, fields that are so clearly and deeply culture bound.¹⁸

With this in mind many people commented that it is now especially important for African universities to break this dependency and to develop much stronger programs that can produce their own PhDs capable of countering the still wide-spread pernicious view that the font of all wisdom lies elsewhere; in Europe, the UK, the US – or once, for many, in the Socialist bloc -- and now perhaps in East Asia or India. Aside from being false, the presumption that the West has a monopoly on wisdom, that the highest levels of intellectual training, development, and thought can only be achieved in other parts of the world, is self-destructive, demoralizing, demobilizing, and a denial of the value of one's own experience.

This should not be read as a demand for a narrow, romantic, or reactionary Afro-centrism. African scholars in all fields recognize the need to be familiar with, to draw on, and make the most of knowledge generated in other parts of the world. But along side that there is growing demand that African scholars must also be able to critique and challenge external knowledges from their own perspectives, to reconstruct them for their own purposes, and to generate their own theories, models, analytical tools that variously incorporate and contest supposedly universal US or Eurocentric models. Many have made this point in writing (e.g., Ake 1984, Amin 1988, Mazrui 1992, Mbembe, 1992, Abegaz 1994, Maolo 1994, Hountondji 1997, Mamdani 1996, Prah 1997, 2000, Ntuli 1999, Yankah 2000, Hamilton 2001, Adesina forthcoming). A recent and particularly reasoned statement and comes from Kwesi Prah (2001:8-9):

“In the African experience it is arguable that there are two parallel histories of knowledge and knowledge production. The first of these is what is generally described in the literature as endogenous knowledge – knowledge that is built into African cultural thought and practice and in steadily modified forms, passed down to successive generations. It is possible to say that this sort of knowledge is generally dying out as a reproduced genre as it is superseded by received knowledge. The other history of knowledge is that which has been received through the Western encounter and which is also reproduced to narrower sections of the African population and which goes into the creation of the modern elite in African societies.

We describe these histories as parallel histories because hitherto there has been no sociological or educational mechanism that enables them to meet or converge. Generally the social process in Africa has tended to devalue endogenous systems of knowledge... Most observers and students of African society suggest that if education and development in Africa is to take place in a sustained fashion which guarantees the socio-economic prosperity of mass society, it will, as of necessity, have to be built on what the masses already know, what they have inherited, and not bypass such knowledge. In other words the received knowledge would profitably have to be indigenised as adaptations to the endogenous. The process of marrying received and endogenous forms of

knowledge poses many challenges and intrigues the creativity of interested parties. Such considerations need constantly to inform our efforts as curriculum development.”

Like intellectuals everywhere today, African academics recognize that they and their students need to spend periods of time in other countries familiarizing themselves with other perspectives and possibilities, as well as building links to a range of counterparts, potential colleagues, and larger international intellectual communities. But that does not mean they must get their PhDs in those other countries. Indeed, as mentioned below in Section II on sandwich programs, doing a full PhD program overseas often results, among other things, in distorted expectations and losing touch with key issues and current dynamics of the home country.

It is interesting to note, however, that as mentioned briefly above, the loss of contact with broader international intellectual currents, and the related loss of confidence, seems somewhat more of an issue in the Anglophone universities than in their Francophone counterparts. At least as reflected in their dissertation topics (Appendix III), it would appear that the problematic but continuing political, economic, cultural, and intellectual bonds between France and its ex-colonies has meant that doctoral students in the Francophone universities feel more able to keep up with the literature and debates at least in the French university system. Determining whether this represents an ivory tower conservatism, a refusal to deal with issues at home and thus local irrelevance -- or more positively, a continuing cosmopolitan and internationalist outlook -- is a complex judgment and would require some further research.

More broadly, the capacity to produce, and the actual production of consequential numbers of PhDs is, and is widely seen as, both a symbol and a concrete and crucial contribution to a nation's intellectual stature and presence in the world. Universities in most of the previously colonized nations in Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America have serious and substantial PhD programs. Moreover, unlike the NLUs, most of their PhD programs are conducted in their own national languages, and not in the colonial language, as is endemic in Africa.¹⁹ There are also of course specialized disciplines in the physical and natural sciences that require elaborate laboratories and equipment only available elsewhere, and in which the most advanced training requires an overseas PhD. But that is not the case in the social sciences, humanities, and arts. These disciplines usually call for access to some classic and current literature and debates in the particular sub-fields, and not all the NLU libraries have all these items. Focused and feasible investments, however, along with access to the growing numbers of journals already on line, or going on-line, mean that these core materials need not be out of reach. But what those seeking the PhD in these fields most fundamentally need is access to people, communities, public and private institutions, archives, expressive forms, etc., in their home country.

There is also widespread agreement that today, even more important for the elaboration of serious social science, arts, and humanities PhD programs in the NLUs, will be an infusion of new self-confident young scholars. Most departments in these disciplines in the NLUs are currently stretched and stressed beyond the point that they could, or could imagine, substantially enlarging their PhD programs. To broaden and strengthen their PhD programs they nearly all need additional committed and well-trained academic staff specifically charged to bring new energy, new confidence, new approaches, and new pedagogies to their departments. There have been many bitter disappointments since the heady days of de-colonization in the 1950 and 1960s. Today a new cohort of younger scholars dealing with social, political, and cultural issues is badly needed, researchers who could regenerate at least some of the excitement and vitality of that earlier period.

Structural Issues

There are also other very pragmatic structural reasons for the relatively low output and intellectually constrained dissertations currently being produced in the African universities. Because of the poor faculty salaries, benefits, and teaching conditions many senior professors have shifted over to externally and relatively well and more flexibly funded, project-oriented, research institutes. But this means minimizing their teaching activities. Others get caught up in well paying project development or evaluation consultancies for national and international donors, agencies, and NGOs operating locally or elsewhere.²⁰ Yet others have simply joined the international brain drain to Europe, the UK, the US, or in recent years, to the Middle East, in some cases taking their best students with them. But by whichever route, these key faculty are lost to their departments and disciplines. As a result, crucial and widely desired courses in theory, methods, proposal writing, agenda setting, philosophy, the ethics and politics of research, etc. are not getting taught. Innovations in pedagogy – courses they might teach designed to encourage exchange, debate, discovery, challenging received wisdom, etc. -- are few and far between. Equally problematic, doctoral students – and thus potential junior faculty – lose the essential apprenticeships, mentoring, supervision, and role models that they need and want. As a consequence, students complain and the remaining overworked faculty admit that it often takes two to six or more demoralizing months for a student to obtain feedback from his or her supervisor on a draft proposal or dissertation chapter.

Furthermore, systems for approving dissertation research and funding proposals are rarely encouraging. Given the still ubiquitous research-only doctoral programs, enormous energy and attention is generally directed to the dissertation proposal. One consequence is that the process of identifying, developing, and obtaining official approval for a dissertation topic often takes two years or more. In most African universities draft proposals must go through a hierarchy of evaluations from

supervisors, departments, faculties, and multi-disciplinary graduate committees whose members are often unfamiliar with or suspicious of the methods used in other disciplines. In some universities, a more or less rubber stamp is required from the Vice Chancellor as well. And at any of these levels, the proposal can be turned back to the candidate for revisions that may call for starting the entire process all over again. And once a proposal is approved, a similar, and similarly long, process is often required to seek access to the very limited university funding available for dissertation projects. As a result while university catalogues generally claim that the PhD takes 2 years beyond the Masters degree or M. Phil, six to eight years seems far more common. Efforts to streamline these procedures are underway, for example, at Dar es Salaam. However, the current and understandable expectation that realistically it will take six to eight years to complete a PhD is daunting and discouraging for many.

At the same time there is also the long established tradition in African universities that PhDs are best obtained in overseas universities, preferably in Europe, the UK, and in recent decades, in the United States. There are several sources for this preference. In part it is rooted in the fact that even the oldest African universities were only established in the immediate post-colonial period of the 1950s and 1960s. Those were heady days of intellectual and political ferment, optimism, and excitement in the new universities. But necessarily, their primary emphasis at that time had to be on the first degree and then Masters level professional training largely aimed at training students for entry into burgeoning government service. In those initial decades the universities rarely had sufficient senior faculty to supervise PhD programs and dissertations. Furthermore, what senior African faculty they did have had usually studied at leading institutions (Oxbridge, Paris, Lisbon, etc.) in the colonial metropole. As might be expected, they then took those universities as an architectural, organizational, and intellectual model for their own institutions. Not surprisingly, they then took the metropolitan universities as the appropriate locale for training their successors. These sentiments were also reinforced by the large numbers of expatriate administrators and faculty from the (now ex-)colonial power who helped to staff the new African universities. Aside from an emotional old school tie, these preferences were justified intellectually by an understandable and appropriate concern to avoid “in-breeding” of faculty from their own university. Today there are signs of a growing concern that European PhDs on European disciplinary agendas are hard to follow-up on once back at home, and are often irrelevant to – indeed in some cited cases seem totally dysfunctional for -- local teaching or research needs. Nevertheless, in principle, and especially for the individual Fellow - if not the institution - the overseas degree remains a powerful model and attraction.

The historic roots in the British and French traditions inevitably meant that as PhD programs did develop on African university campuses they also followed the British and French research-only models, which tend to produce an intensely focused, but often narrow, “needle approach” to scholarship. For many years, the contrasting

American model, combining a broad array of course work, reading, and exams, multiple supervisors (a dissertation committee often including someone in another discipline), along with research for the PhD, was seen as unnecessary and inferior. More recently, however, although the issue is still often debated, views seem to be changing. In part this is due to the growing numbers of faculty who have over the 1970s and 1980s obtained their doctorates in US universities. Indeed, as Appendix IV demonstrates, the number of faculty at Legon, Makerere, and Dar es Salaam with PhDs from US and Canada is beginning to approach the numbers with degrees from UK and European universities. At least among the US trained, there is an appreciation of the American system for its ability to produce a more broadly trained scholar capable of teaching a wider range of courses and engaging in increasingly valued interdisciplinary teaching programs and research activities. The American model is also seen as less likely to simply produce a deferential “clone” of a single domineering supervisor as sometimes happens under the British and French systems. As a result, many faculty and administrators at the various African universities, while sometimes wary or critical of irrelevant US theoretical or highly technical research agendas, nevertheless indicated great interest in shifting to American-style course work cum research PhD programs. Unfortunately, the shortage of relevant advanced courses and faculty trained in this tradition has so far frustrated their development and implementation.

Earlier in this report we noted that it appeared that the number of locally produced PhDs seems to be increasing, and seems likely to continue growing. Two major factors, working together, appear to be pushing this forward. First is the absolute decline in funding to send students or junior faculty for full PhD programs abroad. Many government agencies, international donors, and the universities themselves have reduced or eliminated this form of support. In part, this is because it has become so expensive – often and easily \$40,000 a year for six to eight years depending on the field and the student’s background and prior training or experience. And in part because of bad experience with return rates of PhDs who have done their graduate studies abroad. The recent SSRC study of return rates suggested that while there is substantial variation by country, time period, and political and economic conditions, overall, nearly two-thirds of US trained African PhDs returned to the Continent (Pires et.al. 1999), though not all stayed, or came back to academic positions. Local estimates at most of the universities we visited, however, all ran well under 50%, and it was said that many of those junior faculty who did return, did not stay long, but moved on within a few years to other more remunerative positions. There was also a broad consensus that return rates from the US – with its huge array of colleges, universities, and other employment opportunities - were much worse than from Europe or the UK, where it seemed more difficult for even highly trained Africans to gain entry into the smaller academic or other job markets.

The second factor working to increase the numbers of locally trained PhDs, initiated at Legon in 1995, and more recently put into effect at Makerere and Dar es

Salaam, and possibly elsewhere, is a requirement that junior faculty must register for, and actually begin to work on, PhDs, in order to continue in a faculty position. Until recently, and still today, a great deal of teaching in the NLUs is done by faculty with only Masters or M. Phil. degrees. Intent on raising standards, filling the “generation or succession gap” in faculty created by hiring limits and freezes in the 1980s and 1990s, as well as generally increasing their research and teaching capacities, these universities are now starting to require – and to provide limited funds to facilitate obtaining -- the full PhD for regular faculty appointments. Absent a PhD or demonstrated efforts to obtain one, faculty will now have to make a very strong case explaining why it is not needed. And at least at Dar es Salaam, some junior faculty have already been dropped because they would not comply with this new expectation. Because of the numerous problems and obstacles described above, the actual number of new PhDs being produced locally is nevertheless still only growing slowly. Many of these junior faculty would no doubt prefer to do their degree in some other (overseas) university. The decline of fellowship support for international study, however, has meant that they almost inevitably must register for the PhD at their home institution.

One consequence is that an increasing proportion – perhaps even the majority -- of the students registered for the doctorate in African universities today are in fact junior faculty in those institutions. On the one hand, this means that they are somewhat older, in their late 20s, 30s, or early 40s. Thus many already have familial and financial responsibilities that require them, much as their supervising professors, to engage in consultancies that are rarely relevant to their dissertations, and which further slow progress on their dissertation research and writing. It also means that they cannot be full time students. Indeed it was suggested that the only full time doctoral students on these campuses tend to be fully funded foreign students, or else the wives of diplomats or very wealthy local businessmen! On the other hand, in only a very few fields such as agriculture and economics is there strong labour market demand for people with PhDs – and still not much in the private sector. Likewise, most government agencies, NGOs, and private firms in Africa seem content with hiring (and internally training, if need be), Bachelors or Masters level graduates. Few seem to feel a need for personnel with doctoral level research training.

At least at Legon, Addis Ababa, and Zimbabwe (and perhaps elsewhere) there is however, a structural differentiation between the Masters and M. Phil. degrees. Masters degrees, which require course work plus a relatively modest research project, are in effect designed to lead to professional positions outside the university. The M. Phil, which likewise requires course work, but also a much more substantial research project and thesis, is generally necessary for teaching at the university – and now as the base from which to move towards the PhD in order to retain a faculty position. In time, demand is likely to grow for individuals with PhDs in government and the private sector, but for the moment, the bulk of those seeking the PhD – despite all of the problems (and opportunity costs) – are likely to have academic careers in mind. They

are, or at least would like to become, that rare breed of committed teachers, researchers, intellectuals, and intellectual leaders that every country needs.

Relevance and Dissemination

While there are certainly positive elements in this shift towards more locally produced PhDs, another problem surely undercuts its promise, and also brings us back to the question of “relevance,” and who or what, exactly, is the dissertation being written for? What is it relevant to? We noted earlier that based on their titles, the vast majority of dissertations being written in the NLUs seem to be dealing with local phenomena, issues, or problems. Nevertheless, up to now very few dissertations produced in these universities, or articles or books based on those dissertations, ever get published locally or elsewhere. CODESRIA, OSSREA and a number of professional organizations produce academic journals but they can publish only a small number of articles, and these are mostly by senior scholars. University journals are few, irregular, and rarely distributed beyond the local campus. University presses are grossly underfunded, can publish only small numbers of monographs, and again, national and international distribution is extremely limited. For both lack of experience and lack of contacts, junior faculty have a particularly difficult time breaking into the local, no less the international, publishing worlds. As a result, almost all dissertations end up stacked, or even locked up, in a university office, available if at all, solely in the home university library. At best this leads to campus in-breeding. But more generally, as mentioned earlier, most dissertations remain largely unknown to anyone but the author and his or her supervisor. And still more dispiriting, academic promotions are everywhere heavily dependent upon publications in international and peer reviewed journals and university presses.

The Association of African Universities’ DATAD project mentioned above will take an important first step in addressing some of these issues by enabling scholars at participating universities to become aware of the MA theses and PhD dissertations being produced at the other institutions, and which might be relevant to their own research or teaching. However, access will still remain a problem until there is a reliable Continent-wide inter-library loan system, and/or the kind of University Microfilm system that enables campus libraries to purchase, at reasonable cost, copies of dissertations produced at other universities. Lack of financial resources has certainly been part of the problem up to now. But given the limited opportunities for publication -- and thus establishing copyright and public recognition for who has written what -- there is also a commonly cited fear of plagiarism which discourages individuals and institutions from disseminating their unpublished materials. Few are yet comfortable with the idea of publishing on the Internet, even when they do have access. Thus even if a dissertation represents a brilliant analysis of an important local, national, or international issue, and is filled with useful data and programmatic suggestions, aside

from the important but personal academic credentialing of the author, in terms of “relevance,” it is almost as though the dissertation had never been written. At present, more effective mechanisms and interacting communities of scholars are crucially needed, both for setting research agendas and for disseminating their results.

b. The South African Universities (the SAUs)

The universities in South Africa (SAUs) have also gone through dramatic changes over the past 20 years, but of a very different sort than their counterparts to the north. Today, the South African universities are facing serious challenges and attempting major transformations on several fronts (financial, political/intellectual, curricular, organizational, etc.).²¹ Many of these changes are bringing them closer to the NLUs. Nevertheless, many of the SAUs retain particular strengths that suggest intensified and formalized exchanges and increased collaboration across these lines in a variety of areas would be mutually beneficial.

South Africa is of course a much wealthier country than those to its north, though its wealth is even more cruelly divided. Its system of higher education is likewise much older, has much more substantial physical facilities, but has also long been (and still remains) highly differentiated. Under the Apartheid regime 20 campus-based universities were separately designated for “White,” “Coloured,” “African,” and “Asian” (largely Indian) students.²² The ten “white” universities were further divided between four operating in English and six in Afrikaans. Fedderke et. al. (2001), provide a detailed analysis of university funding, graduation rates, and research productivity across this system from the 1960s up to 1994. Contrary to the common assumption, on a per capita student basis, the eight universities for African students, the one for Coloured students (UWC) and the one for Asian students (UDW), had substantial and comparable state funding, at times even greater funding (especially when first getting established), than the universities for the White students. Nevertheless, if only due to the poor preparation in the primary and secondary Bantu Education system, higher student-faculty ratios, the intense political engagements of many of their students, and their more limited opportunities for employment and mobility, they had significantly lower graduation rates.

In the 1980s, the four English language universities, Cape Town, Natal, Rhodes, Witwatersrand, all centers of opposition to the Apartheid regime, began to challenge Apartheid laws by admitting small but significant numbers of “black,” that is, African, Indian, and Coloured students. By 1988, 20% to 29% of the students in these four universities were black. In contrast, at that same time, the six Afrikaans universities, Free State, Port Elizabeth, Potchefstrom, Pretoria, Rand, and Stellenbosch averaged only 3% black students. Since then, however, under the new ANC government, African,

Indian, and Coloured enrollments in all of these universities have grown dramatically. By 2000, the English language universities had increased to 59% black students and the Afrikaans universities had gone up to 38% black students (Cooper and Subotzky 2001). This has meant developing a variety of special access programs and remedial courses to compensate for the often limited primary and secondary education of many of these students. While this has led to debates about “lowered standards,” many of these programs and courses have been innovative and effective, and have identified many students of previously unsuspected talent. In this context, the total number of African students in universities doubled in the ten years between 1988 and 1998. In addition, there was a sharp shift among them to the previously “White” universities. Thus the percentage of African university students attending those universities rose from 6 to 27% during that period, while the percentage studying in previously African universities fell from 55% to 37%. The remaining 36% of the African students are studying at UDW and UWC or UNISA, the national distance education university.

Clearly, racialism (and xenophobia) remain major and long-term social problems in South Africa – much as they do in the rest of the world. And given that the white population of South Africa is only 13%, the much improved enrollment figures for 2000 are still not proportional. Nevertheless, they also suggest that, at least at an institutional level, there has been substantial and continuing progress in this domain as African, Coloured, and Asian students shift to the older, better endowed, more prestigious previously white universities. It is also important to note that post-Apartheid politics and intellectual life in general, as well as the shift in the student populations, have had a dramatic effect in expanding the amount and level of specifically African material in the curriculum of the South African universities. The prior largely Eurocentric orientation of these institutions is now being supplemented and even challenged by substantial new attention in the classroom to African literature, oral and written, music, theology, medicine, social institutions, agricultural practices, etc.

PhD Granting Capacities

Turning from general (and largely undergraduate) enrollments to the training of PhDs, it is clear that the SAUs originally designated for White students have been very much more productive. These universities are well established, pre-World War II institutions. They had and still have many more faculty trained to the PhD level, better stocked libraries, well equipped laboratories, and long traditions of scholarship based on UK or European models. These models do include the UK or European research PhD, although it is now common practice to insist on supplementing the research with course work or other training essential to facilitate or broaden the dissertation project. The SAUs’ ICT facilities are readily accessible for students and faculty and operate at the highest international standards. These universities are often located in cosmopolitan centers, e.g., Johannesburg, Cape Town, Durban, and Pretoria, and have long defined themselves

as part of - and post-Apartheid have participated actively in - an international community of scholarship, largely oriented towards the UK, US, and Europe. And while they also suffer from faculty being drawn away for consultancies, black faculty especially being drawn away into government and the private sector, and from issues of supervision, these problems are not nearly as debilitating as they often are in the NLUs.

In contrast, aside from Fort Hare, the universities for black students are much newer. They are often (including Fort Hare) located in more peripheral or rural settings, less widely known, and more distant from international contacts. They were also charged with far more remedial work with their students. Advanced research and PhD training did not, and could not, have the same priority. One crude but telling indication of these differences is that in 1984, faculty at these universities produced only 4% of the 3,270 research publications by South Africans that year. By 1995, the situation had improved considerably; that year these universities accounted for 10% of 4,940 South African research publications - though mostly by faculty at UDW and UWC. This is clearly an improvement but still far from proportional to their representation in the population or the teaching force (Fedderke et. al. 2001). At the same time five universities (Cape Town, Natal, Pretoria, Stellenbosch, and Witwatersrand), accounted for 61% of government R&D funds for higher education, and 63% of the research publications (Cloete and Bunting 2000, p.40).

In this context, it should not be surprising that the formerly white universities have been and remain today the major, and quite substantial, sites of PhD training. Thus in 1998 they had some 2,735 doctoral students enrolled compared to 275 in the historically black universities. The University of Cape Town alone produced 382 PhDs in the five years from 1996 to 2000 averaging 76 per year, including 84 PhDs in the social sciences and humanities. Over the ten years 1991 to 2000, the much larger University of Pretoria produced 1,100 PhDs (averaging 110 per year), including 226 in the social sciences and humanities. Similarly, the University of Stellenbosch produced 790 doctoral dissertations over the 11 years from 1990 to 2000, or an average of 72 per year. At least 203 of these were in the social sciences, arts, and humanities. We have requested but not yet received the comparable figures from the Universities of Natal and Witwatersrand but they are certainly equally substantial.

Clearly, the formerly white SAUs have the capacity to train large numbers of PhDs in general, and in the social sciences and humanities in particular. But equally important, unlike many of the NLUs, the SAUs have not been constrained by tradition or orientation to depend as heavily on overseas PhDs for their own academic staff. The differences, as indicated in Appendix IV, are striking. Thus, while 53% to 84% of the faculty in the SAUs have their PhDs from their home or another (South) African university, the comparable range for Legon, Makerere and Dar es Salaam is only 7% to 31%. In effect, at least historically, the NLUs have not been absorbing their own graduates, nor has there been much lateral movement of faculty from other NLUs.

Instead, while the SAUs have been developing home grown talents, the NLUs have been depending for their faculty on PhD training in universities in the UK, the US and Canada, Europe, and Australia and Asia. The SAUs also draw faculty from universities across the globe, but they obviously feel comfortable employing faculty from their own (and other) South African institutions. Indeed, they have a tradition of producing new researchers and professors whom they are pleased to draw into their own ranks – precisely as many of the NLUs are now hoping to do.²³

As indicated earlier, the entire South African tertiary system is currently undergoing major processes of rationalization and consolidation. Many programs and departments within universities have already been consolidated, new inter-institutional collaborations are being constructed, and Ministerial-level discussions are now underway for rapidly integrating, even merging, nearby institutions in order to eliminate redundancies and inefficiencies lingering from the Apartheid period. These impending changes, to be made public in March 2002, are inevitably producing a degree of uncertainty and nervousness in many quarters. But once the process is complete, the resulting institutions should (will hopefully) be stronger than before.

Despite the current relatively high level of scholarly activity, the substantial internal training capacities, and the anxieties regarding the rationalization of the system, there is also a widespread and growing recognition within the SAUs that for intellectual, political, and cultural reasons they need to much more fully integrate with their counterparts in the countries to their north. The Apartheid regime and its supporters insisted on a “South African exceptionalism,” but as Mahmoud Mamdani (1996) and others have pointed out, that is both inaccurate and untenable. South Africa and its universities need, and many of its scholars and intellectual leaders are calling for “deparochialization.” For all its distinctive strengths and equally distinctive history and problems, South Africa is, and is rapidly becoming ever more, part of Africa. Today, recognition of that fact, and the necessity of building upon it, is growing in many quarters and levels of the society.

There are already numerous indications of this within the universities. For example, in 1999 the University of Natal organized an African Initiative Core Group composed of senior faculty already actively engaged in collaborative research projects with counterparts in the countries to the north, and charged the Core Group to help develop still more such projects. At present Natal has on-going projects in the natural and social sciences and the humanities with colleagues in Botswana, Burkina Faso, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Cote d’Ivoire, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. The University of Natal also has more than 600 students from the Southern African Development Community (SADC) countries, and many more from East, Central, and West Africa. It also offers English language courses specifically for postgraduate students from Francophone countries – and most recently from Eritrea. The University

of Cape Town has even larger figures in this regard. In 2001, UCT registered 1,603 students from SADC countries, and close to 200 from other African countries. UCT also has institutional links with universities in Angola, Botswana, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. And at the provincial level, esATI, the consortium of KwaZulu Natal universities and technikons, originally intended for that province's tertiary institutions alone, has been working for several years now to engage Mozambique's University Eduardo Mondlane in its activities.

Among the SAUs more broadly there are numerous markers of a growing concern for developing multi-institutional collaborative links to the rest of Africa. One of the most interesting perhaps is a recent detailed agenda-setting document for the social sciences in the SADC countries, jointly produced by scholars from Namibia, Mauritius, Mozambique, and South Africa.²⁴ At the national and inter-national level, the plans for a Millennium Partnership for the African Recovery Program (MAP), the recent formation of an African Union, and the calls for an African Renaissance, are all being led, among others, by South African President Thabo Mbeki. After years of politically induced separation and conflict with the rest of Africa, many South Africans now recognize the need and indeed desire, to re-engage in new, creative, and constructive ways with its neighbors to the north. On both sides there is a history and a wariness to be overcome. But the differences are not as great as they once were, the problems are increasingly similar, useful complementarities exist, and it is widely understood that new integrative efforts can be extremely and mutually beneficial to everyone concerned.

II. Sandwich Programs

In parallel to the declining ability of African universities and Ministries of Education, and the declining willingness of many external donors, to provide the now very substantial funding needed for full PhD programs in universities in Europe, the UK, and the US, there has been a widespread growth in the use and appreciation of short term certificates and "sandwich programs." Although they vary in detail, the sandwich programs essentially enable doctoral (or masters) students to spend a semester or academic year at another university or a research institute or laboratory - elsewhere in Africa, but more usually overseas - attending courses or seminars, poring through the literature, working with and obtaining external feedback on their ideas from a senior mentor, advisor, or supervisor. These awards, generally four months to a year, also enable the fellows to attend relevant workshops or conferences, learn new techniques, do pilot studies or conduct elements of their research which they could not do at home, all in preparation for, or as part of, their MA thesis or doctoral dissertation project. In the sciences, sandwich program fellows sometimes conduct the entirety of their laboratory research in such programs. Likewise, young historians may use a sandwich program to gather most if not all of their material in relevant European colonial archives.

In the process they may also develop enduring personal and professional relationships and collaborations with faculty and other students in the host institution.

Many students still of course prefer and seek to do a full PhD at an overseas university. The reasons are numerous: (1) longer and deeper international exposure and connections, (2) greater library or technical facilities, (3) broader course work possibilities, (4) more immediately responsive and “up-to-date” overseas supervisors, (5) identification with and/or encouragement from their home university mentor whom probably did his or her degree abroad, (6) a desire to minimize intellectual “in-breeding” at the home institution, (7) the greater possibilities of professional internships and post-doctoral fellowships, (8) opportunities to save some fellowship money and even earn additional hard currency funds, (9) higher status often derived from an overseas degree, and (10) presumably greater subsequent professional opportunities it is thought to confer. In addition, while the long separations involved in doing a full PhD overseas may be much lonelier (11) it is often much easier to concentrate on one’s studies away from the demands and distractions of one’s family, friends, and academic colleagues, as well as from university and national politics. On the other hand, few junior university faculty have the resources to do this, and those who do obtain their degrees abroad, supported by their families, and at whatever level, rarely seem to have in mind academic careers at home.²⁵

From an institutional standpoint, however, many have come to feel that sandwich programs are in fact preferable. Clearly, they cost much less, depending on the country and travel costs, \$10,000 to \$20,000 for a semester or year long sandwich program, versus usually \$120,000 to \$200,000 for a full four to six year overseas PhD. Because they are of comparatively short duration, they are also much easier on the usually already stretched faculty left behind who have to pick up the classes, advising, and administrative roles of their absent colleague. They are also often preferred by students and faculty with family obligations and/or consultancies and who may not be able to afford (literally or emotionally), being away for long stretches of time. Families waiting at home of course usually prefer them as well. In addition, although there seems to be no hard data on the subject, relatively short-term sandwich programs are presumed, probably accurately, to reduce the probability of brain drain. At the same time they do bring new ideas, methods, and contacts back to their home institution. This is valued in itself, but also for reducing the kind of intellectual in-breeding more likely to follow from doing a degree entirely at the home institution – especially in the context of the European model research-only doctorates, in which the student’s dissertation is heavily shaped and supervised by a single senior professor.

Aside from these practical and personal issues, it was frequently observed that students doing full PhDs overseas often are trained in techniques or develop research agendas or deal with issues of limited relevance at home. Equally problematic, they are often seen to develop expectations that cannot be met upon return home, and which lead

to frustration and often a rapid departure from the university. Moreover, several people noted that the high rates of local social, economic, and political change in their home countries mean it is often difficult for students who have been away for extended periods to develop an adequate understanding or appreciation of local issues, dynamics, and trajectories. In effect, shorter-term sandwich programs were said to facilitate the construction of more locally and intellectually relevant research agendas and dissertation projects than full PhDs done abroad.

For all of these reasons, many senior African university faculty and administrators, as well as foreign donors, are increasingly positive about the use of sandwich programs for postgraduate training. Within Africa, and especially in the natural and physical sciences, while we could not determine numbers, many discussions suggested that research-oriented sandwich programs are becoming increasingly common, either at another institution in the same country, or else in another country entirely. These programs or exchanges almost always take advantage of the facilities (and funding) of various national or international scientific laboratories or institutes such as the International Centres for Research in Agro-Forestry in Cameroon and Kenya; the Southern Africa Center for Cooperation in Agricultural Research and Training in Botswana; the International Center for Insect Physiology and Ecology in Kenya and Ghana (which draws MA and PhD students from 26 universities in its African Regional Postgraduate Programme in Insect Science, ARPPIS); the Institute of Molecular and Cell Biology – Africa; the International Livestock Research Institute, the Kenya Medical Research Institute; the Regional Dryland Programme in Eastern Africa; and the National Accelerator Center in South Africa.

At one level it is extremely fortunate that such institutions exist for they often have a capacity to produce important research. Unfortunately, these institutes tend to be minimally linked to the local or regional universities, and thus have much weaker training activities or functions than they might have. In general, support for these institutes grew substantially during the 1980s and 1990s, the period when declining government and donor funding was undercutting the universities' capacities to produce much research themselves. Today, with interest and support for at least selected NLU's growing once again, it would seem important to re-connect the largely autonomous specialized research institutes to at least the nearby universities through exchanges of faculty and staff - and much expanded supervision of MA, and especially PhD, students. In principle, administrators and staff at the research institutes should be pleased to help develop the next generation of scholars in their own field. Indeed, some, even though largely or entirely autonomous, are actually located, physically, on university campuses. It may, however, require some new mechanisms and incentives to achieve this goal – an issue beyond this report, but probably worth further research.

In contrast to the largely natural and physical science oriented sandwich programs described above, and despite frequent statements of a desire or stressing the

value of studying in another institution or country, sandwich programs within Africa for doctoral students in the social sciences, arts, and humanities seem relatively rare. There are multiple reasons for this. Limited funding is the most obvious, but there are also relatively few large-scale, well-funded, formal extra-university multi-faculty research institutes in the social sciences and humanities comparable to those mentioned above in the natural and physical sciences. Moreover, budding social scientists or humanists – many of whom are working on local social, economic, or cultural issues or phenomena – usually do not need the kinds of elaborate equipment or facilities often required in the natural and physical sciences. More broadly still, not just in Africa, but across the world, there is a much greater tradition of multi-disciplinary team work in the natural and physical sciences, particularly in the kinds of topical or problem oriented Centers and Institutes mentioned above.

There are of course in Africa a few multi-disciplinary and topical social science oriented centers and institutes such as the Regional Institute for Population Studies in Ghana and the Institut de Formation et de Recherche Demographique in Cameroon which do provide initial training, certificates, and produce small numbers of MAs, largely for mid-career professionals – but not PhD students. Other social science centers and networks such as the African Census Analysis Project, the SADC Census Initiative, and the INDEPTH Network, and the Africa Population and Health Center produce - or are promising to produce - important topical and policy related research. But again, as noted by Preston-Whyte (2001), so far, their contributions to PhD training or research have been limited.

Perhaps the closest equivalent for social science students to participate in the kinds of larger research programs more readily available to students in the natural sciences might involve taking part in multi-institutional or international collaborative research projects - or else the internships some students obtain in government or policy research organizations. But the similarities are limited, if only because unlike their counterparts in the natural sciences, while such activities may provide useful experience, they rarely seem structured to provide the core data or key materials for their dissertation projects. Instead, social science students who are drawn into these kinds of projects are largely utilized simply to help gather data. Only rarely are they involved in the conceptualization or design of the project, or the analysis, interpretation, and write-up of the material, activities that might contribute substantially and directly to their dissertation projects.

Among the major European donors (British, Danish, Dutch, French, German, Norwegian, Swedish), the provision of small numbers of full MA and PhD fellowships in their own home country universities still remains the most common mode of contributing the formal academic training of Africa students and junior faculty. As might be expected, the French programs do send a few students from East Africa for degree programs in France, but because of the language problem they are much more

active in the West African Francophone countries where university students all speak French, essential to studying in the French universities. In contrast, many Dutch, German, and Scandinavian universities have courses and programs in English, and therefore draw more heavily, but still selectively, on the Anglophone countries. Thus for example, in 2001, the Norwegian NORAD Fellowship Programme is funding 53 professionals from nine Anglophone African countries for formal two-year MS and M. Phil degrees in various applied fields. Most will be attending five different Norwegian universities – with a few expected to attend Eduardo Mondlane University in Mozambique and the University of Western Cape in South Africa. Strikingly, the UN agencies that draw on large numbers of PhDs from Africa (and elsewhere) provide little or no support for PhD training.

The British government similarly offers several large scholarship programs open to international students including of course African students. The three major programs are the British Chevening Scholarships, the Technical Co-operation Training Awards (linked to British overseas development projects and specifically excluding the humanities, fine arts and cultural subjects), and the Department for International Development Shared Scholarships (limited to developing Commonwealth countries). These awards are mostly intended for MA and PhD studies at universities in the UK, although they can also support research projects and short-term non-degree professional/technical courses - some of which could be considered sandwich programs. In nearly all cases the scholars' projects must be related somehow to the socio-economic development of their home country. We are attempting to obtain the numbers, distribution by countries in Africa, fields, levels, and nature of the academic programs for these British (and French) awards, but their authorities have not yet responded.

USAID is also shifting its emphasis from PhDs to shorter term non-degree or MA programs. In 1986, USAID was funding 257 Africans in US universities in PhD programs in all fields; by 1994 the number had fallen to 98 (Heisel 1998:27). Today, that form of support seems to have disappeared. Instead, largely working with IIE, USAID is operating on a much smaller scale and on much shorter time frames. In Africa, for example, it is about to provide short term, specifically non-degree, in-country, third-country, and US based training programs for 30 Namibians working on local development issues. USAID's Tertiary Education Leadership Program for South Africa, again through IIE, currently has 27 fellows in US degree programs. Another 27 MA, but only three PhD, candidates from 12 Historically Disadvantaged Institutions will be selected shortly. The USAID/IIE Mandela Economics Scholars program expects to bring four MA and eight PhD candidates for degrees in US universities. Perhaps equally significant, USAID has recently asked IIE to develop a system to locate (and create follow-on activities for) the large numbers of South Africans the agency has helped train in the past, but whom it has now lost track of!

Nevertheless, even if conclusive numbers are difficult to obtain because of the wide array of countries, donors, types of programs, the mobility of the fellowship recipients (and minimal interest everywhere in careful record keeping), discussions with university personnel and donor staff clearly suggest that short-term sandwich programs outside of Africa are growing. These programs are also quite selective and take a variety of forms. Thus alongside an older PhD fellowship program, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) is now offering sandwich programs to young university or research institute staff in Tanzania who are already doing PhDs in Marine Sciences, Bio-safety, and Archeology that will bring them for further (English language) training in Swedish universities. SIDA is likewise bringing young Eritrean researchers for sandwich programs in various Swedish university Engineering departments. In Uganda, SIDA is providing sandwich fellowships in Sweden in agriculture, engineering, medicine, and social science for the junior Ugandan participants in several large collaborative research projects involving Swedish and Ugandan scholars. More broadly, SIDA has announced a new “Partnership with Africa” approach to its activities which, as in the Ugandan case, specifically focuses the sandwich programs on participating students and junior faculty in large, jointly designed and managed, collaborative research projects (Wohlgemuth, 2000).

One of the more generous new sandwich programs derives from a major grant from the Mellon Foundation to the University of Cape Town (UCT). This program provides full funding for six months at one of six US universities (Berkeley, Brown, Emory, Michigan, Penn State, and Stanford), for fellows doing an MA at UCT. Students doing a PhD at UCT can obtain a full year of support at one of those US universities. To obtain one of these fellowships, students must have a clear plan of research and at least a nominal commitment to an academic career.

The University of California (UC) provides another institutional model and source of sandwich programs for fellows from the African (and other) universities to which UC sends its undergraduates through its own Education Abroad Program. Thus for every UC undergraduate who goes to study abroad, the host university in Africa earns a dollar credit which can be used towards the cost of sending a junior faculty or administrative staff member to one of the UC campuses. The UC system maintains an office to help place the “reciprocity fellows” on UC campuses with appropriate faculty or mentors, and they often use their stay in at UC to conduct research for their PhD or MA degree. Reciprocity fellows in university administration are instead assigned to “shadow” their functional counterparts – usually for shorter periods of three to six weeks – in one or more UC campuses to see what they might adapt to their home institution. At the moment, in Africa, this program only includes the University of Ghana, Legon, the University of Natal (Durban and Pietermaritzburg), and the University of Cape Town, but it has been more inclusive in the past and hopefully will expand to cover more institutions in the near future.

UNESCO has recently initiated another model of sandwich program. Concerned to encourage regional centers of excellence, the exchange of materials and expertise, and to further regional collaboration, UNESCO has funded a “Pilot Academic Exchange Programme” to provide 30, three to six-month, fellowships for African scholars in nearly all fields to study and/or conduct research (possibly towards a degree) in any of five universities and technikons in Western Cape, South Africa. The Western Cape institutions are already the core of the Adamaster Trust, a regional consortium, and by clustering the UNESCO fellows in those institutions, further institutional as well individual synergies were anticipated. The pilot program has just finished and an initial report (Warner 2000) indicates considerable success. The fellows appear to have gained a great deal, both substantively, and in terms of continuing local linkages, and the UCT based organizers (already experienced in running the USHEPiA program described below) gained further experience in managing such programs. Most of the fellows were in the natural and physical sciences, engineering or education; only four of the 30 were in the social sciences and humanities.

Based on discussions with numerous faculty who had been on sandwich programs themselves, three elements seem crucial to the success of a sandwich program. First, a student or junior faculty person going on a sandwich program needs to have a strong background, a clear project, and a good idea of how he or she wants to use the limited time. A single semester is very brief, and even an academic year can pass very quickly. It is easy to waste time settling in and floundering about in a new country. To make good intellectual use of a sandwich fellowship it is essential to use the time efficiently. It is also much easier to capture the attention and support of a busy faculty mentor or supervisor if the fellow can clearly articulate the kinds of research issues, substantive and/or methodological he or she hopes to address, or the specific skill he or she wants to develop. Using a sandwich fellowship simply to “explore” a library or experience another culture or community can have its value, but it is far less satisfactory than having a specific project on which to concentrate.

The second key to success is having a thorough orientation on arrival at the host university, not only in terms of academic matters, but also on very practical issues such as housing, banking, insurance, appropriate clothing, medical facilities, e-mail and internet access, etc. Few faculty mentors are willing, able, or should be pressed to take the time to do this. It is therefore almost essential that another student or an exchange officer in the host university take the initiative in this regard.

Finally, the third and most important element of a successful sandwich program is having a seriously engaged faculty supervisor or mentor. At times students have done well by locating a faculty mentor who is simply interested in similar intellectual issues. But the mentor-student relationships are most often successful when the mentor has actually spent time in the student’s home country, preferably at their home university, and ideally at the student’s field or research site. The point of course is have a mentor

who is intellectually invested in the student's country, with professional ties to local scholars, a personal understanding and interest in the issues the student is addressing, and some sense of the student's context and likely resources upon return home. The idea is not to smother the student with the mentor's own agenda, but to assure the student of substantive and relevant support for his or her own research and dissertation. Equally important, mentors must be at least as rigorously demanding of the sandwich fellow as they are of their own regular students. It was repeatedly emphasized that it is of no benefit to anyone for a faculty mentor to go easy on a sandwich fellow because he or she is short term, or has had less preparation than hoped or anticipated. Indeed, because of the brief duration of sandwich programs, it is essential that the mentor be as constructively critical as possible and the time be utilized as intensively as possible.

When and if these three elements are in place – a clear project, immediate orientation, and a knowledgeable and serious faculty mentor – sandwich programs can be extremely productive. They can also lead to long-term friendships, networks, collegial relationships, and eventual collaborative projects with the mentor, and the mentors' other students. As suggested above, many faculty in African universities see these programs as an increasingly and extremely important element of doctoral training. While no one was aware of any systematic evaluations of sandwich programs, anecdotally, the outcomes seem to have been largely positive. Yet clearly there have been failures as well, especially when one or another of the three elements above have been missing. Success is not automatic. Most fundamentally, however, whether or not a particular sandwich program is sufficient to produce a first rate dissertation still depends upon the student's initial training, the intellectual resources, energy, and direction he or she brings to it - and then is able to mobilize upon return home.

III. Some Innovative African PhD programs.

As evident from Section I above, small, relatively conventional PhD programs continue to operate in the major NLUs, and many much larger PhD programs exist in the SAUs. In some cases these programs are fully conducted at the home university, though there are increasing numbers of sandwich programs which enable students to spend a semester or an academic year receiving specialized training, or else conducting research at another institution in the home country or somewhere abroad. In a very few cases this can lead to a joint degree; far more commonly the degree still comes from the home university. In addition, however, there are several innovative PhD programs on the Continent currently under way or are on the planning stages that it will be useful to describe at least briefly. Significantly, they are all collaborative programs across a set of institutions specifically designed to build on their complementary strengths.

a. USHEPiA The oldest and most established program is the University Science, Humanities and Engineering Program in Africa (USHEPiA) that began operation in

1996, and is jointly managed by eight African universities (Botswana, Dar es Salaam, Makerere, Nairobi, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Kenyatta, and Cape Town (UCT)). This program, with major funding (over \$2 million by 1999) from the Rockefeller and Mellon Foundations and the Carnegie Corporation, is rooted in a recognition of the importance of “South-South” linkages. It is designed to enable junior faculty in Engineering, the Social and Natural Sciences, and the Humanities from the seven NLUs to apply for PhD studies and the degree from UCT, or else a joint degree between their home university and UCT. Upon receipt of an application, if - and only if - UCT has an academic supervisor willing and able to work with the applicant, the potential UCT supervisor is flown to the applicant’s home campus. There, he or she works with the applicant and a home university faculty co-supervisor, the Chair of the department, relevant Deans and others, to construct a detailed, year-by-year, program of study. The program of study is tailored to reflect the applicant’s specific academic interests and professional background (prior studies, courses taken, courses taught, previous research experience, etc.), but which also meets the intellectual or programmatic needs of the applicant’s department and university.

The program of study can cover up to four years, though not all the fellows have needed or used the full four years. A crucial feature of the program is that no more than two of years of the fellowship (which provides for travel, tuition and fees, dissertation research, living expenses, insurance, etc.) may be spent at UCT. Thus at least two years is available for research and/or writing in the Fellow’s home country or institution. The program of study can also be quite flexible such that Fellows may make several trips back and forth between their home institution and UCT depending upon the nature of their studies, research, teaching and/or personal or familial obligations. The dissertation topic must be relevant to the applicant’s home country (i.e., not a specifically South African topic), and UCT must commit itself not to “steal” the Fellow after she or he has completed the degree. Once the program of study has been fully spelled out, it is passed for review to the USEHPiA Steering Committee, composed of representatives of the participating universities. The Steering Committee’s approval is necessary for the Fellowship to begin.

USHEPiA seems to be working extremely well. Between 1996 to 2001, 36 full fellowships were awarded (31 PhD and 5 Masters). Six PhDs have already been completed and nine more are expected in the coming months. The 5 Masters degrees have all been completed. Five Fellows have withdrawn (2 because of AIDS) and 11 fellows are still studying.²⁶ Although USHEPiA has not been formally (externally) evaluated, an informal survey of Fellows at Dar es Salaam and our own conversations with an ex- and a current USHEPiA Fellow at that university suggested that despite occasional glitches, it is basically achieving its goals. Particularly appreciated were the access to unavailable and comparative literatures, experience with new pedagogies, prompt and responsive supervision, critical questioning, and encouragement for independent thinking and new ideas – rather than cloning – from their UCT supervisors.

Aside from the inevitable administrative complexities of such a program, and frequent and continuing difficulties of both electronic and telephonic communication among the universities, two other points are worth stressing. One is that the UCT administrative office managing the program has accumulated great experience in dealing with this sort of multi-institutional South-South initiative. (This accounts for that same office being asked to manage the UNESCO sandwich program described above.) The second is that the USHEPiA Fellows are extremely heterogeneous in their interests and disciplines. Their PhDs seem likely to serve them and their universities well. However, their degrees are too diverse and incremental to meet the broader institutional development needs and goals of their home universities.

b. the esATI Research Cluster Program A second and rather different innovation in the production of new PhDs in Africa is the Research Cluster Program (RCP) designed and operated by the eastern seaboard Association of Tertiary Institutions (esATI) in KwaZulu Natal, South Africa. The RCP began in 1999 with funding - roughly \$240,000 by 2001 - from the Mellon Foundation, university and esATI contributions, and national funding agencies. The program draws together a dozen postgraduate students, mostly at the doctoral level (but also including a few doing MAs), along with four to six faculty, all of whom are interested in and working on a common theme or set of related issues. The students and faculty must come from several different institutions, and because the RCP is concerned with redress, the students must be Black (in the South African usage) or female. Neither esATI nor the RCP are degree granting institutions. Instead, the students are doing their degrees in their respective home universities or technikons. Most of the students have been South African, but the RCP is open to and includes students from other countries doing their postgraduate degrees in South Africa.

So far, two Research Clusters are well under way, one on “Theology and Social Transformation,” and a second on “Small, Micro, and Medium Enterprise Formation.” A third Research Cluster is about to begin on “Reworking Livelihoods: Work, Production and Survival in a Globalizing Economy.” These topical Research Clusters are chosen competitively on the basis of proposals from small but institutionally and disciplinarily mixed groups of faculty – including one from overseas to provide international comparisons and perspectives.

Once a Research Cluster topic or theme has been selected, esATI advertises widely for postgraduate students working on relevant issues and who would be interested in joining the Cluster. The faculty then chooses a dozen promising students, again by prior agreement from an array of institutions and a variety of disciplines, and invites them to a series of four or five workshops over the following two to three year period. The first workshop is concerned with research conceptualization, design, and methods and is intended to help the students construct well focused and feasible research proposals. When their home universities have approved their proposals and

they have established a budget and a starting date, the students receive six months full time funding to assure that they can actually conduct their research. The second workshop, roughly six months after the first, is designed to share and refine the completed and by then usually approved research proposals. In a few cases they will be able to describe their very initial research efforts. The next two workshops, again at about six month intervals, are intended for the students to report on their preliminary findings and enable both faculty and the other students to provide feedback, suggestions of relevant literatures, alternative interpretations, etc. Funds are also available for faculty to visit the students in their field sites when and if this might be useful. Because the students are working on their own independent projects, but on closely related subjects, these workshops are proving extremely useful and energizing. A final “reporting workshop,” to include interested outsiders (other scholars, policy makers, practitioners, activists, etc.), is intended to disseminate the findings and encourage individual and collective publication of the Cluster’s research products.

Both of the first two Research Clusters held their fourth workshop in November 2001. Notices seeking applications for the third Cluster are currently going the rounds of the esATI community. And discussions have begun to establish a fourth Cluster of postgraduate students and faculty from the social and medical sciences working on the HIV/AIDS pandemic in the area. Although it is still too early to evaluate this program, it appears to be working very well. The students are proceeding with their research and along with the faculty they are providing each other with critical but supportive feedback. They are learning the value, limits, and relationships of their own interests and projects with those of the others. Their individual and collective products should be a distinct contribution to scholarship and knowledge. They are encouraging and accelerating the completion of each other’s degrees. Because they are fast becoming a cohort or community of collegially oriented young scholars, there are growing hopes that many will stay in academic or research careers.

c. African Economic Research Consortium (AERC) Proposal for a Collaborative PhD Program in Economics The AERC based in Nairobi has been running an innovative multi-country inter-institutional MA Program in Economics involving 27 universities in Africa since it was founded in 1988. During this period it has also supported the Africa-based dissertation research of 147 Africans doing PhDs in economics at overseas institutions. Since 1993, it has also provided 38 PhD fellowships (five a year) for Africans doing overseas doctorates in economics. Recognizing the demand in academe and the larger society for much larger numbers of economists in Africa (AERC estimates the need as 160 new PhDs per year, versus a current production of some 15 a year), heavy brain drain among those trained abroad, and the importance of creating a field firmly grounded in the African context, the AERC has now developed a proposal for an Africa-based collaborative PhD program in Economics. It will draw on AERC’s past experience (and graduates) from the MA program and will be based initially in three Anglophone universities (“catchment centers”) in the East, West, and Southern regions

of the Continent, but with provisions for Francophone students as well. A Francophone university will be added later.

During the first six years, the AERC hopes to provide four-year Fellowships for some 97 students from a wide array of African universities. Eventually, the program hopes to rise to 356 PhD Fellowships over a sixteen year period. The program would begin by making use of the strongest regional institutions capable of mounting an innovative US-style PhD, combining a year and a half of course work and comprehensive exams, followed by field research, analysis, and dissertation writing. The program would also help establish links and doctoral internships with national policy institutes in Africa, as well as with the World Bank Institute and the African Development Bank Institute. It would bring in additional faculty as needed, and supplement the academic program with three workshops focused on (1) the development of the thesis proposal, (2) fieldwork techniques and methods, and (3) the resulting dissertations. The required funding would grow year by year as new Fellows are added, but is projected as amounting to approximately \$12 million over the first six years – and \$34 million over 16 years. The entire program would be managed by an Academic Board composed of representatives of the PhD granting universities, several senior African economists and scholars in related fields, as well as several international experts (AERC 2001).

d. Consortium of Schools of Education in South African Universities In an effort to improve the quality and increase the numbers of skilled researchers and faculty dealing with questions of education, five South African universities (Cape Town, Durban-Westville, Natal, Western Cape, and Witwatersrand), with support from the Spencer Foundation, have recently established an innovative joint PhD program. Its intent is to focus on the major gap between “policy making at the very top of the system and the implementation of policy in schools and classrooms.” (Proposal 2000) Several of the participating universities already have PhD programs in Education, but the small number of potential supervisors for PhD students has undermined their capacity to attract or create a next generation of advanced researchers. By joining forces they have created a new four-year PhD program with some promise of producing 15 new degree holders – and 15 intensive new research projects – over the next several years. The program is combining broad based theoretically and methodologically oriented course work and workshops at a central location, joint mentorship and supervision of the students by both local and invited international faculty, wider dissemination of the research results, and home university based research and degrees.

As noted above, what is striking about all these new PhD programs is their collaborative or consortial character, and their emphasis on training mutually supportive cohorts more or less simultaneously. The consortial approach makes possible an creating an array of supervisory faculty who can offer a wider range of courses and provide more intensive mentoring than would be possible in the existing individual

university programs. The emphasis on bringing the students together in various workshops is both a means of assuring great efficiency in instruction. Equally important, it is a means of creating on going mutually supportive networks and communities of interest among these younger scholars that again, hopefully, will encourage them to remain in academic or research related careers in their home universities or countries. These same rationales for training cohorts, rather than simply individuals, are likewise central to the detailed paper “Universities in Africa: Challenges and Opportunities of International Cooperation (Abegaz 1994). They also provide the impetus for the Association of African Universities’ project on “Networks for Regional Cooperation in Graduate Training and Research” begun in 1998, and its current draft proposal for its Phase 3, 2002-2005 “Study Programme on Higher Education Management in Africa.”

This latter proposal, the AAU’s plan for a Study Programme on Higher Education Management in Africa, raises a broader more generic issue. Throughout the literature and in many proposals and donor’s statements there are continuous references to the need for or commitments to “capacity building” and “research training.” Very often it is suggested this will be achieved through participation in various forms of joint or internationally collaborative social, economic, or policy research projects. What is then usually described is a research program jointly led by a local scholar and a foreign researcher - who also has obtained the necessary funding. Such projects generally include local students who are given some basic methodological training, normally participate in data collection, and on occasion engage in some data analysis as well. The research is then written up as a report to the funder and perhaps eventually as a conference paper or journal article. It seems very rare, however, for the students to participate in the conceptualization or design of the research, or to be able to use the research material or the experience in their degree programs. Earlier in this report we suggested there seemed to be some missed curricular, training, and publication opportunities in connection with faculty consultancies. It may be that such large scale international social research projects might – like many team organized laboratory programs in the natural and physical sciences - with some care, foresight, and imagination, be used to provide curriculum material for classrooms, and even data or material for dissertations PhD, at least in the social sciences - and even on occasion in the humanities. Bringing students into such projects while they are still being formulated could also help them in the conceptualization and design of their own MA or PhD research.

It is still too early to evaluate the effectiveness of these fairly new efforts at consortial training and community building among junior (and senior) scholars. Much will depend on character of the scholars involved, the funds and funders, and a variety of larger contextual forces. In principle, however, such efforts to construct long-term on-going intellectual collaborations seem more likely to keep people focused on their research domain, and “at home,” than the highly individuated types of training and

scholarly traditions that have characterized most African PhD programs up to now.

IV. Recommendations: Elements Essential to Develop the PhD in the Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities in African Universities

This report and the recommendations that follow grow out of scores of intensive and extended discussions and exchanges with faculty, administrators, students, and international donors, and an extensive review of the literature, regarding the current status, problems, needs, innovations, and opportunities of PhD programs in African universities. Drawing on the ideas, observations, experiences, and specific training models that emerged from these discussions and the literature, this section of the report focuses on what now seems needed to strengthen substantially, both quantitatively and qualitatively, African university PhD programs in the social sciences, arts, and humanities. Clearly, there is a widespread desire to see these programs significantly expanded and improved - even among many faculty and Vice Chancellors from the physical sciences and engineering who specifically pointed to a need to redress the imbalance of past government and donor support that has gone to the sciences.

This section of the report is not intended as a proposal. It is rather a “first cut,” an effort to sketch out an overall structure and some of the major components of what now seems needed to develop serious new PhD granting capacities in these fields. To become a serious proposal would call for considerable further and more detailed discussion among the stakeholders regarding or a wide array of unresolved issues, and the active support and prioritization of key academic and institutional leaders in the African universities. Nevertheless, it does attempt to lay out a minimal set of activities that, taken together, seem essential to substantially increase the scale, productivity, quality, and relevance of African university PhD programs in the social sciences, arts, and humanities.

One might ask, however - in view of the pressing needs in primary, secondary, and undergraduate education, and in masters degree, technical, and professional programs – why put major efforts and resources into training more PhDs in the social sciences, arts, and humanities in African universities? At one level, the answer is obvious; with increasingly complex societies integrating into an increasingly complex and competitive world – and as elitist as it may sound - it is essential for every country to have a large and growing cadre of highly skilled professionals; thinkers, actors, writers, teachers, male and female, in a wide range of fields who are capable of producing critical analyses, local and national policies, and programs to deal with the internal and external social and cultural issues facing their nation. Every country needs to continually replenish and expand its supply of people who can think critically and creatively about processes of globalization, democratization, development, human rights, etc. No country can or should expect to depend upon the good will and

commitment of others to play these roles for them. Nor, given the high and growing costs (financial, social, and human), and the variable but high attrition rates, can countries afford to turn over the training of their intellectual leadership to other countries of the world.

Most immediately, substantially enlarging and strengthening PhD programs in the social sciences, arts, and humanities across the Continent would also have major positive effects on undergraduate education, the development of critical analytical skills, national research and policy-making capacities, and broad social and cultural benefits. It would vastly increase the universities' capacities to develop lateral links to other external (governmental, private sector, and NGO) knowledge generating institutions – and indeed to train staff for those institutions. It would forge new links between the NLUs and the SAUs. More broadly, it would begin to level international academic playing fields, enabling African scholars to reduce their current sense of dependency and to challenge effectively the current intellectual hegemony of their Western counterparts. But before detailing theoretical or practical benefits, let us first describe what now seems needed.

Three general but essential points frame all of the programmatic suggestions that follow. One is that despite the terrible trauma suffered by most of the NLUs in recent years, there nevertheless remain within them a core of dedicated scholars, researchers, and administrators, as well as bright and energetic junior faculty who are personally committed to serious scholarship and advanced graduate training. Second, the suggestions are not simply theoretical, but draw on direct experience with several existing program models. Third, many key figures in the major South African universities are seriously committed to reintegrating their intellectual communities with those to their north. The complementarity of these three points of departure provides an unusual and important opportunity for mutual benefits.

In order to have the maximum effect, it was widely agreed that it would be essential to (a) initially concentrate efforts on building new cohorts of younger scholars in selected disciplines in a relatively small set of institutions that are or soon would become national, regional, and international centers for training still others. This means (b) beginning with intensive discussions among perhaps six of the most promising and interested NLUs and perhaps three of the most productive and progressive SAUs, aimed at (c) developing mechanisms which can take maximum advantage of joint training opportunities, exchanges, and collaborations among these institutions but also actively linking to universities in Europe, the Americas, and Asia in more specialized roles. The entire enterprise would need to operate under (d) the direction of (be “owned” by), a Board composed of key representatives from the participating universities, and (e) take a long-term institution building view with an initial six-year mandate and an expectation that if it proves successful it would continue beyond that period, and over time, ramify and draw in other universities in Africa and elsewhere.

The participation of particular university in such a program would depend on several key criteria. At a minimum these would include (1) a relatively stable and democratic national and institutional political context, (2) a Vice Chancellor committed to support the program for its full duration, (3) reasonable numbers of prospective Fellows among the junior faculty in the selected NLU departments, (4) the availability of NLU and SAU faculty supervisors for the Fellows, (5) reasonable e-mail and Internet access, (6) manifest desire to work collaboratively and build on complementary strengths in the selected disciplines, (7) interest in developing or expanding the course work components of the university's MA and PhD programs, and (8) library funding for key hardcopy volumes and electronic journals.

Five major interlocking, more or less simultaneous, and synergistic structural elements seem essential for both individual and institutional development. Likewise, there needs to be an overarching intellectual goal to give overall direction and coherence to these efforts. The five major structural elements are:

- (1) *Faculty Development*
- (2) *Curriculum Development*
- (3) *Departmental Strengthening*
- (4) *Inter-University Networking and Collaboration, and*
- (5) *Collective Oversight, Coordination, and Administration.*

It is essential that all of the participating institutions feel ownership in all these structural elements. It is also essential that well beyond the rhetoric, while specific roles, activities, and structures will vary and evolve over time, participation must be perceived as providing benefits to all.

The overarching intellectual goal would be to achieve substantial capacity for (1) rethinking, reconstructing, and rooting social and cultural analysis in African institutions and experience, and (2) engaging on more equal terms with externally derived sources of knowledge. Given the past battering and the current multiple demands on African universities, it seems necessary to develop these mutually supportive structural and intellectual elements more or less simultaneously.

Element 1: Faculty Development Fellowships.

As already noted, despite the tremendous difficulties – often genuine crises – faced by African universities over the last 15 to 20 years, they have continued to produce small numbers of PhDs in the social sciences, arts, and humanities. Moreover, there remain small numbers of dedicated faculty and administrators who badly want to be able to supervise more, and more effectively, doctoral students in their departments. Right

now, however, in nearly all departments the academic staff are too few in number, too often distracted by external demands and opportunities, and are, as they themselves often assert, too far “out of date” in terms of current literature, theory, and debates to provide the kind of supervision and training that larger numbers and better trained PhD students would require. (Some are even said to still be using notes from their own training in the 1960s and 1970s.) Freezes on new hiring in many universities during the 1980s and 1990s made matters worse by creating serious generational and intellectual gaps among the faculty (Mushi et. al. 2001). And the “massification” of higher education means that current faculty (and infrastructure), are already badly stretched. Plans to add still more free or fee-paying students mean that many more faculty will be needed.²⁷ They will also be essential to construct larger, more productive and vibrant, PhD programs. As noted above, the AERC has calculated that just in Economics alone, Africa could readily absorb 160 PhDs per year – against the roughly 15 a year now being produced, world wide.

Nevertheless, simply scattering more young faculty across the social sciences, arts, and humanities will not have the cumulative effect essential for the development, or substantial strengthening, of existing PhD programs. A more concentrated, focused, and practical effort is needed. With this in mind it has been urged that the any initiative in this area begin with each of the say, six NLUs selecting three departments across the humanities and social sciences whose research, teaching, and PhD granting capacities it wants to strengthen. The departments would be chosen based on current or imaginable working relations, intellectual linkages or synergies, among them. A university might thus select, in effect, give priority to, e.g., history, anthropology, and literature; or political science, sociology, and economics; or philosophy, history, and religion; or anthropology, sociology, and art; or linguistics, literature, and history, etc. Each of the six NLUs would choose whatever combination of departments that seemed most likely – given their own particular institutional and national context - to create an intellectually powerful and mutually supportive community. Hopefully, in the choice of departments to strengthen they would also attempt to complement the choices of the other participating universities at least in the same region.

Once a university had selected the three departments, donors would be needed assure it of five (5) four-year dissertation fellowships for each of those three departments, or a total of 15 fellowships per university. With six NLUs participating, this would mean 90 fellowships altogether. These fellowships could begin anywhere over the following three year period, in effect, staggering the awards over a six year period. Why five fellowships in three departments? Fifteen new PhDs in three related departments seemed to most people to create a sufficient “critical mass,” capable - along with existing more senior faculty - of self-sustaining development, productive teaching and research, and the supervision of an expanded subsequent generation of locally trained PhDs. Reaching for still higher numbers, say eight or ten fellows per department seemed likely to over-stretch the available pool of interested, committed, and adequately

talented candidates. Likewise, attempting to do more than three departments in the Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities seemed likely to appear unbalanced or unbalancing, and stir internal jealousies and political opposition from other quarters on the campuses. At the same time, if such a program proved successful, it could be replicated in other sets of disciplines as well as in the natural and physical sciences, the professional schools, etc.

Most of the proposed fellowships would go to existing junior faculty, though some might be offered to postgraduate students clearly committed to academic careers in the selected fields. It was also repeatedly noted that many of the brightest postgraduate students and junior faculty are female, and that such fellowships could help redress existing imbalances in the gender composition of the university faculties. A deep personal commitment to an academic career, interest in a specialized field of importance to the department (and the university), and a serious interest in the overarching intellectual focus, described below, would be other key selection criteria.

Fifteen fellowships per university also means that even if two or three dropped out, there would still remain a cluster of 12 or 13 new PhDs, sufficient to have the desired institutional effects. Such a cluster of simultaneously trained new PhDs would both vastly strengthen the existing departments and create the capacities, and no doubt encourage the formation of new interdisciplinary teaching and research programs. Numerous people also suggested that creating a community of 12 to 15 young new PhDs in related fields – or even the knowledge that it was coming into existence -- could slow brain drain from the university, and might even draw back at least for joint appointments, local scholars who had previously left for lack of collegial support and exchange. It might also entice some of the brightest students into academic careers.

It is important to stress that there was widespread agreement that these fellowships should be awarded within disciplinary departments, and not to interdisciplinary centers or programs, however valuable they might be. It was repeatedly emphasized that current priorities must go to strengthening the core academic departments as the key sites for teaching the concepts, theory, methods, history, politics, debates, and ethics of a field, the essential foundations for basic, critical, and well grounded research, analysis, and writing. Interdisciplinary centers and programs – population studies, environmental studies, etc. – are often well regarded and important. But they tend to be applied or problem oriented, and are best constructed by complementary sets of faculty who already have strong theoretical and methodological training in one or another of the core disciplines.

More broadly, it is of course widely recognized that there are serious intellectual (and political) problems with the disciplinary and departmental distinctions and divisions transplanted into Africa from Western universities, and that a fundamental recasting or reorganization of the social sciences and humanities is probably called for.

This is however a huge task, troubling many scholars in the West as well (Wallerstein et. al. 1996). At this point, however, given the multiple current demands on the NLUs, rather than attempt such a radical restructuring with the existing older faculty still in place, it seemed far more plausible to wait for the participation of the new generation of younger PhDs these fellowships would generate. Indeed, any such efforts might well draw quite explicitly on, among other things, the kinds of research and teaching they would be doing.

The proposed fellowships should almost certainly build on USHEPiA model, but with a number of additional and distinctive elements. As noted above, the USHEPiA Program has been quite successful in producing new PhDs. However, because the Fellows are in a wide range of fields they are unlikely to have a concerted institutional effect on their home universities. In contrast, funding 15 new PhDs in three related fields in a single university in parallel with similar developments in five other universities – along with the other essential elements described below - creates an entirely new set of institutional, as well as individual, possibilities.

Clearly, training 15 PhD Fellows from six universities, 90 fellows altogether, even spread out over a six year period, could not depend upon a single training institution, such as the role that UCT is playing for USHEPiA. It would only be feasible as a coherent effort if three or four universities took up the bulk of the PhD training. Given the strong desire described above of at least several of the major South African universities to re-integrate intellectually into the larger African context, and the numerous senior faculty already engaged in such efforts, it seems to make sense to use some of these universities as much as possible. But by no means exclusively. Where strong training and supervisory capacities exist in the other NLUs – or in Brazilian, UK, European or Indian universities - they would be utilized as well. (Unfortunately, US universities with their long, expensive, and generally quite rigid PhD programs would not be good candidates for the Fellows.) More broadly, the point would be to locate for each Fellow the best possible supervisor, if at all possible in an African university. In effect, 90 such PhD fellowships – even if only 60 or 70 went to South African universities - would dramatically thicken and invigorate the intellectual and institutional links both between and among the NLUs and the SAUs.

Making such major use of the South African universities can have its problems. South African society and universities are still marked by racism, xenophobia, and varying degrees of Euro-centrism. Unfortunately, these are all characteristics of US, UK, European, and Asian societies and universities as well. It is also true that, as everywhere in the world, some university administrators see foreign students largely as a new source of income for their institutions. Nevertheless, several University of Natal faculty explicitly noted that their many of their best students are from other parts of Africa, that they are very pleased to be working with them, and that they would like more. Senior members of the Universities of Cape Town, Natal, and Witwatersrand

administration have already expressed strong interest in participating in such a program. Nor should it be difficult to organize the fairly numerous faculty already engaged in links with counterparts elsewhere in Africa to promote such fellowships among their colleagues, to mentor or supervise the Fellows, to identify opportunities for comparative projects, and generally to strengthen mutually beneficial SAU /NLU ties and collaboration.

There are also several very practical reasons to draw on interested SLUs as much as possible. The travel, living, and tuition costs in South Africa are much lower than in Europe, the UK, or the US. There is willingness and capacity – already demonstrated at the UCT, Natal, and Wits - to be flexible in the construction of PhD programs, and to tailor them to the specific background, interests, and needs of the Fellows. Fellows can more easily move back and forth between South Africa and their home countries than from universities in the US, Europe, or Asia. In addition, the current intensive reviews and impending restructuring of the South African university system is generating a great deal of data and useful evaluations of their various graduate programs. Much of this evaluative material is already available, and more has been offered. Together, it should be helpful in identifying the particularly strong SAU PhD programs most appropriate for the Fellows.

It is anticipated that most Fellows would obtain their PhD either from a participating SAU or from another African university where there are strong PhD programs and faculty able to supervise them. But the possibility and value of joint degrees should be explored wherever possible. The Universities of Natal and Cape Town are already granting joint PhD degrees with other universities, and over time this would seem a move to encourage. In addition, aside from the regular fellowship support, funds should be held in reserve to support specialized “sandwich programs” that would enable Fellows to spend a semester (or in special cases an academic year) in universities anywhere else in the world if and when they demonstrate the need for courses or research or networking opportunities only available elsewhere.

Such a fellowship program will also require elaborating on the USHEPiA model in several other respects. Thus when potential supervisors visit a potential Fellow’s home university to work on a proposed program of study, the supervisor would be expected to stay for at least a week, and building on the experience with the more successful sandwich programs, give a seminar, a series of lectures, a mini course, or explore possibilities for joint research activities, etc. In effect, the potential supervisors would engage not just with the Fellow, but more broadly with local students and scholars on topics or issues of common interest. Likewise, the home university co-supervisor would be expected to spend time at the host university working with the Fellow, and engaging with the local scholarly community. This might even lead to, and indeed encourage more short and/or long-term joint faculty appointments, something that many people seemed to desire. The overall frequently expressed goal would be to

encourage a variety of cooperative, comparative or collaborative projects and contribute to the construction of pan-African intellectual communities, as opposed to the current situation, largely characterized by atomized, fragmented, and narrowly domestic scholarship.

Another elaboration of the USHEPiA model would draw on the probability the host university supervisors, teaching and conducting research in a field close to that of the Fellows, would be likely to have PhD students of their own working on related topics. Whenever possible, such one such student would accompany the supervisor to the Fellow's home university and be encouraged to explore possibilities for joint, comparative, or collaborative projects with the Fellow (or others), either immediate or longer-term. At a minimum, the student would gain international experience, learn something of the local institutional context and an alternative framing of common research interests. Such students would bring back new perspectives and models their home university and could provide the Fellow (and others) with a more self-conscious perspective on the capacities (and limits) of the host university. These students could also help settle in Fellows when they arrived at the host institution. The larger goal is of course to encourage the development of mutually beneficial and respectful personal and intellectual links and collegial relations in the next generation of scholars.

Turning from structural features to intellectual content, the 90 PhD fellowships would be contingent on a program of study and a doctoral dissertation project which explicitly deals with the Intellectual Issues (pg. 15) described in Section I. Thus the fellowship projects would be expected to draw on, articulate, or theorize from African experience, issues, expressive forms, understandings, and from that standpoint, relate them, critically or otherwise, to the received knowledge from Western scholarship. As noted above, for at least 20 years there have been repeated calls for such an approach from a variety of African countries and disciplines. More generally, all across the world there is growing interest in and respect for "indigenous knowledge systems" including a new South African National Research Foundation 10 million Rand program for research into such issues.²⁸ Fellows' projects could be historical or contemporary, theoretical or applied, but in all cases seek to articulate the specifically African elements to any more wide ranging or universal features of the subject.

Obviously, no single project or dissertation can speak for all of African experience even in a single domain. Variation is great all across the Continent. But the combined efforts of 90 new PhDs in the social sciences and humanities written more or less simultaneously over a six year period, each project intensively addressing elements of African experience, institutions, and dynamics within this common framework, and brought together in various workshops, conferences, and publications (described in Element 4 below on Inter-University Networking and Collaboration), would create a positive new academic and intellectual atmosphere all across the Continent. It would transform the nature of social and cultural scholarship and build new intellectual

confidence in the NLUs. Moreover, as most of the degrees would be from SAUs, it would have dramatic effects on their campuses as well. Intellectually, it would be a basis for entering on equal terms the international relations of knowledge production. It would create the capacity to both engage with and challenge the current hegemony of Western/Eurocentric concepts, methods, and theories, and contribute to a more genuinely cosmopolitan intellectual community in Africa - and beyond.

Structurally - and much more ambitiously - it might even lead to rethinking the nature of the PhD and the university. The requirements and expectations that go with the PhD already vary in the US, Europe, Japan, and elsewhere. Bringing in African experience and understandings of the sites and sources of knowledge, might suggest still additional models, procedures, and expectations derived, perhaps, from some now unimagined combination of the new technologies and African intellectual and expressive forms.

What might such a fellowship program cost? Extrapolating from USHEPiA experience, such awards might cost \$14,000 a year for up to four years, with perhaps another \$5,000 each for research expenses. That would come to \$61,000 per award. 90 awards at that level would amount to \$5,490,000. In addition, perhaps \$500,000 might also be needed to cover additional costs in connection with (overseas) sandwich programs for some of the fellows. That would bring the total to some \$6 million over a six-year period. That figure, however, is probably high, as again drawing on the USHEPiA experience, some Fellows would probably complete their degrees in less than four years.

Element 2: Curriculum Development

Simply adding 15 new PhDs in the social sciences and humanities in six NLUs in order to expand the capacities of those universities to produce their own PhDs, would not be sufficient to reach the desired goals. As noted above, many faculty and administrators in the NLUs are interested in developing or further elaborating a variety of interdisciplinary programs and the course work components of their MA and PhD programs.

A highly successful five year old Open Society Institute (OSI) program provides one model of how this might be facilitated. The OSI Graduate Fellowship program enables junior faculty from universities in the former Soviet Union to spend two or three consecutive Spring semesters at an American university. The OSI program is intended to familiarize its Fellows with a larger intellectual community, facilitate a research project, and in the third semester, perhaps do some teaching as well. But the primary purpose and obligation of the OSI Fellows is to develop two or three new courses to bring back to their home university. They do this by sitting in a variety of

undergraduate and graduate lectures and seminars, collecting syllabi, reading lists, and course materials, and then using them to construct new courses appropriate to the specific backgrounds and needs of their home institutions and students. Because they are moving back and forth between their home and the US host university, they can test out and revise their new courses over the years.

The Fellows of this Africa program could be charged with the same obligation, that is, over the four year Fellowship, to develop and bring home, along with their new PhD, two or three new courses needed in their Department. It will require some extra effort, but should not be too burdensome as most Fellows will in any case be junior faculty, and thus will already have experience in constructing courses. The interactive effect of developing new courses while doing the dissertation research could also be extremely useful. It should both broaden the contextualization, implications, and literature addressed in the dissertation, but also serve as a means to integrate the Fellow's research into their teaching much more fully than usually occurs.

The implications, however, go far beyond the individual Fellows and their Departments. Fifteen Fellows in three related Departments each returning with two or three new courses - in effect, bringing their home university between 30 and 45 new courses, over a relatively short period of time - creates both pressure and an extraordinary opportunity to do innovative multi-departmental curriculum development as well as experimentation with new pedagogies.

Numerous faculty and administrators, as well as numerous university documents, critiques, and plans repeatedly called for the introduction of a wide variety of new courses and meta-courses on such issues as qualitative and quantitative research methods, philosophy and ethics, orality and literacy, indigenous knowledge systems, the social and economic values of diverse research agendas, etc. They have also criticized authoritarian course structures and pressures on students for rote memorization and regurgitation of lectures and texts, calling instead for the development of new pedagogies that encourage original and critical thinking, discovery methods, independent research, increased student participation, etc. Most often these calls for new courses and new approaches are followed by a sense of frustration over a lack of human, intellectual, and financial resources to implement them. However, given the program's concern with African analyses and articulations of African experience, and the nature of the dissertations it is likely to produce, the Fellows should be able to provide ideas and opportunities for developing such new courses, new pedagogies, and even new degree and interdisciplinary research programs. As noted above, there is still divided opinion about the relative value of research-only versus course-work-plus-research PhDs. The new courses the Fellows would generate could become building blocs in at least those institutions interested in moving towards more significant course work components of their MA and PhD programs.

The prospect of being able to introduce 30 to 40 new courses over a relatively short period of time would mean that the Fellows, their departmental colleagues, Chairs and Deans would almost necessarily have to join forces beforehand to begin to map out new social science and humanities curricula and programs. This would be essential so that the different Fellows could take on assignments to bring back particular and complementary courses. An opportunity and exercise of this sort - involving the development of a critical mass of new courses, rather than the more usual, slow and less transformative, piece meal additions - would almost certainly have intellectual and structural ramifications (if only as a model of what needs to be done), well beyond the social sciences, arts, and humanities. The opportunities for substantive and pedagogical innovations and transformations in curriculum development such fellowships creates could also be elaborated and reinforced though the lateral movement or sharing of the new courses with those developed in the other participating universities - and in other African universities more generally - by means of the fourth essential element, Inter-University Networking and Collaboration, described below.

Element 3: Departmental Strengthening

Providing PhD Fellowships to expand the three selected departments, and new curriculum development, seem obviously useful steps towards strengthening the PhD programs in the participating universities. However, given the sharp decline (or near collapse) in state funding over the past decade or more, the departments which have effectively been starved for resources also need new direct funding to be able to carry out their programs – and crucially, to make them attractive for the new Fellows to return to and really settle into. External project funds from NGOs, donors, or government agencies have often helped around the edges, leaving behind a computer or two, but reasonably flexible new core resources are essential for a department to become an active intellectual center. Different departments with different histories, strengths, and weaknesses will have different needs, and presumably it will be up to the members of the departments, and their Chairs and Deans to set the priorities and allocations among them. The kinds of departmental needs most often mentioned to meet these goals (in no particular order) were:

- Subscriptions (hard copy or on-line) to key professional journals
- Restocking core texts in departmental or university libraries
- Improved Internet access and computer facilities and training
- Travel funds for international professional meetings
- “Rejuvenating” workshops on current literature, theory, and debates for senior faculty not receiving Fellowships, and who feel themselves “out-of date”
- Support for producing hard copy and on-line journals and other publications
- Seed money for research projects and topical and methodological workshops

- Scholarship funds for post-graduate students
- Replacements for faculty away on Fellowships

As an initial estimate or working figure, there was reasonable consensus that departments could be re-galvanized with a fund \$200,000 over the six years of the Fellowship program. This would amount to, in effect, \$40,000 per new PhD Fellow, though the funds would be for the department, not the fellow's alone. It would also amount to \$600,000 for each participating university over the six year period. It was also suggested that these donor funds should be at least partially matched (perhaps 1 to 4) for the duration, and beyond, by the University as an indication of its commitment. These departmental funds would have to be accounted for very strictly, and might best be used for the some mix of the purposes suggested above, as well as endowment to partially match continuing university support over a much longer period. Such funds could have a powerful, positive, and intellectually transformative effect. And as noted earlier, several faculty members and administrators indicated departmental resources of this sort might entice some colleagues back from jobs elsewhere, and encourage others now contemplating departures to stay.

Over and above what such departmental funds could provide, there are of course much larger unmet needs for better salaries, more classrooms, faculty offices, dormitories, general libraries, refectories, computer centers, etc. These university-wide infrastructural requirements go far beyond the individual department and would need to be addressed as part of a much larger university redevelopment programs.

Element 4: Inter-University Networking and Collaboration

With 90 junior faculty from six universities working on PhDs in the social sciences, arts, and humanities under a broad thematic framework, and more or less in parallel with each other, aside from the Fellows' connections with faculty and students at other universities, there are obvious opportunities for various lateral networking and collaborative activities that would be mutually beneficial and strengthen their individual projects, and the participating universities. At the earliest stage, the participating universities might take into consideration the stated strengths and developmental priorities of the other universities (or at least those that are nearby), in selecting their own three priority departments for the Fellowships. Thus, for example, if Makerere and Dar es Salaam were to participate, one might choose to focus on sociology, philosophy, and economics, while the other might select history, anthropology, and literature. The goal would be to minimize overlap, and provide broader, complementary, and coordinated disciplinary coverage and look to creating dynamic and highly productive national, regional, and indeed international intellectual centers in the selected fields. As such, these multi-disciplinary clusters would undoubtedly attract

significant numbers of doctoral students from the other universities from their region, and beyond, and help train junior faculty for those universities as well.

In each of the initial years, as the new Fellows are selected, it would be essential to organize a several day workshop with them to discuss the structural elements outlined here, their own obligations, the overall intellectual concern or focus, how it might relate to their particular studies and dissertation projects. Equally important, such this works would be designed to begin to build a sense of community among the cohort of new Fellows. In addition, as mentioned above, throughout our discussions at the various universities there were repeated calls for encouraging a greater emphasis on new pedagogies, critical thought, creativity, independent research, the value and necessity of theory, local concepts, and grounded theory, experimentation and discovery – as opposed to more conventional passive, “talk and chalk,” rote learning, and “text-book” studies.²⁹ These initial workshops would seem an opportune time to provide a set of exercises or models that would encourage the Fellows to think in these more imaginative lines as they develop their own specific projects. These initial workshops might also prove a useful ground for developing some collaborative or comparative projects among the Fellows.

In later years, further critical but mutually supportive thematic or topical workshops - for the entire cohort and/or for various sub-sets of the Fellows within or across campuses - would be extremely valuable (1) as they are constructing their dissertation research proposals, (2) while conducting their research, and (3) when they have findings to report, much as the AERC is proposing.³⁰ Such three-day to two-week long thematic or topical workshops might focus on the art and techniques of writing research proposals, models of effective research proposals, qualitative and quantitative research methods, bringing out the social or policy relevance of their projects, as well as new curriculum development, ICT utilization, and classroom discussion strategies, problem-solving, team research pedagogies, and workshops on publishing and journals. Interdisciplinary topical workshops could also focus on any of the substantive intellectual issues that undergird their work, and perhaps move toward something like the on-going esATI Research Clusters described in Section II above. Regional organizations with broad intellectual and developmental mandates like CODESRIA and OSSREA might be asked at play a central role selecting and organizing such thematic or topical workshops, drawing on own their prior experience with such activities. But whatever their form or content, it would be important for supervisors from both the home and host universities to participate, perhaps even bringing with them yet other doctoral students working on related issues. The idea would be to foster not just “networks,” but a culture of collegiality, to build a multi-national, inter-disciplinary and inter-institutional mutually critical but supportive community – and a variety of sub-communities -- among the Fellows and their colleagues and counterparts in all the participating universities. A series of workshops of this sort would involve some costs,

perhaps \$150,000 per year for each of the six years. But it would seem a small investment for the very substantial returns.

As the Fellow's dissertation projects developed and matured it would almost certainly be useful to draw on some of the departmental funds for producing hard copy and on-line journals and other publications. Currently, several universities publish social science and humanities journals, likewise CODESRIA, OSSREA, SADEC, and a number of professional organizations. Most of the university-based journals, however, are relatively thin, not always peer reviewed, often behind schedule. Nor do they seem to get much distribution beyond their own country, or even beyond their own campus. Publishing in these journals thus brings little prestige and is said not to count as much for tenure and promotions as publishing in foreign or so-called "international" (in fact almost entirely Euro-American) journals. In this context, if the Fellows are to establish themselves nationally and internationally as serious and creative scholars working to freshly analyze, synthesize, and theorize African experience and institutions, they will need either to expand and improve the quality and distribution of the existing journals or to develop some new publication outlets – electronic or otherwise³¹ - in which to present their materials.

Our discussions suggested that any such publications, necessarily seriously peer-reviewed, should be defined as regional or Continent-wide – whether hard copy or electronic. At present national journals, or those based at and drawing on a single university, attract little attention from the neighboring countries. In contrast, collaboration among the departments in the participating universities in the production of such journals - drawing heavily but not solely on the dissertation (and subsequent) research of the 90 Fellows - as an on-going joint activity would have numerous institutional and intellectual benefits. It would demonstrate the new generativity of the universities and their programs, attract the immediate attention of scholars across the world, and establish Africa as a site of innovative, imaginative, and challenging research and theory building.

Finally, as suggested in Element 2 above, the new courses and curricula developed by the Fellows and their Departments could be shared laterally and build a variety of cooperative links across participating universities and beyond. Doctoral students planning academic careers elsewhere in Africa and beyond would also be attracted to the participating universities. Taken together, these inter-university collaborations would over time expand the research, relevance, and intellectual influence of the program in the development of yet other African universities.

Element 5: Collective Oversight, Coordination, and Administration

Clearly, an inter-linked set of activities of this scale and ambition would need serious oversight and coordination. It would require a powerful sense of ownership by a policy making Board no doubt consisting of senior academics from the participating universities. Such a Board would seem best composed of a combination of Vice Chancellors with their decision making powers, and Deans of the Social Sciences, Arts, or Humanities, who are closer to the substantive concerns. There might also be a role for the Association of African Universities to play on the Board. Initially, the Board would certainly have to meet twice a year to discuss and decide upon the various policy issues, ranging from broad equity issues, to establishing the detailed selection criteria for Fellowships and other activities, the creation and supervision of various subcommittees, and the demands for evaluation that inevitably and appropriately face any such large set of activities. After perhaps the third or fourth year, if all is up and running well, a single annual Meeting of the Board might be sufficient.

Operating under the direction of the Board, it would be essential to have an Administrative unit probably based at one of the participating universities charged with handling the day-to-day program decision making, activities, funding, logistics, and reporting in support of the Fellows, supervisors, workshops, publications, networking, communications, etc. Its activities might be modeled on - and should certainly draw on the rich experience from - the Administrative procedures and systems developed by the USHEPiA and UNESCO fellowship programs based at UCT.

Given the volatile political contexts in which many African universities must still operate, provision must be made for the possibility that one or more initially participating institutions has to drop out - and be replaced - sometime during the initial six years. Clearly, this is not desirable. However, a mechanism or policy should be established such that if a university can no longer generate or employ appropriate Fellows, or support the relevant departments, it can gracefully leave, and if sufficient time and funding remain, make room for another university to take its place.

Finally, A Word on Finances.

It is clearly premature to attempt a budget for such a large and complex array of activities, especially as they may well evolve substantially in the discussions we hope will follow the distribution of this report. Nevertheless, based on the few dollar figures suggested above, and extrapolating from USHEPiA, AERC, and donor experience for the costs of supervisors' and students' travel, Board meetings, administration, etc. and assuming six participating NLUs and three SAUs – the total costs would probably come to something between \$13 and \$14 million. This might seem a large figure, but it would be spread out over a six-year period thus call for on the order of \$2.3 million per year, a not implausible or unattainable figure. Aside from the four-foundation partnership, there are numerous other donors that might be brought together and be

encouraged to support particular elements described above. These include the British, Canadian, Danish, Dutch, French, German, Norwegian, Swedish, and US aid agencies that are already engaged with various African universities, but also the Open Society Institute, the Fulbright program, the World Bank, and no doubt others. The payoff could be considerable. The combined immediate and long term impact of 90 new PhDs embedded in a program of this sort would go far (1) to develop the social sciences, arts, and humanities in Africa, and beyond, (2) to foster structures and cultures of collegiality in African intellectual life, (3) to create a new generation and a critical mass or cohort of new scholars who would enable African universities to expand significantly the numbers, quality, and relevance of PhDs they produce, and (4) to strengthen the capacity of African scholars to productively engage with each other, and on a more equal footing with their counterparts in the West. This would seem more than worth the effort and investment.

ENDNOTES

¹ Unless otherwise signaled, we are using the term “faculty” in this report to refer to individual members of a university’s academic staff – as opposed to its alternative meaning, i.e., a large academic/administrative unit.

² Nigeria was among the worst hit by increasing university enrollments and declining public expenditure on university education. By 1990, the allocation in constant Naira had fallen to literally one-tenth of what it had been 15 years earlier in 1976 (I.O. Oladpo, 1992).

³ It is striking how this corporate vision and corporate rhetoric is now reflected in the internal discourse of the universities themselves. Thus the current Five Year Strategic Plan of the University of Zimbabwe states one of its two primary aims is to “satisfy the need of its clients and customers.”

⁴ Beginning competition from private universities – mostly offering Bachelors degrees in popular (and inexpensive to teach fields, like commerce and education) – has demonstrated that at least some families could and would pay for quality higher education. This undoubtedly triggered some previously free public universities to begin charging fees as well. 5. The massive new Ford Foundation International Fellowship Program supports up to three years of graduate study. It is a global program that includes selected countries in Africa (currently, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania, and Uganda) and could be helpful to some of the universities in these countries. The program, however, is explicitly oriented to innovative individuals; it is not concerned with clustering awards for purposes of institutional development, and most of the initial fellowships have gone to activists and leaders in civil society, rather than to junior faculty or others committed to academic careers.

6. Some of the current or planned MA programs in the professional fields, e.g., public health, agriculture, and engineering, are using multi-institutional collaborative models along the lines of those that will be suggested below for enhancing the PhD programs. However, these MA programs rarely seem to lead their more professionally oriented participants into more academically oriented PhD programs.

⁷ For example, the 1998 Report of the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA) on “African Regional Networks for Graduate Training and Research, and the AAU’s 1999 Project Report, “Networks for Regional Cooperation in Graduate Training and Research.” The latter briefly describes seven selected network proposals only two of which are at the PhD level, and only one of which (USHEPiA) was funded.

⁸ According to a more recent survey as yet unpublished (Altbach and Teferra, forthcoming) many more universities, including many private universities, have been established since the data was collected for the 1999 Guide. However, being quite new, and often profit driven, they do not generally offer the PhD.

⁹ Tade Akin Aina’s 1994 AAU paper is an extremely thoughtful discussion of “Quality and Relevance: African Universities in the 21st Century.” However, it deals with these issues in general, historical, political and principled terms with regard to universities as a whole. It does not deal with the substance, quality, or relevance of the doctoral dissertations actually being produced in the universities.

¹⁰ It is striking that there are a series of published bibliographies of theses and dissertations from the Universities of Ghana, Nairobi, Makerere, Yaounde, and various Nigerian and South African universities from the 1960s to the early 1980s. But they all stop at that point, precisely when national and donor funding fell off.

¹¹ Marios Obwana and David Norman

¹² As part of our study we contacted Registrars or other senior officers at over 30 African universities seeking recent information of PhD production, but very few have ever responded.

¹³ Annual Report 2001, University of Ghana.

¹⁴ “Sujets de these de 3e Cycle, 1984-1999,” provided by Prof. Ibrahima Thion, Cheikh Anta Diop.

¹⁵ These staffing problems can be quite serious. In a recent communication, Lisbeth Levey noted, “The University of Dar es Salaam library has 26 vacancies it can’t fill for various reasons.”

¹⁶ Jamil Salmi, in his paper “Tertiary Education in the Twenty-First Century: Challenges and Opportunities (2001), lays out the positive advantages of high-tech distance education. But the success stories he is able to tell are almost all set in highly developed and wealthy countries, and he himself quotes the Australian Universities Quality Agency, “when you look at the best university education around the world some of it is now distance learning, when you look for the worst, all of it is distance learning.” (p. 10) He also notes that the “high costs of information technology and infrastructure which includes not only the initial capital outlays required . . . but also the recurrent budget outlays needed for expenditures on infrastructure maintenance, training, and technical support” have “very serious implications in terms of the growing digital divide among institutions within any country as well as across nations.” (p. 15) So far most of the successes in distance learning have indeed been in wealthy countries and at the undergraduate level. It is likely to be some time before high quality distance learning PhDs will be available in African universities.

¹⁷ See Yankah 2000 for some particularly egregious accounts of this sort of thing.

¹⁸ We are hardly the first to point this out. In a 1994 paper prepared for the Donors to African Education Working Group on Higher Education, entitled “Universities in Africa: Challenges and Opportunities of International Cooperation,” Berhanu M. Abegaz (a professor of Chemistry) states as the first of three main reasons for the crisis in African universities that they “have done very little to serve the important goal of truly

understanding and radiating indigenous cultures, because of a complex set of events that have made them culturally and intellectually over-dependent on the North.” (P.3)

19 This is not the place for an extended discussion of language issues in higher – or primary and secondary – education in Africa. However, as Mazrui and Mazrui (1998), Yankah (2000), and Prah (2001) forcefully argue, the continued use of colonial languages (English, French, Portuguese, and Arabic) in the educational systems is highly elitist, undemocratic, and undermines the value of local languages and the knowledges which they contain.

20 There may be some important missed opportunities here. Most consultancies deal with contemporary social, cultural, economic, or political issues. While the final report may be proprietary for the funder, with a little effort and planning the research involved might serve as useful training for the consultant’s students, and some of the research material or findings might become particularly relevant curriculum material for use in classes.

21 Master Plan for Higher Education, Ministry of Education, Republic of South Africa, February 2001.

²² In addition, South Africa has long had a large correspondence/distance learning university, UNISA, open to everyone.

²³ The differences between the English language UCT and Natal, and the Afrikaans universities, Pretoria and Stellenbosch, are also striking. For historical and political reasons, the latter universities have drawn over 80% of their faculty from their own university or other South African (and mostly Afrikaans) universities, and relatively little from other parts of the world. UCT and Natal draw heavily for faculty on their own PhDs, but also much more widely across the world (see Appendix IV). More generally, the SAUs are able to attract and show much more academic confidence in their own PhDs, than their NLU counterparts.

²⁴ “Gathering Voices – Perspectives on the social sciences in Southern Africa” edited by Teresa Cruz Maria e Silvia, and Ari Sitas, 2000.

25 In this connection, it is striking, if painful, that in comparison with all other regions of the world, there are both absolutely and relatively few African graduate students in all fields studying in the United States. They amount to a mere 6,606 out of a total of 225,383 foreign graduate students at US universities (IIE, Open Doors, 1999/2000). Furthermore, three countries (Kenya, Nigeria and South Africa) account for 48% of them, and there is little reason to believe that more than a tiny fraction are doing PhDs with the intention of returning to academic positions in Africa. Equally dismaying, again in comparison with all other regions of the world, the relatively and absolutely small numbers of Africans who are studying in the US are disproportionately undergraduates. Because fellowship support is rarely available for the BA degree, these tend to be children of wealthy African families. No comparable figures are available for Africans studying in Europe, but the percentages seem not likely to be very different.

²⁶ Martin West, Deputy Vice Chancellor, UCT, personal communication (August 2001).

²⁷ The faculty:student ratio in the Social Sciences and Arts at Makerere, for instance is currently 36:1. This is nearly double that of the rest of the campus (Musisi and Muwanga 2001).

²⁸ National Research Foundation News Release, 29 February 2000.

²⁹ Calls for more interactive pedagogies were almost universal. At the October 2001 Nairobi conference on Innovations in African Higher Education they ranged from broad appeals (Nyaigotti 2001) to concrete and detailed proposals (Cheng 2001).

³⁰ Given the larger intellectual goals, where possible, some of these workshops might be conducted in the local African language. As far as could be determined, there has only been one academic conference on the Continent in an African language – in Swahili, at the University of Dar es Salaam on “The Future of Swahili.”

31 An expansion of electronic publishing is explicitly recommended in the University of Dar es Salaam’s 2000/2001 to 2004/2005 Five Year Rolling Strategic Plan (pg. 43).