INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS, SOCIAL SCIENCES & EDUCATION

Reliance on Donor Funding for Staff Development Initiatives in Ugandan Public Universities:"*When the hatching machine does the job of hens"*

By

By Maria K. Barifaijo, PhD

Rose B. Namara, PhD

Uganda Management Institute

CITATION: *Barifaijo M. K., & Namara R. B., November (2015*), Reliance on Donor Funding for Staff Development Initiatives in Ugandan Public Universities: "*When the hatching machine does the job of hens"*: *International journal of Social Sciences & Education (IJSSE) Volume 1 (4), 327 -346. ISSN 2105 6008.*

ABSTRACT

The paper discusses the critical role of staff development in terms of training and research; it examines the funding challenges and explores implications of over reliance of donor funding on human capacity in higher education institutions in Uganda. The authors argue that staff development and research are central to the quality of higher education and, a strong motivational strategy for staff working in these institutions, since it is a known fact that career growth leads to upward mobility. The paper discusses how the challenges of insufficient funding has caused serious constraints in the provision of staff development programs in terms of staff training and research, that rendered HEIs helpless in their attempt to retain their key staff which has led to both internal and external brain-drain. Yet, staff development initiatives worldwide, is intended to achieve academic excellence that should stand the test of international comparison, improve quality standards and make these institutions more visible. The paper argues that training and research are core ingredients for achieving sustainable development, institutional profiling, quality of staff and students.Given the critical role of staff development, the paper sought to answer the following questions; (1) What are the current funding challenges facing higher education institutions? (2) How does overreliance on donor funding for staff training affect HEIs? And (3) (What resource mobilization strategies haveHEIs put in place to be able to retain their staff?To answer these questions the Frustration Regress (ERG) by Clayton Aldefer and the Human Capital Flight were adopted. The paper concludes that donor funding greatly builds and boosts human capacity of HEIs. And although donor funding to some extent was responsible for brain-drain, there were other factors such as poor leadership, inequitable compensation, stringent policies, and hostile work environment among others. The paper, hence recommends that HEIs and funding bodies should jointly agree on terms that bind these scholars, institutions should balance internal and external support in funding employee's career growth. Further, the bonding forms should be succinct with overriding sanctions for non compliance. .

Key Words:brain drain**,** capacity building,career growth, donor funding, financing higher education**,** international partnerships, quality, research, retention, staff development, upward mobility.

1.0 Introduction

The paper discusses the importance of staff development in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and explains how donor funding in support of such endeavors plays an important role in enhancing institutional capacity,as it promotes the quality of staff, thereby profiling institutions that benefit from these collaborations. The authors acknowledge that many developing countries, Uganda inclusive, are essentially faced with a dilemma of meeting the rapidly increasing demand for higher education while, at the same time, maintaining the quality of teaching and research against a background of diminishing resources. This dilemma has led many developing countries and institutions alike, to seek external funding through partnerships and collaborations to support their staff development endeavours (Teferra and Knight (2008). It is argued that like many other sectors, most of the developments in the higher education sectors occurred during an era of dwindling government budgets precipitated primarily bythe Structural Adjustment Programs (SAP) imposed by multilateral lending organizationslike the World Bank and IMF(Labi, 2009). In an effort to remain financially solvent, traditionalpublic institutions in developing countries were forced to rely more heavily onstudent fees and tuition as well as the entrepreneurial activities of their staff(Lee and Healy 2006; Abeli 2010). However, despite these efforts to boost funds through SAP, IMF WB etc.., Abeli (2010) found that the quality in the public sector significantly declined during thisera.To counteract this challenge, governments and institutionsdeveloped a number of mechanisms to sustain higher education and also to remain relevant.Specific mechanisms includedneed-based scholarships and fee policies, scholarships for students studying bothdomestically and abroad (Abeli 2010, Lee and Healy 2006), an extra 10% charge payable by students and parents to supplement staff development initiatives, and international collaborations.Other strategies included donor initiatives that focused on institutional capacity building, quality management, access to information and communication technologies, strengthening research, research infrastructure, academic networks, employment-related training programmes and student and staff mobility (Chacha, Abongo, 2007). More recently, with the development of New Public Management, inter-institutional partnerships and public-private-partnership have emerged.

Even with all these initiatives, HEIs have not pulled out to sustain such efforts, and according to Naidoo, (2007), there has been substantial decline in higher education funding to support their human capital and output. As a result, trainings and researcheshave been heavily influenced by donors (Horn, 2009; Naidoo, 2007 and Stella& Gnanam, 2005). Essentially, for a long time, capacities to provide policy guidance for staff development analyses have been squeezed economically by rising student enrollments and declining resource allocations to universities (Horn, 2009). Although staff development has been found to be central to the quality of higher education, world over, its deliveryowes a lot to the general employment framework and conditions of service for HE employees. For this matter, Walenkamp & Boeren, 2007 and Saint, 2008,suggest that staff development as a discrete function should be accorded high attention or should be top priority on HE agenda. Middlehurst and Campbell (2004)advise leaders both national and intuitional as well as independent agencies to encourage and promote staff development initiativesin order to boost quality human capacityin these institutions. Although policies on staff development may be made at national, or institutional levels, there is an emerging trend of granting more autonomy to institutions to focus on how institutional managers should fund their staff development programs (Vincent-Lancrin, 2005). Hence, higher education institutions today, establish linkages with each other in order to strike alliances to be able to compete for staff and funds in terms of exchange programs, research collaboration and training initiatives as well as development projects in order to cope with the global challenges(Saint, 2008; Varghese, 2010; World Bank, 2010).It should be observed therefore that financial sustainability is essential but it cannot be achieved unless HEIs have the necessary autonomy, and appropriate management practices and systems, to make those decisions and act proactively (Saint, 2008). Hence, Saint argues that HEIs do not exist on their own and merely for themselves - they have relations with their broader environment which may involve networks, sectors, legislation and regulations. Therefore, only when these institutions are strongly supported by their governments and exert influence in the broader context will they be able to survive and have an impact in society and beyond.

We are not reinventing the wheel by bringing up the debate on donor-supported staff development initiatives, which has been exhaustively discussed in the scholarly arena. However, these debates have basically concentrated on the benefits, how to apply for SD, how to write proposals for funding and how to source funding. However, only a handful of scholars has analyzed the implication of over reliance on donor funding on these institutions. It should be noted however, that scholars (e.g. Abeli, 2010; Labi, 2009; Miranda, 2008; Mohamedbhai, 2002)have recognizedthe financial burden of higher education provision, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa. We share a similar view especially on theshift of financial task from the state to individual students and parents in development countries. This shift has forced governments to respond to this dilemma in many different ways.Some have appealed to donor agencies for funding, others have entered into partnerships – local and international, while others have introduced an extra fee payable by university students to supplement the staff development fund (Kasozi, 2006). Others, have turned to entrepreneurial endeavors to supplement government's subventions. These strategies have ledmany HEIsto depend on donor funding, since they lackedrational and stable basis for funding their higher education institutions (Vincent-Lancrin, 2005), which had startedto threaten the quality of higher education. It is a fact that these collaborations have permitted long term partnerships (Walenkamp& Boeren, 2007), and we should actually acknowledge that donors have played an important role in developing countries,but what should not be pushed under the carpet is that they have at the same time left these institutions depleted of their core staff through brain-drain (Varghese, 2003).

In fact, Tumuhimbisibwe(2004),explained howboth private and public resources go towards recurrent expenditure, with limited contributions toward research and other capital costs such as physical infrastructure and equipment. He explains how this gap has been filled by philanthropic and bilateral support. The implication therefore is that donor support is largely institution-solicited and commissioned, making these institutions taking the lead to identify donors to support their various activities (Kasozi, 2003). Nonetheless, the stricture in all this is that donor support is task specific, with limited room for flexibility whereby the donations in most cases is attached to preferred disciplines(Bloom, Canning & Chan, 2005).This therefore makes reliance on donor funds for core university activities quite problematic, unreliable and unsustainable since the support is mainly dependent on the interests and policies of the donor agency(Tayebwa, 2004).Aside donor funding, institutions have depended on Private Sector Support to supplement HEIs in various ways and this has led HEIs to adopt internal sharing mechanisms of the privately generated resources. For instance, Kyambogo University, resources from private students on the regular day-programs were centrally utilized while resources from the evening programs allocation was according to the budgetary requirements of the generating unit. Whereas,at Makerere University and Mbarara University of Science and Technology, distribution of resources varied in terms of percentage between the centre and the generating unit designated for the various expenditure categories. And this depended on whether the program was day, evening, external or postgraduate program, and more recently, distance learning programs (Musisi & Muwanga, 2003).

Conceptualization Orientation

There are different types of donors – they may be individuals, organizations or countries. These donors sometimes contribute in kind such as waiving tuition in their country institutions (scholarships) or actual money (finances) or some form of assistance such as research partnerships that bring funds into the country (Varghese, 2009).Donors may sustain the public policy formulation and implementation process with funds and technical assistance. They may also provide international recommendations and guidelines, and have significant influence on implementation through their decisions (Mwega, 2008). Some collaborations are bilateral aid given by the government of a given country directly to another. Others are given to institutions, yet others are individual grants from. This may depend on the partnerships institutions may have or individual aggressiveness. In the Ugandan situation, donor agencies include; France (AFD), Germany (GTZ), Japan (JICA), the Netherlands (Nuffic, NICHE), Spain (AECID), Sweden (SIDA), UK (DFID), United States (USAID), and more recently, Finland, (LMUU). Some are multilateral aidfoundations or loans given from the government of a country to an international agency, which include; World Bank, European Commission, regional (African) development banks (ADB, IADB); or private agencies such as charities that distribute private rather than government/public funds. These include; Carnegie Corporation, Rockefeller Foundation, Ford Foundation, MacArthur Foundation. Others are collaborations that have significantly supported staff development in HEIs which include; inter-institutional that encourages North-South partnerships.More recently however, USAID's Higher Education for Development (HED) program has sponsored partnerships between United States and developing country HEIs (World Bank, 2010).Therefore, whatever form of agency, they have been very instrumental in building human capacities of developing countries worldwide.

Agencies come into play given the significance of staff development endevours. These agencies are not only helpful to the institutions and the individual recipients, but to the nation as a whole (OECD, 2010).No one can refute the fact that staff development is a strong tool to institutional stability and profile. Staff development initiatives have been found to strengthen capacity not only for educational institutions, but other sectors as well. Therefore, staff development enables employees to improve performance in current jobs, prepare for career development, or meet requirements of degree programs related to current performance or planned career development (Palay, 2010). Institutions have often demanded for such training to be discipline-related and directly related to performance requirements of the employee's current assignment. Institutions require those to be trained to pursue programs that respond to organizationalor operational need as defined by the institution or the supervisor (Kapur and Crowley, 2008). This way, institutional capacity can be enhanced in terms of excellence, competitiveness, quality and sustainability.

Capacity building in the context of this paper is used rather consciously and refers to the *process* of developing and strengthening through training and other related means the institution's human resources (Vincent-Lancrin, 2005).Through these deliberate initiatives of staff development, institutions presume to be developing and strengthening human capacity.Yet, as Varghese (2010) put it "once the machine is left to hatch the eggs, the chicks lose touch with the mother". Likewise, institutions can only be sure once they participate in the growth of their staff to enable them remain with the control of those individuals. Once there is such commitment, there are mechanisms put in place to ensure return of those staff and the in culminating retention. Such mechanisms would include memorandum of understanding with the funding body, bonding those going for training, continuous drawing of a salary, attaching sanctions and allowing them to grow in terms of promotions. All these efforts should work towards luring back those employees, and as Degenbol-Martinussen& Engberg-Pedersen (2003) put it, staff retention stands out as one of the most urgent problems of HEIs in African, yet it is through retention that institutions gain a competitive age and augment their profiles. For this matter, Teferra & Knight, (Eds.) (2008), Usher & Medow (2010) and Varghese, 2010), encourage institutions to air tighten their training agreements and collaborations. Scholars such as Wang, 2011; Teferra and Altbach, 2004, have found thatmost higher education institutions invest in long term staff development programs which sometimes turn out to be at risky (Usher & Medow, 2010), because, the more they stay out there, the more they develop ties.

Subsequently, the dependence syndrome on donor funding results into stiff challenges ofstaff retention as those who pursue their studies abroad do not return as they do not develop patriotism for their country and their institutions. Those who return to their countries, look for employment in well paying organizations.It should be made clear that this argument is not to discourage institutions from seeking external funding, because there are numerous benefits in developing staff capacity through donor funding.In support of external funding, Kapur & Crowley; 2008 and Palay; 2010, have reiterated on how institutions have greatly benefitted from donor funding. They however urge these institutions to stop relegating their core function of developing their staff. They pronounce that institutions should instead be assertive and more aggressive to avoid becoming passive players in such collaborations. Hence, scholars such as Degenbol-Martinussen & Engberg-Pedersen; 2003; Didriksson, 2008 and Lewis, 2009; have effortlessly discussed how reliance on donor funding in African has often resulted into brain-drain,which in the end has depleted institutions of their long built capacity. Hence, according to Kapur and Mehta (2008), brain-drain is migration of highly-trained and skilled professionals from their home countries, specifically, to developed countries of the North in search of better economic and professional opportunities. The above almost universal definition of the concept of African of brain drain has always ignored one critical aspect of internal brain drain(Kapur and Mehta, 2008) which is internal migration or domestic movement of highly trained and skilled professionals such as university lecturers and professors, medical doctors, engineers, lawyers etc.. moving from their professional jobs they were originally trained to do to other jobs or occupations unrelated to their original training within the country for economic and non-economic reasons. This includes internal migration of academics from public higher education institutions to private higher educations and internal migration of academics in public universities to other newly established public universities which offers much better remuneration.However, although the authors recognize how internal brain-drain depletes higher education institutions, it was not the object of this discussion.

Theoretical Orientation and Literature Review

The discussion adopted two divergent theories. The ERG theory by Clayton Aldefer, that explains the need for growth and the Human Capital Flight Theorywhich explains how diminishing government funding and overreliance on donor funding has depleted institutions of their most valued resources – the people.Although Alderfer (1964) identified three aspects that or needs that drive human motivation as "existence", "relatedness" and "growth", this paper singled out the last aspect of growth given its relatedness to this discussion. The theory contends that Growth, which is the need for personal development, including creative and meaningful work was very significant in determining the level of satisfaction and subsequent decision to commit to the institution. The theory explains how individuals continuously pursue personal growth and development. The theory has a "frustration-regression" element, meaning that if needs remain unsatisfied at one of the higher levels, the person will become frustrated, and go back to pursuing lower level needs again. Hence, the level of growth induces internal esteem and self actualization which actually compel a person to make creative or productive effects on himself and the environment such as; progressing toward one's ideal self. This includes desires to be creative and productive, and to complete meaningful tasks. It is through this achievement that an individual worker chooses to or not to stay. The theory postulates that the level of growth is the least concrete in that their specific objectives, highly depends on the uniqueness of each person. Hence, according to Kreitner (2005), the theory seems to explain the dynamics of human needs in HEIs reasonably well, because it provides a less rigid explanation of employee needs. The combined processes of satisfaction-progression and frustration-regression also provide a more accurate explanation of why employee needs change over time. Overall, it seems to come closest to explaining why employees regress down (regression) to a lower needs category that has been largely satisfied, by giving up the one that is not forth coming. and give up on the . Therefore, when someone’s needs in a higher category cannot be satisfied, they will certainly regress. If they cannot realize the “Growth Needs” by means of self-enrichment, this person will do anything to satisfy Needs at a lowever. They will fully devote themselves to establishing their relationships with people in their environment (Armstrong, 2006).

On the other hand, the Human Capital Flight Theoryrefers to the emigration of intelligent, well-educated individuals to somewhere for better pay or conditions, causing the place they came from to lose those skilled people, or brains.According to this theory brain-drain is categorized in three broad but related areas. The first category is *Organizational* - The flight of talented, creative, and highly qualified employees from higher education institutions which occurs when employees perceive the direction and leadership of the company to be unstable or stagnant, and thus, unable to keep up with their personal and professional ambitions. The second category is *Geographical*-which explains the flight of highly trained individuals and college graduates from their area of residence to other places, and the third category is *Industrial* which explains the movement of traditionally skilled workers from one sector of an industry to another. For example, higher education institutions and other governments (public sector), have experienced significant generational brain drain, especially after accessing external funding to pursue further education abroad. This brain drain has been further heightened by competition for talent from the private sector and budgetary constraints that have made it increasingly difficult to attract replacements for those who abscond. Although there are other reasons for migration, such as lack of opportunities, political instability or oppression, economic depression, health risks and more that contribute to brain drain, the paper is concerned with staff from HEIs who get donor funding to pursue studies abroad and never return or on return, they abandon their previous employment because their institutions did not make any commitment to their career growth. Hence policy makers need to invest substantially in their staff and bond them so they do not lose patriotism.

Literature Review

Higher education institutions (HEIs), including research carried out in universities, has a crucial role in development (Saint, 2008). It helps generate the human capital needed in key areas and builds a country's capability for self-reliance. Explaining why there were cuts of government budges to higher education, Horn (2009) says that it was partly because donors and recipient governments saw HE as an expensive and inefficient public service, only benefitting the wealthy and privileged and producing too many social science graduates with too few job prospects. Walenkamp & Boeren (2007) too argues that it was because of problems with 'brain drain' which gave institutions in Africa a hard time retaining staff once they have been trained. This has actually reflected a shift in donors' priorities when they turned their attention towards short-term poverty alleviation efforts in food, medical care and emergency response. Donors also argued that many universities in Africa, had become little more than prestige-seeking ivory towers, cut off from the real needs of the world around them, and were deemed unable to contribute to such efforts (Kotecha, 2008 cited in Palay, 2010). According to Saint (2008), and many others in literature, conventional economic measures of returns on educational investment do not accurately reflect the social value added by HE, which includes job creation and enhanced entrepreneurship and mobility (the ability to move across job sectors).

Research on donor funding in terms of international collaborations has been of critical importance in terms of training, staff-student exchange programs and research (Perkinson, 2006) and more recently, innovations and initiatives. Donors have increasingly supported higher education initiatives especially in the developing countries. However, donor funding structures have perpetuated university fragmentation that has many times impeded the integrated, coherent and holistic education development programs. Although sometimes, foreign actors and donors can undermine the role of national and universities authorities in both management and resourcemobilization. Palay (2010) found that actually, donor funding for staff development programs can deplete and erode national capacities if not well planned and managed. The only consolation is that donor funding does not go to mediocre in an institution. But, would you call this a consolation? Losing the "cream" of the company? This is because, as Miranda (2008)argues, eligibility for funding is often for the highly qualified staff, who many times excel in their academic and professional programs. So, what happens when such caliber does not return?Doesn't this erode institutional and national capacity? Underlying these challenges are donors' specific funding arrangements and priorities that place various forms on conditionality on the funding offered. The conditionality tends to shift as the emergency runs its course, with a stronger humanitarian focus at the beginning and development focus later (Mohamedbhai, 2002). As a result therefore, higher education often falls between the cracks, given that education is a long-term investment in the development of human capital, as well as a short-term protection strategy. It at the same time contributes to psychological needs as well as a source of social stability (Lin, 2005). Therefore, although career growth is perceived as the one that will create the difference in one's life, continued budget cuts has paralyzed achievement of this objective. One irony of the situation is that institutional budgets for human resource development are often the first to be cut, just when they are most needed, in times of severe financial difficulty(Kapur & Crowley (2008). In many countries the reduction in funding for state institutions has stagnated the growth and quality of higher education.

What continues to puzzle many (e.g. UNESCO (2010); Van de Walle, 2005; and Varghese, 2003) is the increasing demand by governments around the world for universities to embrace the international agenda and to internationalize their institutions. Even without financial support from these governments, many institutions from developing countrieshave engaged with global partners. We cannot deny the fact that institutions gain access to external funding through internationalization (Didriksson, 2008). This can be through exchange of staff and students, joint degree programs, research collaborations etc… Such endeavors will enable institutions to develop their human capacity, through staff exchange, training of staff and research collaboration. Other than capacity building, these partnerships have also seen many institutions embrace exchange programs of teaching staffing order to strengthen quality. Although governments around the world are increasingly encouraging their universities to embrace the international agenda and to internationalize their institution, they seem to have folded their hands and left the building of capacity to international partners, thereby failing to implement their employment policies (Creed, Perraton, &Waage, 2012; Degenbol -Martinussen& Engberg-Pedersen; 2003; Didriksson, 2008).

Low remuneration and poor working conditions of African professionals have prominently featured as the major push factors influencing brain drain among African professionals. The above researches left out the component of donor funding which is the prime interest of this paper. In attempting to unravel the puzzle in donor funding however, Degenbol-Martinussen& Engberg-Pedersen, (2003) posits negligence on the part of the institutions responsible, but quickly turns around to call it opportunistic syndrome of those who benefit through such funding. Additionally, Agarwal (2006) attacks those who do not return and says these lack commitment for their institutions. Like, Degenbol-Martinussen& Engberg-Pedersen (2003), Varghese (2003) too believes this category of staff is slippery and they only abuse the donor funding that is intended to bring about benefits not only to the institution, but to the country as well.

Methodology

A rich, in-depth qualitative investigation was the most appropriate to address the inquiry because of the complexity, dynamic nature of the implications of donor funding, the scanty empirical research in this particular topic, and the exploratory research questions. Lewis (2000) recommends this approach in this kind of inquiry.Documents were reviewed and analyzed. These included collaboration documents in HEIs, funding proposals, HR Manuals, policies on training, memorandum of understanding, correspondences of the partnering institutions, budgets, modes of accountability, tracking systems, programmes and disciplines involved, levels of participation, reports and activities in those partnerships. For empirical analysis, interviews were conducted with the director of Graduate School, Human Resource Directorates, the International Relations Officer, Heads of Research Units, Researchers, coordinators and beneficiaries.

Findings and Discussions

The first question in this paper sought to establish current funding challenges in higher education in Uganda. Like what literature already suggests, higher education institutions were faced with numerous challenges. Specifically, empirical evidence showed that Uganda was faced with severe financial constraints that demands the government and HEIs to find new sources of finance for higher education. At present virtually all university students, private or government funded are cost sharing.While the international agencies or donor funders can offer low- and middle-income countries partial solutions to help resolve the challenges they face in developing institutional capacity, they need to identify solutions that work and are sustainable in their own countries.

What are the funding challenges in higher education institutions?

Researches (e.g.Varghese, 2010; Vincent-Lancrin, 2005; Walenkamp& Boeren, 2007 and World Bank, 2010). These partnership initiatives are believed to strengthen quality of academic programs, build capacity and strengthen institutional profiling; increase potential for research capacity, and improve the impact of research on policy and practice within diverse contexts. Saint (2008) has found that the dynamism of the diversified workforce and their multiple mandate of Teaching, Research, and Community Service, makes this kind of organization unique. He advises governments to be vigilant in order to attract superior staff (internal and external), motivate them and be able to retain them. However, information available indicates that majority of staff who have trained outside Uganda made their own efforts and initiatives to access scholarships. Evidence also shows that although quality, excellence and succession planning are critical to any HEI, inadequate funding continues to affect the operations of the human resource practitioners in these institutions. Institutions revealed that the best way they have managed is through tuition waiver. Scholars such as Palay, 2010 and Saint, 2008, for example have found that whereas this remedy has enabled progression of graduate scholars, it has seriously affected compensation of staff. Whereas, it might be easier to generate income through entrepreneurial venture in vocational institutions, it is quite difficult in universities. However, a respondent that was thought to have vast experience in entrepreneurial ventures, sounded resigned in his response*"…there are numerous limitations… we have limited space and inadequate funds, so we cannot put up a hotel or a restaurant for our students doing hotel management, catering and many others… because such activities would generate income.."*

It is premised that each of the three arms of HEIs could actually be a source of funding. *"..how can the institution demand workload of 52hours a month and you afford to write funding or even research proposals, let alone conducting research itself.. we can only carry out consultancy work where the institutions takes some percentage and the individual also gets something…"*lamented one of the respondents. This means therefore that neither research initiatives nor consultancy work can bring in meaningful funding to sustain the institution.We all acknowledge that donation have salvaged many developing countries such that, even World Bank mission statementaffirm that donations are used to fight poverty with passion and professionalism for lasting results and to help people help themselves and their environment by providing resources, sharing knowledge, building capacity and forging partnerships in the public and private sectors"(World Bank 2010). Basically, the basis for most donor involvement in developing countries is to improve livelihood through various interventions (JICA 2009). These interventions are directed through sectors such as education, agriculture and health. Hence, over the years, donors have positioned themselves variedly, mainly through involvement in the national policy processes. By exploring how they have done this, we may be able to understand the changes in their role and contribution to the higher education sector. Through the years, donor agencies have played a prominent and a sizeable part in supporting African higher education (Barclays, 2002), which actually is appreciated by the recipients. However, Barclays argues that although donations have numerous benefits, this loss that is manifested in departure-and-never return of these key professionals, deprives the institutions concerned a return to their investment. The paper therefore attempts to provide a theoretical orientation that explains on how reliance on donor funding and also provides works of other scholars in the area of staff development, dependency on donor funding and discusses the brain drain as premised to be the resultant of over reliance on donor funding. One of the respondents said…*"..we can not run away from these donors….out of the thirty candidates currently pursuing their PhD, and sixteen pursuing Masters programs, only 5% of themare internally funded …".*Knight (2008) found a challenge of interpretation of such funding by many institutions. She explains how due to rather funding exciting, institutions front candidates who do not qualify for the international funding, because these donors either follow specific global agenda or discipline. In support of this argument, one of the CEOs of one of the HEIs in Uganda said "…*We are facing a challenge of same faculties receiving grants from different donors, yet we cannot channel this funding to faculties that are most in need….example is in the late nineties, funding was for statistics, economics, medicine and technology…in the early 2000s, preference was given to gender related programs and ICT, and more recently, the focus is on Petroleum. This left staff in the humanities, social sciences and arts unattended to, yet, arts-based courses compliment science based courses….but what can we do? A beggar has no choice!*

Blair (1998) and Saint (2008) argue that because of this limitation, many scholars make personal contacts with funding institutions which makes it difficult for these institutions to institute mechanisms or application of the existing policies. "*..You wake up in the morning and find a letter on your desk after the staff has already left for further studies…..and although institutions penalize them by deleting them from the pay roll, the damage is already done….no smooth transition, no handover notes, classes are left unattended to….some even set exams and leave without marking or even preparing marking guides….this has happened twice this year and left us in shit.."*

How does heavy reliance on donor funding for staff training and research affect HEIs?

Although literature by (e.g. Ishengoma, 2008; Perkinson, 2006; Teferra& Altbach, 2004) indicated that donor reliance was responsible for brain-drain, thereby paralyzing institutions and countries in general, the findings in this study were quite controversial and mixed. However, to some extent, reliance on donor funding was partly responsible for brain drain, but not in all cases. Didriksson, (2008) is among several researchers on causes of external brain drain in Africa and calls it the push-pullfactors as the major causes of brain drain of highly skilled African professionals to developed and other countries. Push factors "motivate" or force African professionals to leave their countries of origin, while pull factors are "the deliberate and/or unintended actions from recipient countries" that attract African professionals to these countries. Literature has shown that low remuneration; poor working conditions; low job satisfaction; lack of professional and career development; and political instabilities in many African countries have created such insecure conditions for the professionals (Abeli, 2010; Bloom, Canning& Chan (2005) and Saint; 2008). Conversely, Abongo (2007) unequivocally observes that the primary causeof brain drain is unreasonably low wages paid to African professionals. Other push factors cited in literature on brain drain in Africa include lack of technology and basic equipment to perform professional tasks. However, the current investigation showed causes to go beyond low pay and found that they were more personal than what employers and societies perceived. Among reasons for brain drain were prestige; acquired citizenship due to inter-marriages, lack of social ties at home such as; orphaned, single, and sometimes homeless (Tumuhimbisibwe, 2004). In Uganda however, it was more of searching for greener pastures and better life, more especially economic security.

In addition to the economic uncertainty, political andsocial upheavals have affected higher education institutions. The sector has also hassuffered from considerable destruction of infrastructure and facilities fromcivil wars. However, Blair (1998) takes a slightly different view and arguesthat the root of the funding crisis in Africa's public higher institutions are thethree major varieties of negotiated state funding namely; incrementalbudgeting (where institutions simply receive a flat, percentage increase onthe past year's budget); adhoc negotiations (where the political skill andconnections of institutional representatives is the key factor); and fixedagreements (where a pre-determined proportion of government revenue isavailable to higher institutions). These varieties of negotiations would definitely affect HEIs, if not well analyzed and interpreted. According to Blair therefore, such bureaucratic funding provides no incentives forefficiency, entrenches conservatism, makes it extremely difficult to rapidlyadjust the allocation of resources to meet changing requirements, andinhibits higher institutions from adapting to the demand for relevant skills.Further, scholars such as; Mushengyezi, 2004, Allio & Ahimbisibwe, 2004; found that financial crises in many Ugandan HEIs were due to financial mismanagement, corruption and lack oftransparency. However, this was not the object of the authors.

Whereas the authors premised donor funding to affect retention, this area was actually a contentious issue, and we must say, it raised a lot of controversies. On the question "in your view, how does donor fundingaffect retention of staff"? Many CEOs of HEIs in Uganda had mixed responses *"…I do not want to mention names but whether donor funding or internally generated funds, this thing..called brain-drain has no formula….our two members of staff who had just returned from abroad to pursue their doctorates, decided to seek employment in other institutions, yet, we used our internally generated funds to train them….I do not want to mention the institutions but these were very expensive universities….we lost them… I mean, they left.."* On the question of whether these two had been bonded, the CEO had this to say, *"..yes, we had bonded them, and they accepted to forfeit their gratuity, and one even topped up since the gratuity money was not enough….so definitely donor funding is just an excuse.."*But, on further probing, on the effect of failure to retain highly trained staff, one of the respondent had this to say; *"..true, failure to retain staff is such a daunting experience…but what can we do? They have their freedom….but, I must say that* *lack of retention of academic staff has negative implications, especially lack of continuity, and succession planning..”*

Higher education institutions, such as universities, colleges and polytechnics, are labour intensive organizations; they depend on people for the delivery of their services. The quality of the staff in HEIs is thus central to their effectiveness. A recent World Bank paper commented that "a high quality and well motivated teaching staff and a supportive professional culture are essential in building excellence" (World Bank, 2010). In business and the professions there is a wide recognition that the skills of their staff need to be continually strengthened and enhanced. Now days, institutions not only on the competence of their staff, but also give time to stressing the need for commitment to the organization’s goals and to promoting a capacity to change. HEIs are crucial to national aspirations for economic development and, if such capacity building aims are to be achieved, the institutions will have to make the most effective use of all their human resources. Although this paper singled out donor funding to be the area of concern, a number of institutional challenges were found to influence retention. For example, Bloom, Canning& Chan (2005) found economic factors to be the “push” factors of staff in higher education institutions *“…at least the pay should be commensurate to my efforts…I came back with a higher degree but only to be paid the money that I was getting before I left…how can I settle for peanut when elsewhere I am offered three times as much? ….I actually refunded the money and decided to move on..”* one of the staff who left the institution lamented. This therefore meant that other than donor funds, remuneration also posed a challenge.

What resource mobilization strategies have HEIs put in place to be able to retain their staff?

On the question of strategies for funding, most institutions had taken almost a similar approach. At undergraduate level, financial assistance has been through grants and loans in Uganda. However, Kasozi (2006) explained how implementation of cost sharing at realistic unit costs was, to a large extent, dependent upon the operationalisation of a successful loan schemes. To some extent, the scheme was likely to promote access for students from lower socio-economic households- but not at graduate level. Experiences from countries where it has been successfully implemented provide several options that could be adopted in Uganda, for example. These options include grants, interest-free loans, subsidized interest loans and commercial-rate loans. In developing financial assistance programs based on a loan system, mechanisms would be put in place to facilitate greater access not only to public higher education institutions as is the case now, but also to the private higher education institutions at undergraduate level (MoES, 2014). Funding by the Private Sector Private sector was envisaged at three levels; direct engagement by the institutions through consultancies and sale of services, business ventures and engagement of industry through contract research. Funding can also be through donations in the form of corporate donations and alumni contributions; and lastly, through students’ contributions in the form of tuition and other fees (Bakkabulindi, 2008).

In Uganda for example, funding could be through Consultancy Services,mainly on an individual basis by staff from these institutions. Although it has augmented staff remuneration it has not had a direct monetary benefit for the institutions. Hence, institutionalizing consultancy services with a strong unit mandated with the solicitation, management and execution of consultancy services not only to the business sector but with the public sector, non-governmental organizations and international bodies should be considered as a source of income for the institution (Nakanyike-Musisi, 2003). Bakabulindi (2009) argues that the advantage with this option is that it is policy orientated and does not require massive investments or start-up capital. Therefore, Direct Business Venturesin Uganda are known to be among the largest land owners in prime locations in the country. These land holdings have not been optimally utilized for resource mobilization. In the majority of cases they have been left as wasteland and/or with non-commercial activities such as staff housing at non-commercial rates. Additionally, while Uganda's tertiary institutions have affiliated establishments that could be operated on a commercial basis such as university farms, hospitals and guest houses, these have not been undertaken (Bakkabulindi, 2010). Creating a business arm of institutions either directly or through joint ventures with the private sector therefore, will reduce the overreliance on state funds and tuition fees. Other strategies for funding HEIs were found to include donations from Alumni and the Private Sector. It was established that institutions that have been in existence for years have actually benefitted from alumni that gives back to their alma mater. Other new institutions are beginning to establish structures that will ensure contributions from future alumni. This requires networking of the old boy's and old girl's in these institutions in Uganda. These networks therefore, largely operate as development oversight committees and have an endowment type of operation which targets specific structural or financial achievements.

As Ishengoma (2007) disappointedly notes, this culture is limping or not actively functional for that matter, in the universities and other degree awarding institutions. Another avenue or strategy for raising funds for HEIs is cost-sharing (Tuition Fees). There are three drawbacks to the current arrangement of tuition fees; it is not equitable and is not paid by all students in the public institutions; the fees Higher Education Financing in East and Southern Africa charged are lower than the true cost of the education; and private institutions with the exception of one, charge fees set within the ranges of those in the publicinstitutions. It is important to note that given these drawbacks, the financial base of both the private and public higher education can be strengthened if these institutions were able to charge realistic or higher than current levels of tuition fees. Most institutions expressed a wish to selectively increase to equal costs while at the same time establishing a mechanism for providing free or subsidized higher education to the most needy students, in what has been referred to as the dual track system. In the absence of income contingent assessments of student support in Uganda, institutions should be empowered to mobilize a greater share of the necessary financing from students because indeed, HE is equally a private good and a public good. Another avenue where HEIs were generated funds was the contract research. Although many HEIs have gone out and study the requirements of the market, with a deliberate effort to develop ideas that would attract the private sector through an incubation arrangement or direct involvement with the private sector from the outset, it has yielded invisible impact. Yet, the private sector has continuously encouraged universities to engage in product development and/or improvement and also to utilize local expertise to enhance production (Bakkabulindi, 2010).

In Uganda however, long-term investments have not featured as a source of income for higher education institutions although they have a potential to be utilized. Perhaps, the Islamic University in Uganda (IUIU) was the only university in the country that had utilized this mechanism with some level of success, when it received an endowment from King Fahd of Saudi Arabia for research. The fund enabled IUIU to finance its activities in large magnitudes. Viable options have been suggested here that the different stakeholders can take in order to better finance higher education in Uganda. These options have been suggested at four levels of the state, the private sector, tertiary institutions and the donor community. The current financing situation will have to be reviewed and address not only the challenge of equitable and quality higher education to its citizens but strengthen human capacity of higher education institutions through staff development programs(Court, 2000). Therefore, some of the strategies to improve HE funding have included; implementing alternative financing strategies; introducing demand-driven courses; and installing new management structures. It is argued that significant effects of these measures within the university have been: diversification of income sources, better utilization of facilities and managerial devolution and greater autonomy from government.Concretely, HEIs in Uganda have diversified their income sources through; encouraging privately sponsored students; commercializing service units; enforcing user fees; institutionalizing consultancy arrangements.In some academic fields it is said that the total of human knowledge is doubling every five or ten years. It is thus almost impossible for an individual staff member to remain in touch with the subject without a conscious investment in scholarship and self-tuition. When these knowledge advances are allied to similar changes in pedagogy, learning materials development and the use of technology, the scale of self improvement required becomes massive. For administrative and support staff there are equally rapid changes in management processes, techniques and technology. Surely the institution should recognise this and have a strategy for enabling each individual to confront this task? Or can it afford to sit back and ignore the fact that its teachers are providing out of date information in an inefficient way? If this happens, how long will it be before employers, government and the students themselves complain about the relevance of the courses and the skills and understandings they have failed to acquire?In considering any strategy for developing human resources an institution must consider **all** its staff; administrative and support personnel can play crucial roles in helping students to learn, and in enabling and facilitating an environment that favours learning.

Conclusion

The debate on donor funding is a controversial one because the crux of the argument seems paradoxical, in a sense that institutions depend on donor funding for most of their core mandates and responsibilities, while at the same time overreliance depletes institutions of their control and power. Donors have for years strengthenedhuman capacity in developing countries through collaborations and exchanges. International donors are making their action more and more constructive. Nevertheless, the great potential of international donors' actions in higher education remains dispersed. As visibility is a precious matter for donors, aspects like excellence or internationalization are privileged compared to actions focused on equality and access widening. Unfortunately collaborations for both the funders and the recipients have focused more on economic gains, than building national or institutional capacities, because clearly, donors many times do not give opportunity to the beneficiaries to air their most pressing challenges. There are still enormous lack of support from donor agencies in the fields of social sciences, arts and humanitieswhich seem to be a lost sheep. Yet, for coherence and harmony both all discipline critical for national development. Therefore, this lack of cohesion and inclusive approach is likely to continue derailing sustainable development and democratization. Actors in these collaborations many times lack space for critical assessment and opinion-making, that engage African scholars in a fair intellectual dialogue. If given opportunity, institutions would overcome a mere donor-recipient paradigm. Further, the traditional ways of resource mobilization may not enhance capacity alone without donor funding.No doubt, donor funding has had numerous benefits and has always been plan "Plan A" and the traditional sources of funding as "Plan B". Finally, resource mobilization strategies that institutions have put place have not yielded much and the options are limited.

Recommendations

Staff development funding should be institutional top priority and should ensure that they establish central staff development units to develop and monitor institutional staff development policies and programs on overall performance of the institution in this area; the institution should seek to create a culture where participation in staff development activities is a regular feature of life. Further, responsibility for promoting staff development should be clearly defined. As institutions source out funding for staff development there should be a balance between each side's contribution. Institutions should focus particularly on their academic teaching, learning and research, and be business-like in the way that they use their financial, physical and human resources, because, with insufficient financial resources and without high caliber staff, institutions will face stagnation. If institutions are in a position to control such matters centrally, they should modify the national systems of recruitment and promotion in order to stress the importance of staff development by making it mandatory at certain stages. Governments should also promote collaboration and co-operation in staff development by providing financial support for institutions. Another approach is to establish a staff development unit at national level, preferably with the backing of the national organization of vice chancellors/Directors, to support HEIs' units and act as a forum for the discussion of staff development policies and mechanisms for collaboration. Ensuring that institutions have an adequate advisory and support service is a proper national function.

References

Abeli, W., (2010). Higher Education and Development: A Critical Nexus. In Kotecha, P. (Ed.), Investment in Higher Education for Development: New Directions, SARUA Leadership Dialogue Series 2(2).

Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. Organizational behavior and human performance, 4(2), 142-175.

Agarwal, P. (2006). Higher Education in India: The Need for Change. Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations. Working Paper No.180.

Albrecht, D. and Ziderman, A. (1991). "Deferred Cost Recovery for HigherEducation. Student Loan Programs in Developing Countries." World BankDiscussion Paper 137.

Allen, M., Mabry, E., Mattrey, M., Bourhis, J., Titsworth, S. and Burrell, N.(2004). Evaluating the Effectiveness of Distance Learning: A Comparison UsingMeta-Analysis. Journal of Communication, 54: 402–420. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2004.tb02636.x.

Bergmann, H. (2009). Review of prospects for scaling up Germany's aid to education, Background paper prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2010 ED/EFA/MRT/PI/08. Paris: UNESCO.

Bloom, D., Canning, D. & Chan, K. (2005). Higher education and economic development in Africa. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University. http://www.worldbank.org/afr/teia/Higher_Ed cucation_Economic_Growth_in_Africa.pdf

Bloom, D., Rosovsky, H. et al. (2000). Higher Education in DevelopingCountries: Peril and Promise. Task Force on Higher Education and Society, TheWorld Bank.

Creed, C., Perraton, H., and Waage, J., (2012). Examining DevelopmentEvaluation in Higher Education Interventions: A Preliminary Study." LondonInternational Development Center Working Paper.

Degenbol-Martinussen, J. & Engberg-Pedersen, P. (2003). *Aid: Understanding international development co-operation*. London: Z Books Limited.

Didriksson, A., (2008). "Global and Regional Contexts of Higher Education inLatin America and the Caribbean." In Gazzola, L. and Didriksson, A. (Eds.),Trends in Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean, InternationalInstitute of UNESCO for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Kapur, D. and Crowley, M. (2008). Beyond the ABCs: Higher Education andDeveloping Countries." Working papers 139, Center of Global Development.

Kapur, D. and Mehta, P. (2008). Mortgaging the Future? Indian HigherEducation, Brookings-NCAER India Policy Forum 2007-08. 4: 101-157.

Lewis, S. (2009). Funding for higher education: facts and figures. In: *Science and Development Network*, 11 March 2009.

Mohamoud, A.A. (2005). *Reversing the brain drain in Africa: Feasibility study for Nuffic*. The Hague: Nuffic.

Moyo, D. (2009). Dead aid: why aid is not working and how there is a better way for Africa. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.

OECD (2010). Development aid at a glance: statistics by region. Paris: OECD.

Van de Walle, N. (2005). Overcoming stagnation in aid dependent countries. Washington, DC; Centre for Global Development

Varghese, N.V. (2003). Financing of higher education in Asia/Pacifi c". In: Keeves, J.P. and Watanabe, R. International handbook of educational research in the Asia Pacific region. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 827-837.

Knight, J. (2005). Cross-border Education: Programs and Providers on theMove." CBIE Millennium Research Monograph No. 10. Canadian Bureau forInternational Education. Ottawa, Canada.

Labi, A. (2009). Experts Assess Consequences of Global Surge in Demand forHigher Education. The Chronicle of Higher Education. November 17, 2009.Accessed Nov., 17, 2010: http://chronicle.com/article/Experts-Assess-Global-Surge-in/47357.

Kapur, D., Crowley, M (2008). Beyond the ABCs: Higher education and developing countries. Center for Global Development Working Paper No. 139 (2008)

Lin, J. (2005). China's Higher Education Reform and the Beida Debate." Harvard China Review, 5(2): 132-138.

Middlehurst, R. and Campbell, C. (2004). Quality Assurance and BorderlessHigher Education: Finding Pathways through the Maze." In Mapping BorderlessHigher Education: Policy, Markets and Competition. London: The Observatory onBorderless Higher Education.Pp. 89-153.

Miranda, X. (2008). Regional Integration and Internationalization of HigherEducation in Latin America and the Caribbean. In Gazzola, L. and Didriksson,A. (Eds.), Trends in Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean,International Institute of UNESCO for Higher Education

Mohamedbhai, G. (2002). Globalization and its Impact on Universities in Developing countries.

Musisi,N.B. & Muwanga,N.K.(2003). Makerere University in transition 1993-2000 opportunities & challenges. Oxford: James Currey Ltd and Kampala: Fountain.

Observatory on Borderless Higher Education. (Ed.). (2004b). Mapping Borderless Higher Education: Policy, Markets and Competition. London: Association of Commonwealth Universities.

Palay, P., (2010). Funding in Higher Education: Trends and Possibilities." In Kotecha, P. (Ed.), Investment in Higher Education for Development: New Directions, SARUALeadership Dialogue Series 2(2).

Perkinson, R. (2006). International Higher Education 'Seizing the opportunity for innovation and international responsibility. International Finance Corporation. World Bank Group. Presentation to 'Global 2' Education Conference, Edinburgh. December 7 and 8.

Saint, W. (1998). Tertiary Distance Learning in Africa." ADEA Working Group onHigher Education, The World Bank.

Tam, M. (2001). Measuring Quality and Performance in Higher Education.Quality in Higher Education, 7(1): 47-54.

Teferra, D., and Altbach, P. (2004). African Higher Education: Challenges forthe 21st Century." Higher Education, 47(1): 21-50.

Teferra, D., and Knight, J. (Eds.) (2008), Higher Education in Africa: TheInternational Dimension." Boston: Association of African Universities.

Teferra, D. and P. G. Altbachl (2004). African higher education: Challenges forthe 21st century." Higher Education 47(1): 21-50.

Tumuhimbisibwe,G.(2004, April 17). Government sponsorship needs fundamental change!: *The New Vision, p.9.*

Usher, A. and J. Medow (2010). Global Higher Education Rankings 2010,Affordability and accessibility in comparative perspective. Toronto: HigherEducation Strategy Associates.

Wang, H. (2011). Access to higher education in China: Differences in opportunity." Frontiers of Education in China 6(2): 227-247.

Varghese, N.V. (2003). Financing of higher education in Asia/Pacifi c. In: Keeves, J.P. and Watanabe, R. *International handbook of educational research in the Asia Pacific region*. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 827-837.

Varghese, N.V. (2010). Running to stand still: Higher education in a period of global economic Crisis, Research Paper. Paris: IIEP

Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2005). Building capacity through cross-border higher education. In: S. Vincent-Lancrin, R. Hopper, and M.G. Grosso (eds.), Cross-border higher educationfor development, Chapter 1. Paris: OECD/World Bank.

Walenkamp, J., Boeren, Ad. (2007). What donors should do. Development & Cooperation No. 09 (2007)

Wang, H. (2011).Access to higher education in China: Differences in opportunity. Watanabe, R. International handbook of educational research in the Asia Pacific region.

World Bank (2010). Financing higher education in Africa. Washington DC: World Bank.

Yusuf, S., Saint, W (2008). Accelerating catch-up: Tertiary education for growth in Sub-Saharan Africa World Bank (2008)