

ISSUES AND TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION PROGRAMMES IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND RESEARCH¹

Ad Boeren, Senior Policy Officer, Nuffic, May 2012

Executive summary

Most international capacity-building programmes in higher education have either been adapted or changed in recent years as a result of policy changes, and the findings of external evaluations and internal reviews. Changes that have been introduced - in varying degrees - in the programmes have resulted in a stronger emphasis on the following:

- *the alignment of collaboration programmes in higher education with sectoral aid, bilateral or otherwise;*
- *demand-drivenness and ownership in the South;*
- *output financing and accountability;*
- *fewer partner countries;*
- *transparency in matching partners, or matching 'supply' and 'demand';*
- *the independent administration of programmes;*
- *South-South collaboration and making use of local and regional expertise;*
- *the untying of aid;*
- *integrated capacity-building approaches;*
- *capacity building in relation to socio-economic needs and contexts;*
- *the organisational strengthening of fellowship programmes;*
- *linking the provision of fellowships (PhD) to capacity-building projects.*

Increasingly programmes are directed towards contributing to the sectoral programme objectives in bilateral aid countries. The modus operandi is shifting towards rendering technical assistance for capacity building in Southern organisations at the expense of achieving broader academic and societal objectives through cooperation and networking. The trend is becoming a reality for cooperation programmes in higher education in the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom. The programmes in these countries are compelling the institutions in the North to contribute to bilateral aid objectives in fewer countries.

The ownership of higher education cooperation programmes and projects is moving from Northern institutions to those in the South. Increasingly, demands in the South determine how the available donor funds are utilised, and Southern partners are encouraged to take full ownership and responsibility for the funded programmes and projects of their choice. Across the board, the influence of Northern partners on project identification as well as programme management is decreasing. In some programmes, the interests of the Southern partners already prevail, reducing the Northern partners to service providers. This is the case for the Dutch and Swedish programmes. Northern universities do not welcome the changing of roles - from partner to service provider. Contrary to their belief the development of higher education institutions in the South requires long-term commitment and cooperation between academic partners, rather than short-term, ad hoc technical assistance from consultants. Having to play the role of consultant reduces the interest of the universities in development cooperation and reduces their opportunities for gaining academic and research benefits.

Donors have been urged to make programme funding more transparent and to show a clear link between fund allocation and the intended outcomes in the South. Cooperation programmes in higher education require that relevant expertise be available in the institutions in the North. Does this justify the use of development cooperation funds to maintain a knowledge base and development cooperation expertise in the North? Norway, Belgium and Germany still answer this question in the affirmative. These countries feel that the involvement of local universities and research institutions in development cooperation and development research is important, not only to acquire know-how and

¹ This document is a compilation and an update of earlier Nuffic studies authored by Ad Boeren - see list of references.

expertise, but also to achieve and maintain a positive attitude in society towards development cooperation. In Sweden, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom the current thinking of donors is that funds should be directed towards capacity building in the South but should not be used to subsidise expertise in the North.

Nomination and selection processes have also become more transparent over the years. While in the past it was quite common for Northern universities to propose partners and projects and sit on committees to review and select the proposals submitted, nowadays the influence of Northern universities in these processes has been curbed in many programmes. The voice and demands of the South are either better accommodated in assessment and selection committees, or selection is performed by the donor agency, the programme administrator or independent committees. In the Dutch NPT and NICHE programmes² the collaborating institutions in the Netherlands are selected on the basis of a public tender procedure. A project outline prepared by the Southern organisation is advertised by Nuffic, which administers the programmes on behalf of the Dutch Minister for Development Cooperation. Interested organisations (universities, training organisations and consultancy firms) can show their interest by submitting a project proposal. One of the Dutch government's arguments in introducing the element of tendering in the programmes is that competition among providers of education and training in the Netherlands will result in better project value for money. Secondly, it will also afford a wider range of organisations in the Netherlands the opportunity to participate in the programmes.

Another noticeable trend is the emphasis on accountability in international cooperation and demonstrating 'value for money'. While in the past more emphasis was placed on activities, input and costs, the current emphasis is on the relationship between objectives and results. The financing principles of programmes and projects are shifting from input to output financing. At the level of the Southern and Northern counterpart institutions, more emphasis is being placed on the accountability of the financial administration of partners.

Many European countries have untied major parts of their bilateral ODA. However, most cooperation programmes in higher education still consist of tied aid. But things are changing. In the Swedish and UK programmes, it is not compulsory to involve institutions from the home country in project implementation. In the NPT and NICHE programmes, only the lead organisation on the Northern side should be registered in the Netherlands. If a consortium is formed to implement the project, the other consortium members do not need to be Dutch.

Donors of fellowships programmes, programme administrators and training institutes have adopted a variety of measures to ensure that training will be relevant to the applicant and that the impact of training will extend beyond the applicant's individual interests. Particularly in the programmes that endeavour to contribute to development cooperation and poverty reduction, a clear trend is visible towards linking individual scholarships more closely to the organisational strengthening processes in developing countries. This is being attempted by the more focused and longer term provision of scholarships to organisations in the South, and by trying to develop training capacity in the South. It is still too early to assess whether these approaches are successful and sustainable. The trend acknowledges the notion that in development-oriented programmes, capacity building in developing countries should be the main aim of training provided through scholarships, and that the training of individuals should contribute to sustainable training capacity in the South. The programmes should enable the South to cater for its own education and training needs. It is obvious that the needs and challenges of the South should be key in determining the education and training support being offered in or by the North.

The question is whether scholarship programmes alone are sufficiently equipped to achieve these objectives. It seems that a broader approach to organisational support is needed to develop and sustain local education and training capacities. The impact of scholarships might be increased if these opportunities are integrated in, or closely linked to broader institutional or organisational development schemes.

² The Netherlands Programme for the Institutional Strengthening of Post-secondary Education and Training Capacity (NPT) was launched in 2002 and is being phased out; the Netherlands Initiative for Capacity development in Higher Education (NICHE) commenced on 1 January 2009 and has a duration of four years.

Introduction

This trend paper provides an overview of the main issues and trends in development cooperation programmes in higher education and research.

Donor agencies in Europe, North America and Asia have funded or co-funded many of these collaborations with the main purpose of helping developing countries build up the required manpower, tertiary education, training as well as research capacity to enable developing countries to cater for their own development.

Two main types of funding programmes have been around for quite a number of years: a) programmes which fund collaborative projects between organisations in developing countries and higher education and research organisations in the North, and b) fellowship/scholarship programmes that enable candidates from developing countries to obtain a diploma or degree abroad. While the fellowship programmes predominantly focus on capacity building for the individual, the collaborative programmes tend to focus on strengthening an organisation's performance capacity.

There are dozens of these capacity-building programmes, each with their own specific aims and characteristics. Over the years programmes have been adapted or replaced either because of changes in the political context or insights into the effectiveness of the programme set-up.

The following two chapters discuss issues surrounding collaborative and fellowship programmes in an endeavour to explain the commonalities and differences between the programmes. In addition, trends are presented as they surface based on an analysis of policy and programme changes that have taken place over the last few years.

The issues and trends concerning collaborative and fellowship programmes are discussed in separate chapters. However, it should be kept in mind that in some instances the two types of programmes tend to converge and/or are implemented in parallel.

The main sources of information for this paper are studies conducted by Nuffic in the last five years, which are included in the List of References. A more recent review study conducted by Nuffic's Expertise Department on donor programmes funding capacity building in developing countries complements the information.

1. Capacity building and/or partnerships

The common objectives of higher education cooperation programmes within the framework of development cooperation are as follows:

- a) capacity building (teaching, research and outreach);
- b) organisational and/or institutional development;
- c) research collaboration;
- d) networking between Southern and Northern partners.

The programme components are fairly standard and emanate from specific objectives. They include staff development schemes, curriculum development, the improvement of teaching and research facilities, joint research activities, staff and student exchanges and professional advice.

These objectives tend to overlap. In many higher education cooperation programmes, two or three of these objectives are combined. Capacity building may well form part of the organisational strengthening process, and capacity building and organisational strengthening may have to be in place on the Southern side before research collaboration between partners can begin.

1.1 Programme orientation and set-up

Although all programmes focus on capacity development in developing countries through collaboration with higher education and/or research institutes from the North, the orientation and set-up of the programmes is quite diverse. An overview is given below:

Programmes focusing on research capacity building

Examples of research cooperation programmes are the Norwegian-funded *NUFU programme*³, the Belgian-funded *VLIR-UOS Own Initiatives Programme (VLIR-OI)*⁴ and the *Irish-African Partnership for Research Capacity Building programme (IAP)*⁵. The programmes tend to combine research cooperation with capacity building and elements of institutional development. The NUFU's view is long-term, that of the two other programmes is medium to long term. It is hoped and expected that these programmes will lead to sustainable research partnerships.

The NUFU programme and *Norad's Programme for Master Studies (NOMA)*⁶, a programme aimed at setting up master's degree programmes in partner countries (see below), are being replaced by a new programme called the *Norwegian Programme for Capacity Building in Higher Education and Research for Development (NORHED)*⁷. The overall goal of NORHED is to build higher education and research capacities in low and middle income countries (LMICs) as a means of enhancing sustainable conditions conducive to societal development and poverty reduction. The programme will be based on equal partnerships between institutions in the cooperating countries and in Norway. NORHED will be organised in sub-programmes with a specific thematic and/or geographic focus, and may support education at bachelor's, master's and PhD-levels, as well as joint research.

In the past Denmark provided the *ENRECA programme*⁸ which was quite similar to the NUFU programme. This has been replaced by a development research programme embracing several components⁹. Support can be granted to research projects in areas where research and new knowledge is relevant to development assistance and where research contributes to resolving problems in developing countries. It is furthermore important that the research projects contribute to enhancing the countries' own research capacity as well as taking account of the countries' own needs and strategies. Support can be given to cooperation projects as well as individual PhD and post-doc projects. In 2008 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs launched two pilot research programmes in Tanzania and Vietnam. In 2011 preparations commenced for pilot collaboration with Ghana. These pilot programmes are based on framework agreements, which also reflect national priorities within the framework of Danish bilateral development assistance.

In 2010 the Austrian Development Agency funded a new programme called the *Austrian Partnership Programme in Higher Education & Research for Development (APPEAR)*¹⁰. The programme funds academic partnerships in higher education, research and management, to strengthen the institutional capacities of academic partner institutions in the South. Scholarships are also made available for master's and PhD programmes that provide support to students and academics based on existing partnerships established to implement sustainable cooperation and realize the overall programme objective.

Sweden has been supporting *development research* since 1975.¹¹ The goal is the same for all forms of research cooperation: to help create knowledge that will enable poor people to improve the quality of their lives. Sida provides support to help developing countries improve their ability to run their own research programmes, and to research that can contribute to resolving important development problems, as well as to Swedish research programmes that focus on issues related to development and development cooperation.

Support is provided to research councils, universities, research institutions, regional research networks and international research programmes. The Research Council appointed by the Government decides on the research focus. Strengthening research capacity encompasses supporting partner countries in creating a better research environment, researcher training as well as developing methods for planning and determining research priorities. Promoting development-oriented research involves strengthening, both financially and academically, the ability of partner

³ The Norwegian Programme for Development, Research and Education (NUFU): <http://www.siu.no/eng/Front-Page/Programme-information/Development-cooperation/NUFU>

⁴ VLIR-OI: http://www.vliiruos.be/index.php?language=EN&navid=496&direct_to=Own_Initiatives_EI

⁵ IAP: <http://www.universitiesireland.ie/news/iaprcb.php>

⁶ NOMA: <http://www.siu.no/eng/Front-Page/Programme-information/Development-cooperation/NOMA>

⁷ NORHED: <http://www.siu.no/eng/Front-Page/Programme-information/Development-cooperation/NORHED>

⁸ ENRECA: http://www.fomabo.life.ku.dk/About_FOMABO/ENRECA.aspx

⁹ DANIDA research cooperation: <http://um.dk/en/danida-en/partners/research/>

¹⁰ APPEAR: <http://www.appear.at/>

¹¹ Sida: <http://www.sida.se/English/Partners/Universities-and-research/From-funding-research-to-fighting-poverty/About-FORSK/>

countries to identify areas of importance for their development as well as disseminating research results.

Capacity-building programmes for post-secondary education and training organisations

Examples of a programme aimed at strengthening the organisation of Southern institutions through higher education cooperation are the Belgian-funded VLIR¹² and CIUF¹³ *Institutional University Cooperation Programmes*. These programmes pursue a focused strategy in strengthening partner higher education institutions. They take a long-term view and have been implemented in a small number of institutions in the South. The collaborating organisations have launched a number of projects on the basis of a strategic plan formulated by the Southern partner. The projects are required to have an impact on certain disciplines and on administration and management, but above all, their sum total should strengthen the performance of the institutions as a whole.

The British-funded *Development Partnerships in Higher Education (DeLPHE)*¹⁴ funds partnerships between higher education institutions in developing countries and developed countries, including the United Kingdom. DeLPHE succeeded the Higher Education Links Scheme (HELs) in 2006. Its overall goal is to enable HEIs to act as catalysts for poverty reduction and sustainable development. DeLPHE aims to achieve this by building and strengthening the capacity of HEIs (South and North) to contribute towards the MDGs and promote science and technology-related knowledge and skills. It has no institutional development objective, which makes it more of a capacity-building programme.

The same can be said of the Canadian partnership programmes funded by CIDA and administered by the Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada (AUCC): the *University Partnerships in Cooperation and Development Program (UPCDP)*¹⁵ and the *Canadian College Partnership Program (CCPP)*. These programmes were launched in 1994. The goal is to enhance the capacity of education and training institutions in developing countries to produce human resources that can address the countries' most important development needs in sustainable ways. At the same time, partners are expected to respond to the needs of local communities in developing countries.

In 2009, the Association of Public Universities in Catalonia (ACUP) in collaboration with the Catalonia-Africa Institute launched an *Institutional Development and University Management project (DIGU)*¹⁶ which aims to strengthen the institutional capacity of African universities. The DIGU programme aims to promote exchange experiences, the analysis of good practice and the professional training and development of university directors and managers through training, professional development, periods abroad and mobility of university directors and managers, as well as the creation of networks of knowledge.

DAAD administers quite a number of distinct capacity-building programmes, which aim to strengthen higher education institutions and staff in developing countries by making use of and fostering partnerships with German higher education institutions. Examples are the *Dialogue on Innovative Higher Education Strategies (DIES)* programme¹⁷ (launch in 2001), which aims to promote international experience through the exchange of academics as well as through cooperation between universities and industry and developing countries, and the *Professional Relationship with Universities in Development Countries* programme, which assists academic exchange enhancing the situation of teaching and the configuration of lasting structures in apprenticeships.

The European Commission funds programmes aimed at establishing networks and partnerships between higher education institutions in Europe and other continents. Among these are the *EDULINK programme*¹⁸ and the *ALFA-Regional cooperation programme*¹⁹, aimed at fostering capacity building and regional integration in the field of higher education between Europe and ACP countries (EDULINK) and countries in Latin America (ALPHA) through institutional networking. The EDULINK programme was launched in 2006 and the ALFA Programme in 1994. The programme co-finances

¹² Flemish University Council (VLIR)

¹³ Conseil Interuniversitaire de la Communauté française (CIUF)

¹⁴ DeLPHE: <http://www.britishcouncil.org/delphe-what-is-delphe.htm?mtklink=delphe-homepage-mt-link-what-is-delphe>

¹⁵ UPCDP: <http://www.aucc.ca/programs-services/international-programs/university-partnerships/>

¹⁶ DIGU: <http://www.acup.cat/digu>

¹⁷ DIES: <http://www.daad.de/entwicklung/hochschulmanagement/08014.en.html>

¹⁸ EDULINK: <http://www.acp-edulink.eu/node/23>

¹⁹ ALPHA: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/latin-america/regional-cooperation/alfa/detail_en.htm

projects aimed at improving the capacity of individuals and institutions (universities and other relevant organisations) in the two regions. EDULINK's overall objective is to foster capacity building and regional integration in the field of higher education through institutional networking, and to support a quality higher education system, which is relevant to the needs of the labour market, and consistent with the socio-economic development priorities of ACP States. The programme commenced in 2006.

In late 2010 the European Commission launched an intra-regional cooperation programme called the *intra-ACP academic mobility scheme*,²⁰ which promotes cooperation between higher education institutions (HEIs) and supports mobility in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific (ACP) regions. The programme aims to increase access to quality education that will encourage and enable ACP students to undertake postgraduate studies, and to promote student retention in the region along with (academic and administrative) staff mobility while increasing the competitiveness and attractiveness of the institutions themselves. This programme builds on the African Union's Mwalimu Nyerere programme for Africa, granting additional funding, and setting up a similar scheme for the Caribbean and Pacific regions. It is funded through the European Development Fund (EDF).

The Dutch NPT²¹ (2002-2012) and NICHE²² programmes (2009 -2012) support the strengthening of education and training capacity in selected bilateral cooperation countries. The projects are identified by local stakeholders and should preferably strengthen the sectors which have priority in the Dutch bilateral aid programmes in these countries. Dutch expertise is contracted to co-implement the projects. The cooperation relationship is not defined in terms of a partnership, but rather in terms of a business arrangement between the client (project owner) and the Dutch service provider. This is further underlined by the way in which suppliers are selected. The projects identified by Southern partners are advertised in the Netherlands through a public tender procedure.

An interesting new programme was launched on 31 May 2010 by AUCC called the *Strengthening of Higher Education External Stakeholder Relations in Africa*²³ project. This three-year project is managed in partnership by the AUCC and the Association of African Universities (AAU) and funded by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). The project aims to strengthen higher education stakeholder relations in Africa and focuses on three key components:

- Strengthening African University Outreach – African universities in partnership with Canadian universities will strengthen their strategic plans for improved outreach to external stakeholders;
- University-Industry Linkages – African universities in partnership with Canadian universities will produce case studies of successful African university-industry linkages; and
- Strengthening AAU Stakeholder Relations – AAU will work in partnership with AUCC to strengthen its ability to support its member universities' external stakeholder relations and to strengthen its own external stakeholder relations.

The interests of this project have a clear focus on Africa as it endeavours to improve the relevance of higher education in Africa. The role of the Canadian partners is to help Africa in the process. In-kind contributions are expected from the African and Canadian partners.

1.2 Partnerships or technical assistance

Many programmes use the term 'partnership' in their name and objectives. In some programmes this means that the cooperation is expected to lead eventually to long-term partnerships between the cooperating partners. This applies in particular to the NUFU and Flemish, Irish and Austrian research cooperation programmes. It is hoped that as a result of programme support the cooperating institutions will reach a stage of equal strength allowing collaborative research of mutual interest to be conducted. The establishment of a well-functioning partnership can be regarded as proof of the sustainability of the project results.

Partnership is an implicit aim of institutional development programmes, such as the Belgian *Institutional University Cooperation* programmes. However, the mutual interests of partners in these

²⁰ intra-ACP academic mobility scheme:

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/intra_acp_mobility/programme/about_acp_mobility_en.php

²¹ Netherlands Programme for the Institutional Strengthening of Post-Secondary Education and training capacity (NPT): <http://www.nuffic.nl/npt>

²² Netherlands Initiative for Capacity development in Higher Education (NICHE): <http://www.nuffic.nl/niche>

²³ Strengthen higher education stakeholder relations in Africa : <http://www.aau.org/?q=shestra/background>

programmes tend to be smaller than in the research cooperation programmes because of the emphasis on the curriculum and staff development, the improvement of management and administration, and the improvement of facilities.

In other programmes partnership refers to the mode of cooperation in achieving the programme objective. Usually this involves a fair amount of co-funding by the cooperating institutions. The Canadian programmes and DelPHE are an example of this type of set-up. The same principle applies to the German programmes and the Catalanian DIGU project.

There is no mention of partnerships in the Sida, NPT and NICHE programmes in which Swedish and Dutch institutions respectively serve as instruments in realising the capacity aspirations of the Southern organisation. Partnerships may evolve as a result of implementing the project, but this is a spin-off and not a primary programme aim.

The table below endeavours to provide a visual overview of the orientation of the different European capacity-building programmes in higher education.

Table 1: *Typology of programme orientation based on objectives*

Objectives	Capacity building	Organisational development		Networking
Orientation	Service provision	Linkages		Partnerships
Programmes	Sida research NPT NICHE	VLIR-IUC CIUF-CUD- CUI	NUFU VLIR-OI CIUF-CUD- PIC IAP DAAD programmes APPEAR DelPHE	Alfa EDULINK

1.3 Programme objectives and programme ownership

Over the years, development assistance policies have moved from a project to a programme-driven approach, identifying a limited number of sectors that are to receive more concentrated support, and from a paternalistic to a demand-driven perspective that emphasises the need for local ownership and responsibility. Likewise, programmes in higher education have undergone a shift, moving away from mainly academic cooperation based on mutual interests, becoming more development cooperation-oriented geared towards the institutional development of higher education and broader development objectives.

Multilateral and bilateral programmes are increasingly governed by agendas agreed by the entire donor community, such as the Millennium Development Goals and the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers. Donor agencies tend to strive for consistencies in policy, and synergy between various development programmes. Unsurprisingly, a trend seen among almost all donors is the alignment of cooperation programmes in higher education and research with bilateral programmes and overall development policy principles. Hence the programmes are increasingly expected to contribute to alleviating poverty, removing gender discrepancies, improving the environment, supporting sectors identified for bilateral cooperation and to focus on sub-Saharan Africa. In their approach, they should be demand-driven, promote ownership in the South, encourage donor coordination and lead to sustainable results. The room for initiatives from the North, the free choice of cooperating partners, and the free identification of research topics has diminished considerably.

Traditionally, cooperation programmes in higher education and fellowship programmes have not been obliged to follow these overall development policies literally. The reasons were twofold. First, the fact that in some countries the programmes served dual purposes. In a number of countries, support for their own higher education programmes was an important underlying – and usually – implicit motivation. The programmes in Germany, Norway (NUFU), Canada (UPCDP) and Belgium (VLIR-OI)

are regarded as important instruments in creating and sustaining development-related expertise in the country and to internationalising the higher education system. Collaboration between institutions is seen as a good instrument for capacity building on both sides, and it serves objectives broader than those of development cooperation alone.

Second, partnerships and networks will only work if both sides have something to offer that meets a need from the other side. This process cannot easily be accomplished within strict boundaries set by priority themes and regions. In return, the institutions in the North are expected to make a financial contribution to the projects. The NUFU, the Belgian and Canadian cooperation programmes and the DelPHE make a substantial contribution. Northern institutions contribute their staff time to the projects, free of charge. The Irish-African Partnership for Research Capacity Building (IAP) makes a 15% financial contribution to the project budget for staffing. Northern institutions are expected to capitalise on their returns in the form of published research, providing opportunities for staff and student training, developing international courses, and providing advisory and consultancy services on the basis of the expertise gained, and such like.

The dual goals of the programmes, often combined with a considerable own contribution, had implications for the ownership and management of the programmes. The institutions in the North regarded the programmes as their own and were granted responsibility for programme management and the allocation of funds. This was the case in the first phases of NUFU, ENRECA and the previous Dutch cooperation programmes²⁴, and still is the case in the Belgian, Canadian and Irish programmes. Another modality was to assign the management to intermediary organisations having strong links with national universities. Nuffic, the British Council, and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) belong to this group.

In recent years, this situation has changed in some countries. In an attempt to decrease the influence of Northern institutions on the administration of the programmes and to shift ownership to more neutral grounds, programme management has been transferred to other bodies. In Norway, SIU's²⁵ status was changed on 1 January 2004 from the Centre for International University Cooperation, created in 1991 by the Norwegian Council of Universities (UHR), to an administrative agency under the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research (UFD) with its own Board of Directors. In Denmark the capacity- building programmes are now being managed by the Danish Fellowship Centre, and in the Netherlands, Nuffic was forced to break its formal links with Dutch higher education institutions and adopt a new and independent status in 2002 in order to qualify for the administration of the new international cooperation programmes. In Belgium the programmes are still administered by a Council of Universities. However, the Council has been granted this responsibility in exchange for complete transparency of and accountability for programme management and implementation. The Irish IAP programme is administered by one of the Irish universities. The Catalanian DIGU project is co-funded by the Spanish Development Agency and administered by the ACUP.

In Northern Europe, the trend towards de-linking the programmes from the Northern institutions and aligning them with bilateral and international cooperation themes and focal areas is clear. The Sida programme had already adopted this model. The Dutch NPT and NICHE programmes have followed suit. The projects in the DelPHE programme are required to demonstrate how they will contribute to the MDGs and to alleviating poverty.

In Flanders, the policies concerning university cooperation were reformulated in 2011. Although the existing programmes will continue, there is a clear intention to implement the programmes in a more coordinated manner, and to ensure that these are more clearly related to Belgian bilateral assistance in partner countries.

The table below provides an overview of European programme modalities and ownership.

²⁴ The Joint Financing Programme for Cooperation in Higher Education (MHO Programme), the Programme for Cooperation between the Dutch Universities of Professional Education and Educational Institutions in Developing Countries for the Benefit of Primary Education (HOB Programme), the SAIL Projects Programme (SPP) which all ended in 2004.

²⁵ The Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education (SIU), administers programme including the NUFU programme.

Table 2: Typology of cooperation programmes according to the programme modality and ownership criteria.

<i>Programme modality</i> Programme ownership		<i>Service provision</i> ←————→ <i>Cooperation</i>	
		Northern partners ↑ ↓ Southern partners	VLIR-IUC DelPHE
		Sida NPT/NICHE	

In most programmes the project initiative and the responsibility for project implementation lies primarily with the Northern partners. This relates to the co-funding nature of the programmes and/or the focus on partnership building. Almost all of these programmes (especially the research cooperation programmes) make use of a competitive system, national or otherwise, in which a committee selects the best proposals. The committee members are appointed by the government in the donor country, and by higher education and/or research bodies.

In Belgian research programmes, a committee of peers is responsible for selecting project proposals. The principle of mutual benefits for both partners requires that the interests of the Northern partner are also taken into consideration when selecting areas of cooperation. Their interests may not fully dovetail with those of the Southern partners.

In the Belgian university cooperation programmes, partner universities in the South are selected by the administrative organisations (VLIR and CIUF). However, candidate partners are nominated by the Belgian universities. The Southern partners decide on the collaboration projects and can select a partner in Belgium to co-implement projects. A system of match-making visits to Belgium is used to meet and select preferred partners. The match-making process is also used in the Danish pilot research cooperation programmes in Vietnam and Tanzania.

In the Dutch programmes the intermediary organisation, Nuffic, identifies the topics for cooperation as well as the cooperating organisations in consultation with national stakeholders and the Netherlands Embassy in the partners countries. In the Sida programme, partner organisations/universities in the South are identified and selected by Sida.

1.4 Trends

The discussion of the various programmes in the previous paragraphs reveals the following trends:

- *Alignment of higher education collaboration programmes with (bilateral) sectoral aid*
 This policy principle is evident in the set-up of the Swedish and Dutch programmes and is gaining more emphasis in the Norwegian and Flemish programmes. Local government priorities and bilateral aid sectors are leading in deciding on programme interventions.
- *Demand drivenness and ownership in the South*
 Most programmes stipulate that the needs and priorities of the southern organisation should be taken into account when deciding on the topic of collaboration. But the way they organise this principle varies. In programmes which select projects on a competitive basis it is up to the submitting partners to demonstrate that the project is demand driven by the South and co-owned by the partners. In the Swedish, Danish, Dutch and Flemish programmes the initiative clearly lies with the organisations in the South. They can indicate what they want and need before contracting Northern partners. This is carried out on the basis of sector studies and/or the institute's strategic plans.

In terms of full project ownership, only the NPT and NICHE programmes also endeavour to grant the requesting organisation financial responsibility for the project. In practice, in most cases local

financial hurdles and deficient organisational capacities prevent the operationalisation of this principle.

In a number of programmes a type of tripartite contract is used in which the requesting partner is assigned responsibility for operational funds for activities taking place in the South (e.g. VLIR-IUC programme).

The relevance of programme outcomes is a topic on which more emphasis is being placed. In most instances this means that education programmes and research should address topics which are relevant to the needs and contexts of the local society/economy and that the results should be applicable. In the NICHE programme, one of the policy priorities is to make sure that the education and training in NICHE projects clearly relates to labour market demands. This means developing relevant curricula, and that students will easily find employment upon graduation.

The new Canadian programme (*Strengthening Higher Education External Stakeholder Relations in Africa*) seems to go a step further. The programme is not sector or discipline-driven but focuses on the relevance of capacity building in terms of societal outreach, university-industry linkages and stakeholder relations.

- *Output financing and accountability*

In practical terms this means that projects should be able to demonstrate that they have achieved the planned results. Likewise, reporting should pay less attention to the activities that have been carried out and pay more attention to the extent to which the planned results have been achieved on the reporting date. This approach is based on or supported by the logical framework methodology as adopted by most programmes. In addition, the importance of the concept of Value for Money is growing, especially under the influence of DfID. Projects and programmes should be able to demonstrate that the taxpayer's money is spent with the best possible rate of return.

- *Fewer partner countries*

There is a tendency to decrease the number of eligible countries across the board, the exception being the NICHE programme where the number of collaborating countries increased from 14 to 23 compared with the NPT programme²⁶.

Linked to a decrease in numbers is the tendency to relate the list of countries eligible for capacity-building programmes more closely to the list of bilateral partner countries.

Co-funded programmes focusing on research partnerships seem to be less restrictive when it comes to eligible countries.

- *Transparency in matching partners, or matching 'supply' and 'demand'*

Matching collaborating partners is carried out in three ways: a) by the partners themselves, b) through a match-making process, or c) through a tender procedure. Most programmes make use of method a). Partners decide to submit a joint proposal for collaboration in response to a call for applications.

In method b) selected partners in the South have the opportunity to look for a partner through a 'match-making' visit to the donor country (VLIR-IUC and Danish pilot programme).

The NPT and NICHE programmes are the only programmes that make use of a public tender procedure to match demand from the South with supply from the Netherlands. This principle was introduced in 2002 but has not been adopted by other countries.

The composition of selection committees reveals ownership of the programme. In Belgium and Norway the committees are still dominated by representatives from the national universities. In other countries committees have a more mixed composition with government-appointed representatives and even representatives from developing countries.

- *Independent administration of programmes*

Funding mechanisms have a great influence on the way programmes are administered. Single source funded programmes are administered by the funding agency or an independent intermediary organisation. Co-funded programmes are usually administered by organisations affiliated with one of the funding organisations. In order to represent the interests of the other

²⁶ For various reasons the NICHE programme was only implemented in 19 countries.

sponsor better, some programmes have opted for a more neutral solution. For example, in 2004 the Norwegian SIU was transferred from the Norwegian Universities Association to the Norwegian Ministry of Education.

- *South-South collaboration and making use of local and regional expertise*

South-South collaboration is encouraged in an increasing number of programmes. The underlying rationale is three-fold: a) to encourage organisations in the South to enter into mutually beneficial collaborations which may be as effective and more relevant than North-South collaborations, b) to strengthen locally available expertise, and c) to curb brain drain and replace it with regional brain circulation.

In the Norwegian NUFU and Belgian IUC programmes, North-South-South collaboration is promoted as a distinct programme component. The Dutch NPT and NICHE programmes have adopted a more functional approach. Projects are rewarded for involving more regional expertise in the implementation of projects.

- *The untying of aid*

None of the collaborative capacity- building programmes represent untied aid. The Swedish programme comes closest. The Dutch programmes require at least a Dutch lead partner in the Northern consortium that co-implements the project together with the requesting organisations.

The capacity-building programmes are also hardly harmonised with the other principles set out in the Paris Agenda and Lisbon Declaration. They are not an easy fit with sector support programmes at the national level: they provide project support rather than budget support and are administered from the donor country instead of by the embassies in the partner countries.

The NICHE programme attempts to bridge these gaps by closely linking the NICHE projects to national policies and priorities as well as the Dutch bilateral aid agenda. Coordination with government programmes and those of other donors also receives due attention. The Swedish and Danish programmes also seek a close link with national priorities and policies.

Under the new Belgian university cooperation policy and the new Norwegian NORHED programme more attention is also being paid to the above aim.

- *Integrated capacity-building approaches*

Over the years enhanced insight has shown that capacity building needs to be tackled from an integrated perspective. Most programmes now combine more than one level of capacity building. Staff training is often combined with curriculum development, software and infrastructure development. The Belgian IUC programmes are based on a broader organisational strengthening perspective, which also targets management capacities. The same applies to the Swedish and Dutch programmes albeit that capacity building in these programmes might also extend beyond the organisation and include the institutional context.

2. Fellowship programmes²⁷

2.1 Source of funding, objectives and major stakeholders

The funding sources of international training programmes and scholarships tend to determine the objectives they serve. Programmes with a humanistic perspective are usually linked to broader development cooperation policies and paid for from development cooperation funds. Academic objectives are usually driven by national ministries of education and they fund the programmes which serve these aims. Scholarship programmes that serve economic and political objectives receive funding support from the budgets of ministries of foreign affairs and economic affairs. Quite a number of programmes are funded from two sources and therefore have two sets of objectives which the international programmes must serve. The combination of academic and humanistic (development cooperation) objectives is quite common. Trying to combine funding sources and different objectives in one programme can cause tension.

²⁷ Main source for this chapter on fellowship programmes: Boeren et al., 2008.

Development cooperation

The fellowship programmes funded by development cooperation aim to strengthen individual and organisational capacities in developing countries. Funding from development cooperation budgets does not imply that a programme only serves the interests of individuals or organisations in the South. After all, the knowledge does not flow exclusively from North to South, but also in the opposite direction. Participants from developing countries pass their regional specific know-how on to students, instructors and researchers at the Northern universities, strengthening the competence of these institutions in regard to developing countries. Moreover, the programmes create space for the establishment of professional and personal networks, facilitating future international cooperation. This is evidently the case in the Belgian and German programmes²⁸, and to some extent in the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan (CSFP).²⁹ DFID funds CSFP while the universities in the United Kingdom provide co-funding. In the Belgian and German programmes three interests play a role: the capacity needs of partners in developing countries, the policies of the funding ministry, and the interests of the education and training institutions in the host countries. These institutions benefit from the schemes in terms of the internationalisation of courses, attracting researchers, establishing collaborations with partner institutions in the South, and gaining access to research domains in developing countries.

In Germany, all five programmes financed by the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and development (BMZ) and administered by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) focus on poverty reduction, socio-economic development, the development of future leaders, individual capacity building and strengthening international academic and scientific relations. Two out of five programmes are also aimed at the organisational strengthening of academic institutes (the programme on university partnerships and the DIES programme). According to DAAD, programmes for developing and transformation countries pursue two central policy goals: (1) to provide initial and continuing education and training for young university teachers, as well as key experts and executives (staff development) and (2) to support the construction of appropriate structures (institution building).

The *SIDA International Training Programme* too has a broader aim than merely training people from the South. It is also meant to communicate information about Swedish society and culture. The *Danida Fellowships Programme* has two windows: fellowships which serve specific capacity needs in bilaterally supported sectors, which are funded from Danida project and programme funds, and centrally-funded fellowships, which are reserved for training activities of a political, strategic or technical or innovative nature, decided upon by Danida.

The *Canadian Francophone Scholarship Program* (CFSP)³⁰ is funded by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and helps to build institutional capacity in Francophone countries and strengthen Canada's ties with these countries. These ties include political, economic, academic and scientific relations. Under the current structure, CFSP contributed to the development of leaders although it was not an explicit objective.

The *Netherlands Fellowship Programmes* (NFP)³¹ are designed to be single-purpose programmes: i.e. they are to serve manpower needs in developing countries. The Danida Fellowship Programme is the only programme which explicitly links its fellowships in full or in part to sector programmes in countries with whom Denmark has bilateral cooperation agreements. Fellowships can only be granted to local counterparts or candidates affiliated with Danish-funded programmes/projects. The other programmes do not have this direct relationship with other development schemes or programmes.

Education

The *Quota Scheme*³² in Norway is financed by the Norwegian Ministry of Education and enables Norwegian universities to attract international students and establish international courses and cooperation with institutions abroad.

²⁸ [Fellowships and Scholarships of the German Academic Exchange Service \(DAAD\)](#), Germany; [Study and training grants for students from developing countries](#), Belgium.

²⁹ CSFP: <http://www.csfp-online.org/>

³⁰ CFSP: <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/acdi-cida/ACDI-CIDA.nsf/eng/ANN-93094423-J5A>

³¹ NFP: <http://www.nuffic.nl/nfp>

³² Quota Scheme: <http://www.siu.no/eng/Front-Page/Programme-information/Development-cooperation/Quota-Scheme>

In Finland academic objectives prevail. Fellowships provided by the Centre for International Mobility (*CIMO Fellowship Programme - CFP*)³³ are to enhance human capacity in all participating countries through interaction and mobility. The aim is also to generate and disseminate knowledge and to create sustainable partnerships between higher education institutions in donor and partner countries, with a special focus on the enhancement of higher education in partner countries.

The programmes in Sweden have a combination of political and academic objectives. The objective of the *Linnaeus-Palme programme (LP)*³⁴ is to strengthen cooperation between institutions of higher education in Sweden and developing countries, thereby increasing and deepening global contacts in the world of higher education, through an exchange programme for teachers and students at undergraduate and master's level of higher education. The overall goal of the programme is to increase knowledge and understanding about developing countries in Sweden and knowledge and understanding of Sweden in these countries.

The *Australian Endeavour Programme (EP)*³⁵, which is funded by the Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST), aims to strengthen education linkages, skills and knowledge throughout the Asia-Pacific region, while showcasing Australia's excellence in education, science and training.

Foreign affairs

The British *Chevening Programme*³⁶ and the *Canadian Awards* programmes are fully funded by the Foreign (and Commonwealth) Office of their respective countries. The Chevening programme explicitly promotes the UK's long-term political, economic and commercial interests. It should also increase knowledge of and respect for British institutions and values. In addition, the programme should enrich developing countries' resources of skilled professional people, and, generally, contribute to an improvement in the quality of life worldwide and develop a strong international community. The award scheme of Canada stipulates that the study programmes of the candidates must focus on a Canadian subject or include significant Canadian content.

Political and cultural objectives dominate the French scholarships (French Government Scholarship Programme, Eiffel Merit Scholarships and Major Merit Scholarships); their aim is to create a Francophone and Francophile network for the partnerships of tomorrow by forging very many and diverse ties during students' stay in France³⁷.

The programmes funded by the Australian Aid Agency aim to strengthen human resource capacity in partner countries to contribute to long-term development needs and promote greater stability within the Asia-Pacific region (ADS); to develop leadership, build partnerships and links, and address priority issues in the Asia-Pacific region (ALA)³⁸.

2.2 Programme modalities

The Belgian and Irish programmes have a restricted range of modalities for study and training, i.e. fellowships for diploma and master's degree courses. In addition the Sida programme is restricted as it only offers fellowships for three to eight week training courses.

The other programmes offer greater flexibility and more opportunities. Such flexibility comes in two forms: 1) integrated into the programme set-up, or 2) sub-programmes for different modalities. The British and Quota programmes have in-built flexibility. The CSFP, for example, has five types of scholarships:

- General scholarships – primarily for taught study options or research post-graduate study.
- Academic staff scholarships – for promising junior staff of universities in certain developing countries.

³³ CFP: http://www.studyinfinland.fi/tuition_and_scholarships/cimo_scholarships/cimo_fellowships

³⁴ LP: <http://ki.se/ki/jsp/polopoly.jsp?d=28388&a=43420&l=en>

³⁵ EP: <http://www.deewr.gov.au/International/EndeavourAwards/Pages/Home.aspx>

³⁶ Chevening Programme: <http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/about-us/what-we-do/scholarships/chevening/>

³⁷ The French scholarship programmes are administered by CNOUS (<http://www.cnous.fr>) and EGIDE (<http://www.egide.asso.fr>)

³⁸ Australian Development Awards; <http://www.ausaid.gov.au/scholar/Pages/default.aspx>

- Fellowships – visits up to twelve months for mid-career staff of developing country universities.
- Split-site doctorates – up to one year in the UK, as part of a doctoral degree in certain developing countries.
- Scholarships by distance education.

In the Norwegian Quota scheme fellowships can be granted for bachelor's, master's or PhD degree courses. The Dutch programme presently offers three levels of education: diploma, master's and PhD, as well as fellowships for Refresher Courses. In addition there is the option of organising short tailor-made courses for groups of professionals.

The German, Belgian and Canadian programmes consist of sub-programmes. DAAD has a wide range of fellowship modalities, including:

- Research grants for doctoral degree candidates and young academics and scientists.
- Sandwich research grants for doctoral degree candidates and young academics and scientists.
- Practical traineeship for foreign students of natural and technical sciences, agriculture and forestry.
- Study visits to Germany for groups of foreign students.
- In-country/in-region postgraduate scholarships for university staff development.
- Postgraduate degree courses with relevance to developing countries programme (35 postgraduate study programmes) scholarship quotas are made available – upon application – to German universities offering such courses.
- Re-invitation programme for former scholarship holders.
- Country-related scholarships for young academics and scientists from advanced developing countries for young engineers (nine countries).

This wide range is further complemented with sub-programmes which enable German academics to lecture at universities in developing countries, the bilateral exchange of academics (research or study visits), and inter-university partnerships for a period of four years.

The Belgian programme too offers support to visiting lecturers. In addition, it enables a small number of Belgian students to conduct research visits to developing countries and provides small research grants to candidates who have completed their PhD study in Belgium. With this grant they can continue to do research when they return to their home country. However, these modalities are not incorporated in the fellowship programme but rather are included in a programme which funds research cooperation initiatives (VLIR Own Initiatives Programme).

Until 2008, the Dutch NFPs consisted of six modalities: apart from the fellowships for diploma, master's, PhD and refresher courses already referred to, the programme also funds tailor-made training courses (maximum duration of twelve months) and Multi-Year Agreements (a package of fellowships for the staff of one organisation). When the Dutch programmes were replaced by new successors in 2009, the last two modalities in the NFPs were removed. The in-built flexibility in the new NICHE was expected to take care of staff training for selected organisations. However, at the strong request of Dutch embassies and organisations in the South as well as in the Netherlands, in 2012 tailor-made training was re-introduced as an NFP modality.

If scholarships are expected to contribute to sustainable organisational strengthening in the South, two conditions should be met: a) the scholarships should meet the capacity needs of the organisation it wants to strengthen, and b) the support should be broader and longer term than the individual scholarship. In other words, the programme should combine demand drivenness with longer term organisational support. The Multi-Year Agreements of the Dutch NFP and the Norwegian *NOMA Programme* (see below) have adopted this approach. An alternative arrangement designed to achieve impact at the level of organisations in developing countries was stated above: a combination of scholarship opportunities and project support. In practice these programmes are not that easy to combine because of different programme cycles and selection methods. However, two recent programmes make an attempt in this direction: both the Austrian *APPEAR programme* and the *Danish Development Research Programme* link the provision of PhD fellowships to larger research

programmes funded by the programme. PhD degrees for researchers from partner countries are only eligible for support if they are part of a larger strategic project and are attached to one of the partner institutions.

After the external evaluation of the Norad Fellowship Programme in 2004/5, NORAD decided to replace the programme with a new programme called *Norad's Programme for Master Studies* (NOMA), which meant a considerable break with its predecessor. While the Norad Fellowship Programme provided candidates from developing countries the opportunity to follow education programmes in Norway, NOMA is a programme that provides financial support for developing and running master's degree programmes in the South through collaboration between local and Norwegian Higher Education Institutions. The programme provides fellowships to candidates who plan to pursue these new master's programmes. The aim of this approach is to achieve, with a longer term perspective, sustainable capacity at institutions in the South to provide the national workforce with adequate qualifications within selected academic fields of study and to stimulate South-South-North cooperation by supporting the development of regional Master programmes.

The external review of the programme in 2009 made clear that the Norwegian institutions are unhappy with the programme. The returns in academic terms on their investments in time and energy apparently are too low. The review team recommended integrating the NUFU and NOMA programmes. The integrated successor programme is called NORHED (see above).

In 2009, AUCC signed an agreement with the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) for the management of the *Canada-Africa Research Exchange Grants programme* (CAREG)³⁹. As part of the two-year pilot programme, IDRC aimed to fund seven to eight grants worth a maximum of USD 40,000 each to support short-term exchanges between Canadian and African universities and research institutes that address IDRC research themes. As well as joint research activities, the programme also provides some support to activities aimed at improving student training at the graduate level. The anticipated medium-term outcomes/results of the programme are as follows:

- Strengthened interaction and collaboration between Canadian and African researchers (as indicated by the development and consolidation of research partnerships facilitated as a result of the programme);
- Strengthened research and training collaboration on development priorities of mutual interest to partner institutions and IDRC (as determined by the focus of the research and training collaboration);
- Increased mutual familiarity with African and Canadian research and training systems as well as funding mechanisms (as indicated by the qualitative reports of programme participants);
- Increased corporate knowledge on the part of IDRC and AUCC on the impact and lessons learned in order to create and enhance a research dialogue.

In 2010 the *International Fellowship Programme* (IFP)⁴⁰ of the Ford Foundation came to an end after operating for ten years. It was a unique programme which provided opportunities to candidates from social groups and communities who lacked systematic access to higher education but had the potential to become leaders in their respective fields, furthering development in their own countries and helping to achieve greater economic and social justice worldwide. After a careful selection process, the candidates were placed at universities around the world, based on their needs and interests.

2.3 Eligible countries

The objectives of the programmes influence the countries that are eligible for making use of the opportunities. While academic objectives call for an almost unrestricted number of eligible countries, political and economic objectives favour a focus on certain regions or certain allies. Developmental objectives lead to a selection of countries on the basis of development indicators. Although many countries in the world are poor and underdeveloped and, therefore, potentially eligible development donors increasingly tend to restrict the number of eligible countries. This is caused by the emphasis put on achieving tangible results and increasing impact through concentration. In addition the desire to make a difference with scholarships in terms of institutional capacity building favours the

³⁹ CAREG: <http://www.aucc.ca/programs-services/international-programs/canada-africa-research-exchanges/>

⁴⁰ IFP: <http://www.fordfp.net/>

concentration of scholarship opportunities. The number of eligible countries from which candidates can apply varies from programme to programme. The Danish, Belgian, Irish and Canadian programmes restrict eligibility to a small number of countries. In the case of the Danish and Belgian programmes these are the bilateral assistance or programme countries. In the Sida programme priority is given to twenty cooperation countries but participation is open to more than 100 selected low and middle-income countries where Sida provides programmes. The Dutch, Norwegian Quota and British programmes are open to candidates from a considerable number of countries. For the British and Quota programmes this is easy to understand because of the objectives of the programmes. In the Dutch programmes one would have expected a smaller number of eligible countries than the current 60.

2.4 Target group and selection criteria

Most fellowships focus on professionals and/or people with some years of work experience. They may be staff members of governments, NGOs or education or research organisations. In order to encourage training to benefit the organisations in developing countries, the programmes require that employers authorise the application of the candidate and declare that they will retain the candidate in the organisation upon his or her return.

The Belgian programme has an age limit of 35 years for candidates, and the British *Chevening Programme* does not accept candidates above the age of 38. In the Danida programme age limits may be fixed locally for short-term training courses. The guidelines of the programmes stipulate that the candidates must return to their country and place of work after they finish their study or course. The students in the Quota Scheme receive a student loan equivalent to what Norwegian students are entitled to. When they leave Norway after completing their studies, the loan to foreign Quota students is written off as a grant.

All programmes have a set of eligibility and selection criteria for individual candidates. The eligibility and selection criteria for applicants are determined by the programme objectives and planned outcomes. Academic qualification is the most commonly used selection criterion, and financial background the least common. However, for each individual programme the order may differ. For example, for the *IFP* and the *scholarship programmes of the World Bank Institute (WBI)*⁴¹ programmes the applicants' financial background is an important selection criterion. Many funders also try to promote the participation of women and people from disadvantaged groups. Depending on the dominant objective, employment status and employer support may also be a decisive criterion. This is usually the case in programmes with a strong development objective.

In vocational training programmes, professional experience is a more important criterion. The *Postgraduate Courses for Professionals with Relevance to Developing Countries (AST)*⁴² in Germany is a vocationally related programme and directed at young professionals from developing and transition countries that have completed a first academic degree with honours. They should be no more than 36 years of age, have at least two years of professional experience in business, management or civil service. What all participants have in common, regardless of their individual career ambitions, is the professional potential for becoming disseminators of education and knowledge in their countries of origin. In accordance with the admission requirements referred to above, the first and foremost criterion for the selection of future scholarship recipients is excellence.

In programmes that have strong development objectives poverty reduction is an overriding concern. However this is not always made explicit in the programme selection criteria. *IFP* is probably the most explicit programme in this respect as it recruits its scholarship students from poor backgrounds. *IFP* uses the following indicators to determine the background of a candidate: parents' occupation; region; race; and school. In addition information is gathered about the family's income. Some of the other programmes also claim to make efforts to reach the economically most deserving candidates, and to contribute to poverty reduction. In Germany applicants from parental homes with weaker educational backgrounds and fewer financial resources are said to have precedence over potential self-paying students. The DAAD selection procedure apparently also encourages the emancipation and participation of social groups with weaker educational backgrounds. Approximately 30% of the scholarship holders come from parental homes with little or no cultural capital, where parents only

⁴¹ WBI Scholarship Programs: <http://wbi.worldbank.org/wbi/scholarships>

⁴² AST: http://www.daad.de/entwicklung/studierende_und_alumni/bildung_postgradual/ast/08492.en.html

have a basic school education. The selected courses of the programme are designed to meet the needs of the partner countries. The contents of the curricula begin where specialisations at universities and transition countries are still largely lacking. This can also be considered to be a contribution to poverty reduction.

The programme administrators and implementers have more to report about their policies for increasing the number of female participants in the scholarship programmes. This does not come as a surprise as the gender criterion is easy to define and quantify. Some programmes, like the Dutch *NFP*, have set a mark of 50% for female participation. The institutes should keep this in mind when selecting candidates.

In the Canadian *CFSP* the countries need to nominate the same number of female and male candidates. The final selection by the Committee should also be gender balanced. In many programmes gender balance is a goal or a policy rather than a selection criterion. In Norway, gender is defined as a central criterion in all programmes. The British Council's operations are guided by an equal opportunities and diversity policy. CSC-UK wishes to see that all programmes have an even gender balance, and uses every opportunity to advertise the awards to encourage female applications, on the one hand, and female selection on the other, where partners in the UK or overseas help with recruitment. In addition, gender parity in the programme is a goal of the IFP, but not a selection criterion. Nevertheless, there is parity while 40% of the applicants are female.

2.5 Training location, effectiveness and impact

In the majority of the scholarship programmes, scholarships are tied to education or training opportunities in the donor country. This is logical for programmes with a dominant political or economic perspective. It is not necessarily logical for development-oriented programmes. Nevertheless, most, if not all of the scholarships in development-oriented programmes are also tied to training locations in the donor country. Danida and DAAD are more flexible in this respect. In the Norwegian *NOMA programme* the training location is in the South but involves Norwegian partners. For international organisations and foundations like the World Bank and the Ford Foundation the training location is not linked to national interests. The training location matters as it is believed that training nearer the student's home base will increase access to training opportunities, enhance the relevance of training, reduce the risks of brain drain, and strengthen local and regional training capacities. Sandwich PhDs, joint and double degree programmes, and regional training courses are ways of bringing education and training closer to the students in developing countries and strengthening teaching and training capacity in the South. But there is a downside to training exclusively in the South. People do not get access to high-level and specialised forms of training (including the accompanying equipment and software), are not exposed to enriching study and living experiences in a developed country, do not get to the chance to broaden their academic and personal horizons, or establish relevant international networks.

The institutes in the North tend to have a positive attitude towards collaborations with Southern partners in organising education and training because it broadens their academic and scientific networks, opens up possibilities for interesting partnerships, and can be expected to attract more students to their own institutes. However, the financial implications of these arrangements are difficult to oversee at the start of a venture and may turn out to be negative for the Northern institutes. The accreditation issue is also problematic, as well as the administration of jointly conducted programmes. The experience with joint degree courses in the programmes included in this study is limited. It is certainly not yet standard practice. For most scholarship programmes, supporting joint degree programmes is (still) beyond their mandate. Joint degree programmes create opportunities for combining strengths, opening new markets, the exchange of staff and students, better access to research data and research grounds. This approach is most encouraging both from a professional quality perspective, as well as from the perspective of impacts (developmental and academic), relevance, effectiveness and cost-efficiency. The only drawback could be the financial compensation for the Northern partner, which could work out much lower compared with the tuition fees and fellowship revenues obtained for a regular course in the North. Donors do encourage the setting up of sustainable degree programmes in developing countries, but these initiatives usually take place within the framework of academic cooperation projects. The Norwegian *NOMA programme* is the only scholarship programme among the ones studied that aims to set up sustainable master's degree programmes in the South, albeit by providing Norwegian teaching staff.

Distance education is hardly used as a modality of training within scholarship programmes. Distance education has the reputation of high drop-out rates, long study periods and quality control problems. However, the experience which CSC-UK has gathered so far with its distance education scholarships seems to indicate that distance education is a feasible modality if linked to a partnership model of education providers and for study programmes that do not require access to complex teaching or research infrastructures. In very few scholarship programmes, the link with bilateral aid programmes at country level is explicit and direct. This is definitely the case in the Danida Fellowship Programme. The fellowships are demand driven, and directly linked to bilateral aid programmes and projects. Training takes place in Denmark if relevant opportunities are available, otherwise training locations are found elsewhere. In most countries the development scholarships are meant to be complementary to the bilateral aid policies. But in practice synergy and complementarities are not easy to achieve. The programmes differ in specific objectives, in eligibility criteria, in programme cycles, in programme management structures, responsibilities and systems.

2.6 Relevance of training

Different viewpoints can be distinguished in determining the relevance of the education or training for candidates from developing countries. These viewpoints relate to the supply or demand orientation of the programmes. In supply-oriented programmes, candidates select from the regular training courses those that are relevant to their own use. Programmes with a predominantly political or economic orientation are usually supply driven. There are no restrictions to the courses that can be followed.

On the demand side, scholarship programmes provide scholarships to existing education programmes, of which the content is relevant or is expected to be relevant in the context of capacity needs in development countries, or to courses that have been specifically designed for candidates from developing countries. Donors and programme administrators have (not yet) established a set of hard criteria to assess the relevance of master's degree programmes for candidates from developing countries. Committees of development experts are usually charged with this responsibility, or programmes are selected by donors because they seem to relate to sectors which have priority in bilateral development assistance policies. On paper at least, donors try to avoid situations where candidates come and study in the North in subject areas for which good alternatives are available in the South. The selection of courses that are of relevance to candidates from developing countries is a difficult exercise. Relevance is highly context related, subjective and time-bound.

All programmes, except a few components of some programmes, are supply-oriented in the sense that candidates from developing countries can choose from training opportunities which are on offer in the host country. The scope of the offer is decided upon by the ministries which fund the programmes. The usual practice is that a limited number of courses or disciplines are earmarked for fellowships. The composition of the courses and disciplines is regularly adjusted on the basis of changing demands or policy priorities.

The British, Canadian and Dutch programmes have few restrictions regarding courses which are eligible for scholarships or fellowships. In the Netherlands, all courses nominated by Dutch institutions for fellowships and meet certain minimum criteria are included in the official NFP catalogue. Whether these courses acquire fellowships depends on the demand for the courses. Fellowships are divided over the courses according to the number of applications for each and every course. This may result in a situation where a course does not acquire any fellowship, or maybe only one or two. The demand-drivenness of this system may be compared to what happens in the market place. Demand determines which training courses 'sell'. This system creates uncertainties particularly for training institutions that depend on fellowships for their survival.

Matching training demand with training supply is the focus of *Danida Project and Programme Financed Fellowships* (and that of the tailor-made training and Multi-Year Agreement components of the Netherlands Fellowship Programmes). The programme takes the training needs of an organisation or programme as a starting point and endeavours to match this need with a training course in Denmark or the region.

The *NOMA programme* and the *IFP* of the Ford Foundation are equally demand-oriented. The master's programmes at higher education institutions in the South which NOMA supports should be in accordance with national needs. The IFP candidates were given the opportunity to undertake advanced studies according to their needs and interests.

A number of programmes offer opportunities for study in the region, fellowships for sandwich courses and joint degree programmes. These elements can be found in the Danish, Dutch, German and CSFP programmes. These elements are aimed at increasing the relevance and effectiveness of training activities as well as enhancing the institutional development of education and training capacity in developing countries.

There are simple, pragmatic processes for deciding on the relevance of the content of courses and training programmes. An example of a simple selection criterion is used in Germany and Denmark: courses are relevant if they support national bilateral aid programmes and projects. Another pragmatic solution would be to select only those courses that: a) directly relate to one or more MDGs, and b) have an international reputation in the relevant field(s). Other types of selection criteria add to the complexity of the assessment process, such as trying to establish whether there is a need for this type of education in country X, Y, Z; whether such training is not yet available in the developing countries; whether the content and delivery will be interesting enough for the 'average' candidate from developing countries, etc.

Selection criteria that need to be taken into consideration in every course relate to the learning environment and whether the receiving institute can provide a stimulating environment for the candidates. Depending on the subject, the applied nature of the course contents is usually also taken into consideration.

2.7 Selection process

All programmes have a set of eligibility and selection criteria for individual candidates. The eligibility and selection criteria for applicants are determined by the programme objectives and planned outcomes. Educational background, position in an organisation and language proficiency are the most important criteria for the selection of scholars. While receiving institutes pay more attention to academic background and language, donors tend to be more interested in the position of the scholar in an organisation or society and the possible impact of training.

Competitive applicant selection processes is common practice in the programmes included in this study. Usually applicants are assessed by the receiving institutes, because of admission criteria that must be met. In some programmes pre-selection is carried out, usually involving committees and/or the local embassies of representative offices in the applicants' home countries. In a number of programmes the selection is performed in various steps, involving committees in home countries and the donor country.

There seems to be no relation between the development objectives of a programme and the selection process. One may expect that pre-selection in the applicant's home country will better ensure that the application is genuine, and relevant in relation to local capacity needs and demands. When selection is performed by institutes in the donor country without pre-selection in the applicant's home country, the interests of the academic institutes in the North tend to prevail over those of the developing countries. In some programmes this is counterbalanced by allocating donor embassies an advisory role in the selection process.

In most programmes applicants are assessed by the receiving institution. In some programmes pre-selection is carried out, usually involving committees and/or the local embassies or representative offices in the applicant's home country. In a number of programmes the selection is performed in various steps, involving committees in home countries and the donor country. In the Australian *ADS programme*, the Australian Diplomatic Mission (Post) performs the initial screening of applicants in the applicant's home country. The institutions in Australia assess the applications on the basis of merit. After the in-country selection of an applicant, the Post seeks placement at an institution by entering the placement details into Scholarship Information Management On Line (SIMON), including any relevant details of country-specific conditions set by the partner government. The institution is notified by email that an outstanding 'Request for Placement' (RFP) is in SIMON awaiting processing. Once the RFP has been generated in SIMON, the Post must forward a hard copy of the applicant's fully completed ADS application form to the institution. Only one RFP per applicant is forwarded to an institution at any one time. On receipt of the RFP, institutions will assess all ADS applications on the basis of merit.

In the Canadian *CFSP programme* the selection process is carried out in two phases: 1. countries send candidates to the CFSP (in Canada) selected through a competitive process; and 2) an independent board comprised of Canadian academics makes the final selection (competitive process as well). In the 37 countries, committees perform the pre-selection of candidates, for example by using a selection grid provided by CIDA. The pre-selection committee consists of representatives of the Canadian embassy and relevant ministries in the country. Each country can nominate fourteen candidates, ten for university studies and four for vocational training. The nominations should be gender balanced (seven-seven). The Selection committee in Canada makes the final decision, CIDA does not interfere.

Participants for Danida's cross-sectoral courses are selected from candidates nominated by the Danida programmes. Selection is carried out by the Danida Fellowship Centre and the place of study. The criterion is to achieve a homogeneous group with the same level of responsibility in their home working station. Participants for tailor-made courses are selected solely by the Danida programmes. PhD students are selected by Danida research project personnel, often from a Danish university.

In Germany selection processes depend on the individual programme (DAAD currently runs approximately 300 different programmes at this time). Within the *AST Programme* a selection committee decides which postgraduate courses will be included in the programme. It assesses the courses conceptually and on the basis of content and evaluates their relevance to development policy. The committee is made up of university instructors from the respective departments, experts of international higher education policy and capacity building, and BMZ representatives. There are no specific criteria, only some general ones: the programme components should be relevant for developing countries in terms of specific themes (water, spatial planning, etc.), in terms of regional orientation - focus on tropical and subtropical regions.

In the Norwegian *NOMA programme* the institutions assess the applications. A selection board appointed by the programme institutions performs the final selection. In the *Quota Scheme*, individual applications are screened by the central admission office and assessed by the study programme admission officers. The central office performs quality assurance on documentation (diplomas, etc.).

In the Swedish programmes identification and selection is carried out by the Southern partner/sending organisation. In the Karolinska International Research and Training (KIRT) post-graduate PhD programmes, planning visits are made. The research fields and candidates are first selected by the partner country. Subsequently, matching supervisors are identified at Karolinska Institute.

For the *Commonwealth Scholarship Programmes*, the process varies by programme. In most cases local agents (governments, universities, trusts, and foundations) carry out recruitment and act as a first sift. Nominated candidates are pooled and judged by independent advisers in the UK prior to selection by CSC Committees who consider this independent advice. Professionals are nominated by UK host organisations. Those on awards paid for in equal measure by UK universities are selected by the universities themselves. For the distance scholarship programme UK universities propose courses for CSC support. The universities then select students for courses approved by CSC.

In the *IFP* all selections involve peer review and multiple stages. Although the specific configurations differ, in all *IFP* countries staff from partner organisations are responsible for the outreach, recruitment, and screening of applications for completeness and eligibility. Outside specialists examine applications from disciplinary and regional perspectives and shortlist selected candidates. In most cases national and regional selection committees interview the shortlisted candidates and recommend finalists for each country and region. The selection committees comprise independent local and international development experts, academics, and supporters from each country. They serve up to three-year terms and are regularly rotated. No member of the Ford Foundation is involved in the selection process. As a final step, the IFP Secretariat in New York reviews data on all recommended finalists and approves the final endorsement of each fellow.

In Belgium, the universities evaluate candidate qualifications. The VLIR office and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs perform the final selection together.

All development assistance donors and programme administrators are concerned about the return of scholars to their home countries. They have developed an elaborate set of 'incentives' and

'conditions' to encourage the scholars to return. Candidate motivation and supporting letters from employers are important inputs in the selection process. The most effective measures seem to be the selection of candidates according to employment status and age. In programmes which provide scholarships to mid-career professionals almost all candidates return home. Not only do they have a job, but they usually also have a family to return to.

2.8 Nomination of candidates

The usual nomination procedure for the programmes is that candidates apply individually with approval from their employer or are nominated by their organisation or institution.

In the *Danida Fellowship Programme*, the Programme and Project-Financed Fellowships are integrated into Danida's sector programmes and projects, NGO projects and other activities financed by Danida. The candidates are identified and nominated by organisations involved in Danida projects and programmes.

In the tailor-made training programme of the *Netherlands Fellowship Programmes* candidates for the group training course are nominated by the organisation that has requested the training.

2.9 Administration

Only one of the listed programmes is administered by a government agency; the Sida International Training Programme. The Commonwealth Scholarship Commission, which administers the CSFP, and the British Council are non-departmental public bodies.

The programmes in Norway, Belgium, Germany, Canada and Austria are managed by branch organisations of the higher education sector. The *Quota Scheme* was administered by the Ministry of Education but administration was transferred to the Norwegian Centre of International Cooperation in Higher Education (SIU) on 1 January 2005. SIU is also charged with the daily administration of the *NOMA Programme*.

The programmes in Denmark, the Netherlands and Ireland are administered by an intermediary organisation. Nuffic was formerly a branch organisation but cut its formal links with the Dutch higher education institutions when it applied for the administration of the new Dutch international education programmes in 2002. One of the eligibility criteria for the administration of the new programmes was formal independence from higher education institutions.

2.10 Follow-up support to alumni

Follow-up support for candidates who have completed their course of study can be integrated in, or linked to the study programme which the candidates pursue, or can consist of opportunities and services rendered to alumni in general. Three measures are linked to the courses and are meant to increase the impact of the study or training. They are: a) back home action plans/assignments; b) development of skills enabling transfer of the acquired knowledge and skills to others; and c) small research funds for those who completed a PhD. The more general support measures relate to various alumni activities and the organisation of electronic platforms. Few of the programmes include concrete measures or approaches to support candidates in the application of their newly acquired knowledge and skills.

There is quite a big difference between the programmes in terms of organising alumni activities. Although most donors and administrators agree on the importance of such activities, quite a few programmes do not undertake any activities due to limited financial resources and limited available human resources. Very active and successful alumni activities are carried out by BMZ and DAAD based on a clear vision and with the provision of the necessary budgetary allocations. The WBI is also an active player, focusing on the usefulness of the alumni network for evaluation and monitoring purposes. In recent years the Netherlands has also developed a policy framework and provided the necessary funds for a broad-based alumni platform.

In programmes with other than academic objectives, it seems logical that the major funder shoulders the responsibility. The responsibility for implementation can be delegated to the programme administrator or the institutes. In Germany, the Netherlands and the World Bank programmes, the administering organisation takes the lead in setting up and organising alumni activities.

2.11 Challenges facing fellowship programmes

An analysis of the evaluation studies of fellowship programmes reveals five major challenges⁴³:

1. Better integration of fellowship programmes in broader policy frameworks, e.g. foreign relations, development cooperation and the internationalisation of higher education.
2. Matching training needs with training supply relevant to developing countries, and which supports capacity development in developing countries.
3. Enhancing the effectiveness of fellowship programmes.
4. Demonstrating the impact of fellowship programmes.
5. Effective linking of fellowship opportunities with other forms of capacity development and organisational strengthening.

1. Integration

The integration of a fellowship programme in broader policy frameworks is easier to achieve in single-purpose programmes where the customers are clearly defined. Multi-purpose programmes serve the interests of various ministries and political constituencies. In single-purpose programmes, integration into a broader policy framework is easier to achieve because a) there are no conflicting or competing interests of various parties which need to be accommodated, b) the owner and customer(s) of the programme can easily be identified, c) it is clear who should pay for the output of the programmes, and d) the outcomes are directly related to the purpose of the programme. An example of a programme where a good integration into a broader policy framework seems to have been achieved is the Danish Fellowship Programme. The programme is not a single-purpose programme in the true sense. It actually serves two purposes, but they are addressed in two separate programme components. Central Danida funds are used for fellowships for those courses which Danida finds important from a political, strategic, technical or innovative perspective. Danida-funded projects and programmes in developing countries pay for the fellowships which serve specific capacity needs in bilaterally supported sectors.

Although single-purpose programmes have the advantage of a clearer purpose-inputs-outcomes relationship, this does not guarantee better results. Multi-purpose programmes may be equally effective despite the fact that interests need to be balanced and programme management is more complicated. The interests of the participating parties may add value and dynamism to the training opportunities that are offered. It also provides fertile soil for linking fellowships with other forms of capacity building and with collaborative research programmes.

2. Matching

Most programmes consist of fellowships that enable courses to be pursued in the donor country. The courses are developed in the North from a Northern perspective. For funding agencies that see fellowships as a vehicle for promoting the institutions at home this is not regarded as a problem. However, donors who fund fellowships for development purposes expect that training courses respond to training needs in developing countries. This applies to the relevance of course content and the training approach. There are several ways to enhance the demand-drivenness of education and training. In programmes the following practices can be found:

- The training needs of bilateral sectors and programmes form the basis for identifying specific training needs. Training opportunities in the region or in the North are identified to match the training need (*Danida Fellowship Programme*).
- The specific training needs of an organisation form the basis of tailor-made training courses. A training provider is identified to conduct the training in the region or in the North (*Netherlands Fellowship Programmes*).
- The training needs of an organisation form the basis for a multi-annual agreement in which the necessary fellowships and training opportunities are provided over a period of time (former *Netherlands Fellowship Programmes*).

⁴³ Boeren, 2005b

- Fellowships are provided for studies at institutions in the region (the DAAD programmes, *Danida Fellowship Programme* and the *NOMA programme*).
- Fellowships are provided for joint-degree programmes conducted at Southern institutions in collaboration with a Northern partner.

There is no doubt that training in the region and joint-degree programmes will claim a larger share of the available fellowships in the years to come. There are several reasons for this. Fellowships in the region are usually cheaper than those in the North, so more people can benefit from the available fellowship funds. Not all people have a burning desire to study in the North. Various circumstances make people prefer to pursue a study or training programme in the region. Providing fellowships for study in the region strengthens the position and capacity of local education and training institutions. These are convincing arguments for donors as well as stakeholders in developing countries.

Joint-degree programmes are interesting for the institutions in developing countries and for the institutions in the North. They create opportunities for combining strengths, opening new markets, of staff and student exchanges and better access to research data and research grounds. Joint-degree programmes in the South seem to incorporate qualities that appeal to stakeholders in the South and funding agencies as well as Northern academicians. This approach is most encouraging both from a professional quality perspective, and from the perspective of impacts (developmental and academic), relevance, effectiveness and cost-efficiency. The only drawback could be the financial compensation for the Northern partner which could work out much lower compared to the tuition fees and fellowship revenues obtained for a regular course in the North.

3. Effectiveness

Programme evaluations indicate that an increase in the effectiveness of fellowship programmes is likely to take place if one or more of the following conditions are fulfilled:

- Individuals are selected on the basis of their capacities and potential to play a role as an agent for change in their profession, organisation or society. This is an important selection criterion in the DAAD and IFP fellowship programmes. DAAD believes that effectiveness is achieved through investment in and prolonged support for talented people. The tracer study of the fellows who had participated in degree courses relevant to developing countries revealed substantial career improvements for the majority of respondents.
- If the aim is to strengthen the functioning of organisations, then a critical mass of staff members needs to be trained which can bring about changes/innovations in an institute/organisation. A critical mass can have any size and composition depending on the organisational context. The importance of the critical mass is raised in the *Netherlands Fellowships Programme* evaluation, and supported with evidence from the *Danida Fellowships Programme* and the Tanzania field trip of the *Norad Fellowship Programme*⁴⁴ evaluation⁴⁵.
- Training for institutional strengthening is based on the training needs assessments and manpower development plans of the organisations. It is conceived as a 'training project' and lasts several years. Employers are involved in planning and monitoring the training activities.
- Training opportunities are flexible in terms of level, duration and location in order to cater for the varied and changing training needs of organisations. Training opportunities cover the entire spectrum, from academic education to short-term vocational training, in the North as well as in the region.
- The relevance and impact of education and training is enhanced by implementing (joint) education and training courses in the recipient region or countries concerned.

Approaches which aim to fulfil conditions b), c) and d) had been incorporated into the former *Netherlands Fellowship Programmes*. As already stated, the multi-annual agreements offered a longer-term perspective for training support to an organisation on the basis of an analysis of its manpower training needs. The programmes also offered a variety of training modalities from PhD studies to tailor-made training courses. Tailor-made training could be organised in the Netherlands or in the region. Refresher courses for former students and their colleagues are organised in the region.

⁴⁴ Predecessor of the NOMA programme.

⁴⁵ Stein Hansen c.s. (2005)

The German, Danish and German programmes also offer opportunities in the region, as stated earlier. Fellowships funded by the Danida project and programme are anchored in locally identified training needs.

4. Impact measurement

None of the programmes have clearly defined specific objectives or indicators for measuring the expected outcomes. Occasionally, tracer studies are conducted. External reviews or evaluations are seldom undertaken. This is quite surprising given the fact that fellowship programmes are the oldest form of development cooperation.

The 2010 Foreign Commonwealth Office programme review suggests making use of a simple dashboard of indicators that will allow all decision-makers to see how effectively a programme is operating. This dashboard could include indicators for the quality of applicants (measured by the Graduate Record Exam, GRE); the quality of scholars (measured by GRE and an interview panel rating); the scholars' educational achievement (based on a standardised rating from the academic supervisor); and the public diplomacy impact in-country (key messages in PR campaigns and the impact on international student recruitment).

The dashboard of indicators for measuring fellowship impact could include indicators relating to the relevance of courses to objectives (ratings from Posts); the suitability of fellows for courses (rating by course leaders); the relevance of courses for fellows (rating by fellows); and the impact on objectives (rating from Posts). The latter indicator could be backed up by a tracking study for each fellowship theme, with a key country or group of countries chosen for more detailed assessment.

Another method is used by the Danida Fellowship Centre (DFC) which conducts annual 'tracer studies'. An interesting element of this approach is that the interviewees are not the former students but those who proposed them for the study, i.e. the officers linked to the Danish bilateral programmes and projects. DFC has opted for this approach because the answers from alumni are usually biased and very positive. It hopes to obtain more realistic assessments from the officers who work with them.

5. Synergy

Synergy between programmes can be achieved at three levels: that of policy, that of administration and that of implementation. It seems that synergy is best accomplished at the implementation level, i.e. by the institutions implementing the programmes, provided they are encouraged to work towards achieving synergy.

Stimulating synergy between programmes at the administrative level is attempted by concentrating the administration of various programmes in the hands of one organisation. This model is deliberately practiced in Norway and the Netherlands. SIU and Nuffic administer the cooperation and fellowship programmes financed by their respective governments. In Norway this model seems to work better than in the Netherlands. The most plausible explanation for this is the different character of the Norwegian and Dutch programmes. The ownership of the Norwegian programmes by the Norwegian institutions is still considerable (but decreasing) and they can influence the identification and selection of cooperation projects in the *NUFU / NORHED programme*, and the selection of courses which are awarded *NOMA* fellowships. In addition, Norwegian institutions acquiring fellowships under the *Quota Scheme* can utilise these fellowships freely for a number of courses of their own choice. This enabled NUFU activities to be creatively combined with *NOMA* fellowships and *Quota* students.

The Dutch programmes do not offer similar opportunities. The cooperation programmes (*NPT/NICHE*) and the *Netherlands Fellowship Programmes* are both driven by demands identified and formulated in developing countries. Dutch institutions play no role in the identification of partners or projects, nor can they use NFP fellowships in a strategic and planned way to promote North-South cooperation. Two factors complicate the realisation of synergy between programmes: a) there is no one-to-one overlap between *NPT/NICHE* and NFP countries, and b) applications for fellowships are individual and are open to every interested person who qualifies.

2.12 Trends

- *Capacity building in relation to socio-economic needs and contexts*

The fellowship programmes having a clear development objective above all endeavour to ensure that education and training are relevant to the development of the candidate's country of origin. The programmes employ different instruments to achieve this: a) nomination and selection criteria and processes, b) assessment of curricula, c) location and duration of training.

Nomination by the employer is quite a universal instrument which is used to ensure that the education or training is relevant to candidates and/or their organisation. Screening by an in-country authority is another instrument and is carried out in two ways: a) screening by the donor embassy or administrative agency, and b) selection by a local selection committee. The committee may consist of local experts, government representatives and donor representatives. Selection by the committees works as a filter; only the best and most relevant applications are forwarded to the institutions.

The relevance of education and training programmes to candidates from developing countries either assessed by the administrative agency or a semi-autonomous committee or otherwise. The first approach is less demanding than the second but may easily result in long lists of eligible courses.

In all of the programmes the receiving education or training institutes are tasked to assess the candidate's academic qualifications.

The sandwich construction of master's and PhD degree courses has been introduced in quite a number of fellowship programmes over the last decade. Training in the region is on the rise, although mainly for short courses. The *NOMA programme* is an innovative master's degree training programme concept.

Few programmes make use of online nomination and selection processes. This process was introduced in the *Netherlands Fellowship Programmes* in 2011.

Occasionally joint and double degree programmes are trialled but numerous obstacles need to be removed before these options become common practice..

Only one of the programmes appears to be successful in using e-learning in its fellowship programme.

- *Organisational strengthening in fellowship programmes*

Donors, programme administrators and training institutes have adopted a variety of measures to ensure that training is relevant to the applicant and that the impact of the training programme extends beyond the applicant's individual interests. Particularly in programmes that seek to contribute to development cooperation and poverty reduction, a clear trend is visible towards linking individual scholarships more closely with the processes of organisational strengthening in developing countries. This is being attempted by the more focused and longer term provision of scholarships to organisations in the South, and by endeavouring to develop training capacity in the South. It is too early as yet to assess whether these approaches have been successful and are sustainable. This trend acknowledges the notion that in development-oriented programmes, capacity building in developing countries should be the ultimate goal of training provided through scholarships, and that such training of individuals should contribute to sustainable training capacity in the South. These programmes should embrace the goal of the South having the ability to cater for its own education and training needs. Obviously, the needs and challenges of the South should be leading in determining the education and training support offered in or by the North.

The question is whether scholarship programmes alone are sufficiently equipped to help achieve these objectives. A broader approach to organisational support seems to be required to develop and sustain local education and training capacities. Scholarships could have far greater impact if these opportunities were to be integrated in, or closely linked to broader institutional/organisational development schemes.

The role and position of Northern education and training institutes in these scholarship programmes are key. They need to be convinced of the need and value of providing international programmes to candidates from developing countries; they need to be willing to make investments and take risks; and they need to be flexible in the face of changing donor priorities and global challenges. However, the real and potential rewards are significant for those who can see them.

- *Linking the provision of fellowships (PhD) to capacity-building projects*

Two recent programmes have endeavoured to create a link between research cooperation projects and the provision of individual PhD fellowships (outside the project) – the Austrian and Danish programmes. This would embed the individual research fellowships in a broader research context and increase the chance of continued research by the PhD holders. Research foundations also seem to be exploring this direction (e.g. WOTRO⁴⁶ in the Netherlands).

⁴⁶ WOTRO Science for Global Development: : http://www.nwo.nl/nwohome.nsf/pages/NWOA_6UB9S8_Eng

REFERENCES

- Boeren, A. (2005a). A matter of interests: perspective on international cooperation in higher education. In: Boeren, A., Holtland, G. (Eds.). (2005). A Changing Landscape. Making support to higher education and research in developing countries more effective. Nuffic: The Hague. Retrieved from <http://www.nuffic.nl/home/news-events/past-events/landscape/Downloads>
- Boeren, A. (2005b). A bird's eye view: lessons from evaluations of international cooperation programmes in higher education, research and manpower development. In: Boeren, A., Holtland, G. (Eds.). (2005). A Changing Landscape. Making support to higher education and research in developing countries more effective. Nuffic: The Hague. Retrieved from <http://www.nuffic.nl/home/news-events/past-events/landscape/Downloads>
- Boeren, A., Maltha, H. (2005c). Background paper and annotated bibliography for Nuffic's international conference 'A Changing Landscape. Making support to higher education and research in developing countries more effective', held in The Hague on 24-25 May 2005. In: Boeren, A., Holtland, G. (Eds.). (2005). A Changing Landscape. Making support to higher education and research in developing countries more effective. Nuffic: The Hague. Retrieved from <http://www.nuffic.nl/home/news-events/past-events/landscape/Downloads>
- Boeren, A. et al. (2006). Sida/SAREC Bilateral Research Cooperation: Lessons Learned. Sida Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit. Sida Evaluation 06/17. Stockholm. Retrieved from http://www.sida.se/shared/jsp/download.jsp?f=Utv06-17_SIDA30352en.pdf&a=25352
- Boeren, A. c.s. (2008). Donor policies and implementation modalities with regard to international postgraduate programmes targeting scholars from developing countries. Final Report. VLIR-UOS. Retrieved from http://www.vliruos.be/downloads/Donor_policies_Nuffic.pdf
- Hansen, S. c.s. (2005). Evaluation of the Norad Fellowship Programme. Nordic Consulting Group AS in association with Nuffic. Norad. Evaluation Report 1/2005. Retrieved from <http://www.norad.no/en/tools-and-publications/publications/publication?key=109531>
- Hydén, G. (2010). Mapping the World of Higher Education and Research Funders: Actors, Models, Mechanisms and Programs. Prepared for Danish Development Research Network and Universities Denmark, October 2010. Retrieved from <http://www.dkuni.dk/Internationalt/~media/Files/Internationalt/BSU/Mapping%20the%20world%20of%20higher%20education%20and%20research%20funders%20DDRN%20og%20DU%20Oct%202010.ashx>