

Higher Education, Inequality and the Public Good in Four African Countries: Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria and South Africa

Report of Johannesburg Workshop
22 – 24 May 2017

Compiled by
Colleen Howell, UCL, IOE

Principal investigators:
Elaine Unterhalter, UCL, IOE
Stephanie Allais, REAL, Wits

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Emerging issues for the conceptualisation and implementation of the project	3
3.1 Considering the ‘unit of analysis’	3
3.2 Understanding higher education and the public good in context	5
3.3 Universities as public spaces on the African continent.....	8
3.4 Considering the public good at the institutional level.....	9
3. Next Steps	12
Ethics clearance	12
Refinement of the research design and work plan for field work	12
Finalisation of draft papers.....	13
Conference participation	13
4. Appendices	14
Appendix A: Workshop Programme	15
Appendix B: List of confirmed attendees, 23 May 2017	18
Appendix C: List of papers presented at workshop.....	20
Appendix D: Stakeholder discussion on potential interviewees in context.....	21
Appendix E: Guidelines for selection of interviewees	26

1. Introduction

This report provides a synthesised overview of the deliberations of the Project Workshop held in Johannesburg, South Africa from 22 to 24 May 2017 for the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Newton/National Research Foundation (NRF) funded project, *Higher Education, Inequality and the Public Good in four African countries: Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria and South Africa*. The Workshop had two main purposes. As the first face-to-face meeting of the project since its start-up in December 2016, it was designed to provide an opportunity for in-depth planning by the full, cross-country research team, particularly towards the refinement of the research steps and instruments, as well as the further development of the first set of research outputs. In addition, the Workshop was structured to include on the second day a Stakeholder Workshop. This day was aimed at bringing together key higher education stakeholders from the participating countries to engage with them around the conceptual and contextual framing of the project and to strengthen the research design. The three days were therefore designed to enable more in-depth planning for going forward with the project and to begin to facilitate stakeholder involvement in the research.

This report is aimed at providing an overview of the proceedings over the three days and, most importantly, drawing out the emerging issues from the Workshop for the project. It is therefore intended as both a record of key milestones within the project process and as a tool to assist in its further development and implementation. It has been organised into two main sections. The first discusses important themes that emerged out of the planning process and stakeholder engagement that are important for the project going forward, particularly towards deepening the conceptual thinking around the project, refining its research design and strengthening the planned research outputs. Discussion on and agreements reached on the next steps that need to be taken in the project are outlined in the second section. Attached to the report are also a number of appendices related to the workshop process and its outcomes.

2. Emerging issues for the conceptualisation and implementation of the project

3.1 Considering the ‘unit of analysis’

A key question that emerged in the discussion at both the planning meeting and the stakeholder workshop was, as one participant put it, how do we understand the “unit of analysis”? Put

simply, what do we mean by ‘higher education’ and thus how do we operationalize this understanding in the context of the project and the research process. It was recognised that despite an assumed homogeneity in the concept of higher education and its positioning within broader education systems, the nature and form of higher education differs across countries, including the four countries in this study. Especially important here are the different institutional forms and associated mandates that make up the higher education system in each country.

A number of participants argued that these parameters have been strongly informed by the historical development of higher education in each country, influenced in particular by the forms and conceptions of higher education provision dominant in the previous colonial power – that is, the English higher education system. However, it was further argued that the nature and form of higher education systems have also been shaped by particular political and economic imperatives underpinning government policy towards higher education at particular historical moments. For example, the post-independence ‘national projects’ in many African countries where universities were seen as key to building state capacity or the development of segregated universities to reproduce the social engineering of the apartheid system in South Africa. In the context of this project and the four countries focused on, these developments within higher education have also been impacted on by strong external forces, such as the structural adjustment imperatives of the World Bank in the 1980s. These imperatives, however they emerge, inform the national purposes that define the public mandates of higher education institutions, which may be different for different institutions.

What is important to the concerns of this project is that these differences in form and purpose impact directly on how the notion of higher education and the public good is understood and how institutions are “judged” in relation to their contribution (or not) to the public good. Thus, for example, how the contribution towards the public good of a university with a strong mandate or purpose towards the reproduction and development of technological skills and knowledge is understood or evaluated, may need to be understood differently to a university with a strong social science, liberal arts mandate. Also important to these concerns is the increasing involvement of the private sector in higher education, especially through the development of private universities – a trend that is very evident in Ghana, Nigeria and Kenya. In such a context, how can the contribution of a private university towards the public good be understood and ‘judged’ and how does this differ from or align to a broader conceptualisation of higher education and the public good in that context, through the public higher education system?

3.2 Understanding higher education and the public good in context

It was argued throughout the discussion that in the same way that the nature and form of higher education systems are contextually framed, so too are perceptions and understandings of the public good and higher education's relationship to it. Important here and consistently emphasised in different ways throughout the three days, is *the African continent, particularly sub-Saharan Africa, as the context in which the project is located* and thus the context that needs to be grappled with and explored as an essential part of the research. As one of the participants emphasised, it is important that the project seeks to "interrogate the conceptual debates (around higher education the pubic good) in the context of African realities". Central to this it was argued is that mainstream debates and considerations around higher education and the public good are dominated by perspectives that draw from a Western or global North experience, with limited engagement of what these may mean within the global South, including the African continent. While it was emphasised that it is important not to homogenise this context and to interrogate the specificities of each of the four countries, three overarching issues emerged as especially important to understanding this context and necessary concerns for the project to consider.

It was argued that *the notion of higher education and the public good is always time bound*, so that it is informed by a range of political, economic and social factors that characterise that particular historical epoch. It was recognised that some of the key factors influencing such understandings may be very specific to that historical moment, such as, as one participant suggested, the rising youth anger of the present time around access to higher education and the failure of existing systems to deliver on these expectations. However, other factors that influence how higher education and the public good are understood at any particular historical moment may transcend that particular time and are always important to how this relationship is understood. It was argued that for this research project, understanding those historical influences that have been important to how the relationship between higher education and the public good is understood within sub-Saharan Africa in particular, especially in the post-colonial period, are a necessary and important part of the research process. Similarly, we need to situate the research within a careful understanding of those factors that are important to the present context and may be important to influencing the understandings of existing stakeholders around higher education and the public good in their country context.

In considering the present historical moment, it was asserted by some of the participants that *the public good role of higher education in Africa was threatened at the present time* (as it is in

other parts of the world) by globally influenced, market driven policies towards higher education that restrict perceptions of the benefits of higher education to its economic benefits and frame the quality and effectiveness of institutions within these parameters. There were a number of consequences to these, such as intense local competition between universities driven by global parameters (such as ranking systems) rather than local needs and priorities. Other participants argued that while these influences were strong, the contradictions emerging from such policies, especially in relation to the perpetuation of high levels of inequality, were leading to the resurgence of debates about the value and importance of higher education to society, or put another way, its “public good role”.

The second over-arching issue that emerged in this discussion on context was recognising the complexity of issues and concerns that may influence people’s understanding of higher education and the public good. Important here was the issue of *people’s positioning in relation to the higher education system* and how this may influence how they make sense of higher education and its public good role. So for those people who actively participate in the higher education system, such as academics and students, or are directly involved in its governance and management, their understanding may be informed by the level at which they operate or participate in the system (for example, as a student at the local level within their local institution or as a senior academic within an international research community). These differences in perspective in relation to a person’s positioning were also evident at the workshop itself, where the views articulated by different stakeholders tended to reflect their existing positioning within or in relation to the system. It was argued that these differences in where and how people participate in the system may be important to how they see higher education’s role within the society. However, for those people who are positioned outside the system but connected to it in some way, such as school leavers aspiring to gain access to higher education or employers looking for particular kinds of skills and knowledge, their understandings may be influenced by their expectations of what they want and require from the system.

It was also emphasised that the issue of positioning and what this may mean for people’s perspectives of higher education and the public good, extended to *how people within African higher education institutions located themselves within an increasingly globalised world*. Thus, the question was posed as to how higher education leaders in sub-Saharan Africa position themselves in relation to both the global and the African continent and how this may influence their understandings of higher education and the public good. It was argued that while this would probably differ in relation to different institutions, a number of participants asserted that

the trend was for African higher education leaders to be more strongly influenced by their continental location, which in turn influenced their perspectives on higher education and the public good.

The third theme that emerged in this discussion concerned the importance of the context in *blurring the parameters of what have traditionally been considered as the public and private goods* derived from higher education. A key argument made here is that in contexts with high levels of inequality the private goods that are derived from higher education have important benefits beyond the individual, for their family, community and the broader society. The example continually articulated here are the benefits that derive for families of first generation graduates, where a range of social and economic benefits for the individual and their extended family are enabled through their education. These benefits are likely to be reflected in the educational opportunities their children will enjoy and in the contribution that they are now able to make to the country.

This discussion was closely linked to the reflective discussion in both the planning meeting and the stakeholder workshop on the draft conceptual paper and in particular *the exploration of two distinctive notions of higher education and the public good*, conceptualised in the paper as instrumental and intrinsic notions of higher education and the public good. An argument made in the paper and given strong support in the discussions was that if these notions are considered and explored within the different country contexts, they come together in complex ways. This suggests intersections between them that make it, as one participant said, “difficult to disentangle the public and private good” of higher education.

It was also suggested in this discussion that there is a tendency to understand instrumental notions of the public good as strongly market driven. Such as the acquisition of skills required by the market, with limited benefit beyond the individual benefits of acquiring such skills, a benefit usually only seen by the elite. Some of the participants emphasised that within the context of a developing economy, especially where structural inequalities continue to undermine equitable growth and development, higher education becomes a key lever in facilitating necessary national development. This would include the aspirational impacts of higher education on communities and its potential contribution to the building of a critical citizenry. It was suggested that the challenge rests with ensuring that higher education systems operate in pursuit of this national project, rather than as vehicles for the perpetuation of a small elite.

3.3 Universities as public spaces on the African continent

Closely related to the above discussion were the arguments made about the importance of understanding what it means for universities in the four countries, particularly the public ones, to be positioned and function as public spaces and what this may mean for how their relationship to the public good is understood and enacted.

The first issue that was discussed here and felt to be important for the project was the need to develop a deepened understanding of the positioning of universities in relation to the state and its citizens, within each of the country contexts. A number of participants emphasised that the university is a key space within society where the relationship between the state and its citizens is played out, including the contestations around this relationship. Central to this is the legitimacy of the state, which is maintained among other things through the provision of higher education as a public good for its citizens, with all the associated benefits to the citizenry and the country. However, it was argued that in many African countries the state is failing to undertake this responsibility, especially towards the provision of higher education opportunities for all its citizens. This results in challenges to its legitimacy (very evident, for example, in the recent #feesmustfall protests in South Africa) and/or the taking over of this responsibility by private providers, with equally complex consequences.

It was also argued that within a number of African countries, including in some of the ones in this study, the influence of government on the universities has become more overt, particularly through their role in the appointment of higher education leaders. A consequence of this, it was argued, is that the ability of universities to operate as spaces where public concerns are raised and engaged with, including critiquing the state when necessary, is constrained. From the perspective of government, however, such direct influence may be seen as important to ensuring the accountability of institutions to take forward their responsibilities and in this way contribute to the public good. Understanding that there may be differences in how government, universities and citizens view the role of universities and what is needed to fulfil this role has implications for the project - the research needs to be able to capture these potentially different visions and understand what they may mean for the functioning of the universities as their perceived contribution (or not) to the public good.

In reflecting on these concerns the question was raised as to whether the research was premised on a strong assumption that higher education provision was always in pursuit of the public good, even where its role in this regard may be understood differently. Put simply, *can a*

higher education system and its constituent parts being doing “bad things” that are ultimately not in the interests of the public good. In responding to this question, a number of the participants drew attention to the extent to which existing higher education systems, particularly within highly unequal contexts such as the countries focused on in this study, were reproducing, often in complex ways, the dominant patterns of inequality within that society. It was argued that, while a range of contextual factors were important in how these inequalities were reproduced, it could be argued that in all of the countries in the study higher education institutions, by and large, and despite in some cases having enabling and progressive policy frameworks, are still elite public spaces out of the reach of many citizens and complicit through their practices in protecting such privilege.

3.4 Considering the public good at the institutional level

It was argued by a number of the participants that the *role of higher education in relation to the public good is largely enacted at the institutional level* and this means that attention also needs to be given in the project to considering institutional practices and functioning as key to the concerns of the project. One participant therefore posed the question, “what kind of institution is needed that serves the public good, and another asked, “what are the characteristics of an institution that operates in pursuit of the public good in the African context?”

In taking this discussion further, it was suggested that there are two important elements to this. The first, is about the university itself and its make-up and functioning as an academic institution, particularly the practices it deploys in the organisation, management and delivery of its core functions. Important issues raised here included; the mix of academic programmes on offer; how its teaching and research roles are understood and taken forward, including the relationship between them; how different kinds and forms of knowledge are recognised and valued; the nature of its teaching and learning practices; and the relationship that exists between itself and external stakeholders, particularly local communities. It was suggested that these all become important considerations in identifying what is important to the public good role of a higher education institution. The second element to this is about the functioning of the institution, especially public institutions, as part of a broader system. It was suggested that the university’s functioning within a broader system creates opportunities and constraints that may be important to the enactment of its public good role. What becomes important to the project is therefore to consider the institutional level, informed by internal practices and positioning within a broader system, as a necessary area of focus to understanding the relationship between higher education and the public good.

Implications for the project going forward

Finalisation of draft research papers:

- **Country context papers** need to ensure that important historical trends and contestations impacting on the nature and form of the higher education system in that country and which may be important to contextualising understandings of higher education and the public good are captured.
- **Country context papers** also need to ensure that the present constitutional and policy provisions that frame the higher education system in that country, including its size and shape and articulated national imperatives, are described so that the reader has a clear ‘picture’ of the higher education system in that country.
- **Conceptual paper** needs to acknowledge the fluidity in the notion of higher education and suggest how it is being understood and used in this project.
- **Literature review** needs to ensure that it brings together insights from African research scholars and research undertaken on the continent that expands the literature base on higher education and the public good and draws out contextual issues important to the concerns of the research. To do this it will be necessary to explore a range of literature, especially what may be regarded as ‘grey literature’ and local research studies. |

Implications for the project going forward (cont)

Refinement of research design:

- Consideration needs to be given in the **selection of interviewees** to those variables, emerging out of the discussion that should be used to stratify the sample. **Appendix A** captures the decisions reached on what should guide the selection process, who should be targeted and the size of the sample.
- Important to the selection of who to interview in the research is recognising that it may be more **difficult to reach and capture some voices**, often a consequence of their marginalisation within the system or in relation to it. The research process should think creatively on how to reach the most marginalised voices so that all critical perspectives are captured.

Development of indicator:

- The complexity of issues that may inform how the relationship between higher education and the public good is understood and the importance of contextual influences, including the time bound nature of understandings, means that **it will always be difficult to evaluate at any particular historical moment** the extent to which institutions are contributing to the public good. The process towards the development of the proposed indicator needs to therefore give careful consideration to what measures could be used and how they could be brought together in nuanced and careful ways. This process will also need to consider what measures can be used so that the indicator can provide for specificity of context and useful comparison.
- The process at all times must be **guided by the conceptual framing of the project** and insights emerging from the field work so that the proposed indicator is recognised and can be defended within the context of the project and what it has set out to explore. This would include developing the indicator around a working understanding of the public good that aligns with the project's conceptual frame.
- In considering what variables may be important in the development of a planned indicator, cognisance must be taken of **differences in institutional purposes and mandates**. The indicator process must explore how the relationship between purpose and contribution to the public good can be provided for in the kind of evaluative measure the project seeks to develop.
- It must be recognised that the danger always exists that any process towards institutional evaluation and functioning, especially in relation to broader political and social imperatives, can become **one of limited compliance**. Here institutional efforts are largely directed at complying rather than aspiring to enhance their capacity to contribute to the public good. This danger needs to be recognised and acknowledged in the project and consideration given to how the indicator process may be able to disrupt rather than reinforce such practice.

3. Next Steps

Emerging out of the workshop discussion and the two day planning meeting in particular were a number of steps that were agreed upon as important in the next phase of project implementation. These steps are captured below.

Ethics clearance

- Very important to moving forward with the project is gaining ethics clearance for the research at UCL and within each of the countries. It was agreed that ethics clearance should be sort within each of the participating institutions and/or with the relevant body in that country and this process should begin as soon as possible
- To support the process and ensure alignment in the ethics submissions, a generic document containing information that is likely to be required for the ethics submissions would be developed and circulated to the research team

Refinement of the research design and work plan for field work

- A document capturing the decisions reached at the workshop regarding the research process and design with time frames and allocated responsibilities would be developed and circulated to the research team.
- Any emerging issues arising from the discussion that have any implications for revisions to the initial research plan would be noted and discussed with the funders if necessary.
- Each country will draft a research plan for the undertaking of the field-work within their country. This plan will align with the broader project plan and budget, and will include details of the research team and a proposed budget.
- A draft interview schedule to guide the interview process will be developed and circulated to the research team for comment. It was emphasised that the schedule would have a set of generic questions that would guide the research in each country, but have questions that are broad enough to allow for context specific issues to be probed in each country. Once feedback was received on the draft schedule, a finalised document would be sent for the research teams to use.
- It was proposed that to strengthen stakeholder input into the project especially around the conceptual frame and proposed indicator, additional funding would be sort to support the holding of two smaller workshops on the project with academic stakeholders in each of the four countries. Insights emerging from these would be captured and integrated into the project findings.

Finalisation of draft papers

- The authors of the conceptual paper would work on further refining the document drawing from feedback from the researchers and the broader discussion at the workshop. Consideration would be given as to which journal should be targeted for publication and suggestions in this regard would be circulated for discussion. The paper would be refined and further developed to prepare it for publication in the proposed journal.
- The authors of the context papers work work on further refining them so that they address the feedback emerging from the workshop discussion. Further consideration would be given as to what would be the best way of placing these papers in the public domain – two ideas at this stage were put forward for consideration – i) that they are prepared for a book aimed at exploring higher education in the four country contexts and/or ii) are developed further, particularly in relation to the conceptual framing of the project, and finalised for journal publication. These options will be discussed further.
- Attention would be also be given to exploring the possibility of preparing all or some of the papers for a special edition of the *Journal of Higher Education in Africa* published by CODESRIA. This possibility would be investigated.
- A strategy for authorship of all research outputs from the project was discussed and a decision reached on how this should work. The proposed strategy would be captured and circulated to all the researchers.

Conference participation

- A number of upcoming international academic conferences were identified and it was agreed that it would be important for the researchers to participate in these and present the findings and conceptual thinking emerging from the project as the research process unfolds.
- While attendance at some of the conferences has already been planned and budgeted for within the project budget, it was agreed that who attends and presents on behalf of the project would be decided as the process unfolds. However, the overarching principle guiding such decisions would be that different members of the research team are given the opportunity to attend and present and all efforts will be made to support conference attendance within the constraints of the project budget.
- It was also agreed that where researchers are able to access other sources of funding to attend conferences to discuss the project findings, this should be encouraged so the research is disseminated as widely as possible, especially within each of the countries.

Indicator process

- Taken the complexity of the issues involved in measuring and evaluating the public good, the indicator process should be seen as something that is ongoing and requires constant engagement from issues and insights emerging from the research.
- At this stage in the research process, researchers should identify whether there are any existing evaluation frameworks in place within any of the countries that could be drawn on in the development of the indicator and consider what these may offer the process.
- Researchers in each of the countries should also identify appropriate higher education data sets within their country that the project can draw on, and consider what variables are included here that could be used as part of the development of the proposed indicator. Similarly, existing international data sources should be explored. |

4. Appendices

Appendix A: Workshop Programme

Appendix B: List of confirmed attendees

Appendix C: List of papers presented

Appendix D: Stakeholder discussion on potential interviewees in context

Appendix E: Guidelines for selection of interviewees

Appendix A: Workshop Programme

**Higher Education and the Public Good in Four African Countries
Programme for 1st planning meeting and stakeholder workshop
University of the Witwatersrand (Wits)
Johannesburg, 22-24 May 2017**

MONDAY, 22 MAY 2017: **Researcher's Planning Meeting (Day 1)**
VENUE: **A305, School of Education, University of the Witwatersrand**

- 9h30 – 10h00:** Meet at Wits
TEA & COFFEE
- 10h00 – 10h30:** Welcome to three days and introduction to the research team
CHAIR: *Prof Stephanie Allais*
- 10h30 – 12h30:** **PLANNING SESSION 1:** Where are we and what to prioritise going forward?
CHAIR: *Prof Elaine Unterhalter*
- Progress on academic papers
 - Concept paper
 - Indicators paper
 - Contextual papers
 - Literature review
 - Ethics clearance
 - Feedback on UCL process
 - Country specific ethics reviews
 - Data sets – questions/issues
- 12h30:** **LUNCH**
- 13h30 – 15h30:** **PLANNING SESSION 2:** Planning around the research process and outputs
CHAIR: *Prof Moses Oketch*
- Research steps for data collection
 - Interviews
 - Analysis of existing data sets
 - Research outputs
 - Journal articles
 - Conference papers
- 15h30 – 16h30:** Discussion and final planning for stakeholder workshop
- Researchers provide background and introduction to country stakeholders who will be attending Tuesday workshop
 - Workshop objectives
 - Any logistical issues that we need to be aware of
- CHAIR:** *Prof Stephanie Allais*

TUESDAY, 23 MAY 2017: Stakeholder Workshop
VENUE: Wits Club, University of the Witwatersrand

9h00 – 9h10: **WELCOME**
Prof Adam Habib, Vice Chancellor, University of the Witwatersrand

9h10 – 9h20: **AIMS FOR THE DAY**
Prof Stephanie Allais, REAL, University of the Witwatersrand (Wits)
Prof Elaine Unterhalter, IOE, University College London (UCL)

9h20 – 11h20: **CONCEPTUALISING HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE PUBLIC GOOD** Presentation and discussion of draft concept paper

CHAIR: Dr Siphelo Ngcwangu, University of Johannesburg (UJ)
PRESENTERS: Prof Elaine Unterhalter (UCL) & Prof Stephanie Allais (Wits) in conversation with Dr Tristan McCowan (UCL) & Prof Ibrahim Oanda (CODESRIA)
RESPONDENTS: Ms Carol Brown, Burro Brand Ghana
Prof Chacha Nyaiigotti-Chacha, Kenyan Commission for University Education
Prof Jibrin Ibrahim, Centre for Democracy and Development, Nigeria
Dr Molapo Qhobela, National Research Foundation, South Africa

11h20 – 11h40: **TEA**

11h40 – 13h00: **DEVELOPING AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE COUNTRY CONTEXTS**
Presentation and discussion of draft country context papers

CHAIR: Prof Elaine Unterhalter, UCL
PRESENTERS: Dr Christine Adu-Yeboah, University of Cape Coast, Ghana
Prof Jibrin Ibrahim, Centre for Democracy and Development, Nigeria
Prof Moses Oketch, UCL, (Kenya)
Prof Stephanie Allais, Wits, South Africa

13h00: **LUNCH**

14h00 – 15h30: **DEVELOPING AN INDICATOR ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE PUBLIC GOOD.**
Presentation and discussion of draft indicators paper

CHAIR: Prof Stephanie Allais, Wits
PRESENTERS: Prof Elaine Unterhalter, UCL & Ms Palesa Molebatsi, Wits

RESPONDENTS: Mr Jerry Sarfo, National Council for Tertiary Education, Ghana
Dr Suleiman Babatunde Ramon-Yusuf, National Universities Commission, Nigeria
Prof Simon Gicharu, Mount Kenya University, Kenya
Prof Ahmed Bawa, Universities SA, South Africa

15h30 – 15h50: TEA

15h50 – 16h50: **INFORMING THE RESEARCH PROCESS**

Identification and discussion on appropriate interviewees for each country, key issues for investigation in interviews and review of pathways to impact

CHAIR: Dr Colleen Howell, UCL

16h50 – 17h00: **WRAP UP & CLOSURE**

Prof Stephanie Allais, Wits

Prof Elaine Unterhalter, UCL

17h00: **DRINKS & SNACKS**

WEDNESDAY, 24 MAY 2017:

VENUE: **Researcher's Planning Meeting (Day 2)**
A305, School of Education, University of the Witwatersrand

9h00 – 9h30: **INTRODUCTION:** Brief reflection on stakeholder workshop

CHAIR: *Ms Lerato Posholi*

9h30 – 11h00: **PLANNING SESSION THREE:** Design of research instruments

CHAIR: *Dr Christine Adu-Yeboah*

11h00 – 11h30: TEA

11h30 – 13h00: **PLANNING SESSION FOUR:** Development of coding frame for data analysis

CHAIR: *Prof Jibrin Ibrahim*

13h00: LUNCH

14h00 – 15h00: **PLANNING SESSION FIVE:** Maximising pathways for effective project impact

CHAIR: *Prof Ibrahim Oanda*

15h00 – 16h00: **WRAP UP:** Finalisation of steps/responsibilities/time lines for next phase

CHAIR: *Dr Tristan McCowan*

Appendix B: List of confirmed attendees, 23 May 2017

Participant	Organisation	E-mail address
Dr Christine Adu-Yeboah	University of Cape Coast, Ghana	nyhiraba.aduyeboah68@gmail.com
Mr Jerry Sarfo	National Council for Tertiary Education, Ghana	jerry.sarfo@gmail.com
Ms Carol Brown	Burro Brand Ghana	carol@burrobrand.biz
Prof Jibrin Ibrahim	Centre for Democracy and Development, Nigeria	jibrinibrahim891@gmail.com>
Prof Ibrahim Oanda	CODESRIA	ibrahimoanda@gmail.com>
Prof Chacha Nyaigotti-Chacha	Kenyan Commission for University Education (CUE)	chachanyai@gmail.com / chachanyai@cue.or.ke
Prof Simon Gicharu	Mount Kenya University	simnyg2012@gmail.com / chairman@mku.ac.ke
Prof Stephanie Allais	REAL, Wits, RSA	stephanie.matseleng@gmail.com>
Prof Ahmed Bawa	Universities SA	Ahmed.Bawa@usaf.ac.za>
Prof Melanie Walker	University of the Free State, RSA	melanie2walker@gmail.com
Dr Molapo Qhobela	National Research Foundation, RSA	molapo.qhobela@gmail.com/ZIPHORA @nrf.ac.za
Prof Thaddeus Metz	University of Johannesburg, RSA	tmetz@uj.ac.za
Mr Sizwe Nxasana	National Student Financial Aid Scheme, NSFAS	sizwe@sifiso.com
Dr Pamela Nichols	University of the Witwatersrand, RSA	Pamela.Nichols@wits.ac.za
Dr Laura Dison	University of the Witwatersrand, RSA	laura.dison@wits.ac.za
Dr Samuel Fongwa	Human Sciences Research Council, RSA	sfongwa@hsrc.ac.za
Mr Irvin Phenyane	The Higher Education Parent's Dialogue (HEParD)	irvinp@hepard.org.za
Mr Babsy Nhlapo	Congress of South African Trade Unions	babsy@cosatu.org.za
Ms Thandi Lewin	Department of Higher Education and Training, RSA	Lewin.T@dhet.gov.za>
Ms Makano Morejele	National Business Initiative, RSA	MakanoM@nbi.org.za
Mr Mthobisi Ndaba	PG student Wits	sompisikandaba@gmail.com
Ms Cecilia Selepe	PG Student Wits	cselepe.cs@gmail.com
Dr Bothwell Manyonga	Wits post-doc	manyongab@gmail.com
Prof Felix Maringe	University of the Witwatersrand, RSA	felix.maringe@wits.ac.za
Ms Naadira Munshi	Equal Education, RSA	naadira@equaleducation.org.za>
Mr Kefentse Makhuru	Wits SRC president	src.president@students.wits.ac.za
Ms Mikaela Simms	Wits PHD student	
Mr Thabo Moloja	President of South African Student's Congress (SASCO)	makhombothi@gmail.com

Johannesburg Workshop, May 2017

Mr Sthembiso Siyabonga Ndlovu	South African Union of Students (SAUS)	sthembisosndlovu@gmail.com
Prof Achille Mbembe	WISER, Wits	Achille.Mbembe@wits.ac.za>
Dr Siphelo Ngcwangu	University of Johannesburg, RSA	siphelo.Ngcwangu@gmail.com>
Ms Palesa Molebatsi	REAL, Wits	pm.molebatsi@gmail.com>
Ms Lerato Posholi	REAL, Wits	posholilerato91@gmail.com>
Prof Elaine Unterhalter	University College London, UK	e.unterhalter@ucl.ac.uk>
Prof Moses Oketch	University College London, UK	m.oketch@ucl.ac.uk>
Dr Tristan McCowan	University College London, UK	t.mccowan@ucl.ac.uk>
Dr Colleen Howell	University College London, UK	colleen.howell@ucl.ac.uk

Appendix C: List of papers presented at workshop

1. Unterhalter, E; Allais, S; Howell, C; McCowan, T; Morley, L; Oanda, I & Oketch, M (2017). "Higher Education and the Public Good: Concepts, Challenges and Complexities in Africa". Draft framing paper prepared for Johannesburg Workshop, May 2017.
2. Adu-Yeboah, C (2017). "Higher education, inequality and the public good: The Ghanaian Context". Draft context paper prepared for Johannesburg Workshop, May 2017.
3. Ibrahim, J (2017). "Trends and disputes over university education and the public good in Nigeria". Draft context paper prepared for Johannesburg Workshop, May 2017.
4. Oketch, M; Oanda, I; McCowan, T & Unterhalter, E (2017). "Higher education and the public good in Kenya: Articulation of the concept in historical and contemporary literature. Draft context paper prepared for Johannesburg Workshop, May 2017.

Appendix D: Stakeholder discussion on potential interviewees in context

NIGERIA	
WHO	WHAT
National institutions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tertiary Education Fund • National Universities Commission (NUC) • Committee of Vice-Chancellors (CVC) • National Youth Service Corps (NYSC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differentiation of the higher education space • Friendships among elites and formulations of the public good • The geography of location • Standards • Corruption and anti-corruption processes • Mobility of students and staff
Individual universities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North/South • East/West • Private/Public • Religious/Secular • Federal/State • Military 	
Student unions	
Staff unions (lecturers and admin)	
Parents	
Alumni associations	
Professional bodies/societies	
Employers	

GHANA	
WHO	WHAT
National Council for Tertiary Education (NCTE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imperative for 60/40 STEM enrolment – is this achievable etc, what about issues of quality etc.
National Accreditation Board (NAB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employability of graduates
Association of Ghana Industries (AGI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are graduate ‘giving back’ and what does this mean in the Ghanaian context
Employers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and understanding of key policies
Staff (Faculty and admin)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasons for going to a university or pursuing higher education study
Senior Higher School Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobility of graduates – within country and leaving country
University students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the expectations of stakeholders with regard to the training of students and what is required?
Unemployed graduates	
Higher education providers (universities)	
Local communities where universities are based	

KENYA	
WHO	WHAT
Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevance and role of higher education
Kenya Private Sector Alliance (KEPSA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constraints and challenges faced by higher education institutions/higher education sector
Teacher's Service Commission (TSC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality concerns
Heads of schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employability of graduates
Kenya National Union of Teachers (KNUT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic awareness of higher education
Kenya Union of Post-Primary Education Teachers (KUPPET)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordability and accessibility of provision
Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectations
Alumni Associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance and accountability concerns
Private providers association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community engagement
Academic staff union	
Employers (state and private)	
Civil society	
Ministry of Higher Education	
Regulatory bodies	

Professional associations/bodies	
TVET authority	
Kenya Universities and Colleges Placement Service (KUCPS)	
Commission for University Education (CUE)	
VCs Forum	

SOUTH AFRICA	
WHO	WHAT
Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrolled (national student organisations) • Graduates • Unemployed graduates association
Local communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Success vs massification imperatives • Employability of graduates • Why are universities important? • What are stakeholders proud of in terms of cultural inheritance? • What kind of graduate attributes are needed?
Employers organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What kind of knowledge do students (other role players) expect to receive from university/expect the university to impart?
Civil society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do stakeholders value about university education? • What is the public good in context of neo-liberalism and impact on the university? • What kind of curriculum/pedagogy is needed? • Issues of de-colonisation • Barriers to gaining access to higher education • Pervasive inequalities and impact on, for example, skills set of undergraduates • How do you measure critical thinking and learning skills outside the classroom? • Policy goals, expectations and vision
Policy Makers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council on Higher Education (CHE) • Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) • South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) • National Research Foundation (NRF) • Department of Science and Technology (DST) • National Planning Commission (NPC) • National Treasury • Human Resource Development Council of South Africa (HRDC)
University managers	
Academics	
Media	
Professional bodies/councils	

Appendix E: Guidelines for selection of interviewees

Following from the discussion at the workshop on informing the research process, this document synthesises the country discussions on who needs to be targeted in the interview process and the key issues that need to be explored with the interviewees. The specifics of these for each country that were discussed at the Stakeholder Workshop are also included in the table that follows.

- Strategic approach to selection of interviewees (depth vs breadth)**

Given the limitations in budget and time we need to be strategic in the interview process and identify those people who we feel can contribute the most to the aims and objectives of the project. This means that at times we may need to sacrifice breadth (e.g. we may not be able to speak to all the relevant civil society structures) and focus on structures that are representative of, or bring together, particular stakeholders (e.g unions, relevant associations etc). Overall it is recommended that we keep the sample of interviewees to no more than 20 interviews (this may include focus groups with, for example, group of academics).

- Balancing alignment across countries with specifics of context**

A key challenge for the project is balancing the need to create opportunities for cross-country comparisons across the data AND to ensure that we are sensitive to and alert to important issues in the context that have relevance for the project. It is suggested that we work towards an interview schedule that consists of a set of common questions for all countries and some key constituencies that will be interviewed in all countries. However, for each group of key thematic questions, country research teams should consider what issues/concerns they would like to probe that are specific to their context and important to explore with the interviewee(s).

- Selection of interviewees**

The following emerged as the key stakeholders that we need to try and reach through the data collection process. As already noted we should try and keep the number to 20 (where adjustments need to be made for context we should still try to keep within these limits).

Key constituency	Issues for countries to consider
Government (higher education) X 2 interviews <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Political head	The situation will be different in each country but the intention would be to interview the person who is the political head in the country responsible for higher education (so could be Minister of Higher Education or

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative/management head 	maybe Minister of Education) and the person that managers the higher education system (that is, the most senior civil servant responsible for higher education)
Academic/university leaders X 4 interviews	Selecting only 4 is going to be difficult in each of the countries as there are likely to be many good possibilities to approach. It is suggested that an important group here would be head/chairperson of the Vice Chancellor's (VCs) association and then two additional VCs. Where there is a strong private sector presence it may be good to try and get one VC from a private university and one from a public university. In each of the countries there may be other variables that may be important to consider such as geographical location, institutional size, history, student demographics etc. The main intention here would be to get people (as representative as possible of the sector) who are actively involved in running universities and thus to explore the extent to which the public good comes into their strategic thinking and the kinds of challenges they may be facing.
Employers X 4 interviews	Taken the breadth of this sector it will be important to try and target organisations/associations that represent or bring together people involved in key areas of the private sector that make a major contribution to the economy and preferably ones that are interested in and concerned with issues around higher education. Similarly, in all countries some key public sector employment organisations would be important – say in education and health.
Regulatory body X 1 interview	In each of the countries there may be a number of regulatory bodies that have some connection to higher education. However, here it will be important to target the body that plays the greatest/overarching role in relation to the regulation/direction/quality assurance of higher education.

Students (focus group) X 2-3	<p>It is recognised that this is going to be quite a challenging constituency to reach. In particular, recognising that there may be a number of different student organisations that it will be important to consider – countries will need to make some decisions around what is best within their context. In countries with sharp regional divisions, or divisions between different kinds of students it may be worthwhile to have different focus groups</p>
Academics (focus group) X 1 interview	<p>It is suggested that it may be best to reach academics through a union/staff association if this exists, otherwise it will be really difficult to include a group of academics that is not heavily skewed towards one university etc. It is also important to remember that interactions with academics will hopefully take place through the seminar series across the different countries discussed at the workshop and this may prove sufficient in terms of reaching academics. Other possibilities to be explored here where budget allows.</p>
Trade unions X 2 interview	<p>Although each country context will be different, if possible this union(s) should provide an opportunity to represent the views of staff employed in higher education (not just academics)</p>
Civil society X 2 interviews	<p>Once again it is going to be very difficult to isolate who would be the best people/organisations to interview. Here considering which people/organisations could add most value to addressing the issues the project is exploring should guide the decision-making.</p>
Higher education funding bodies X 1 interview	<p>The intention here should be to try and reach individuals who are involved directly in facilitating/managing funding support for students with a key focus being on the kinds of challenges that exist etc.</p>
TOTAL = 20 interviews /focus groups	

|