

SECTION I

Background and Theoretical Discourse



Introduction

Background

Issues concerning higher education and their mode of governance have, since the 1990s, come to occupy a privilege position in debates on education, and its relevance for development in many national contexts (Weinberg 2007; de Boer *et al.* 2007; Sawyerr 2004). To set out with clear parameters on concepts, we want to point out that ‘higher education’ is used in this text to represent academic institutions that are ‘intellectually (the) most demanding stage of pre-career acknowledged education’ (Teichler 2007:11). In some national contexts such as the United States, the concept ‘higher education’ is employed generically to refer to all forms of post-secondary or tertiary education; but in this discussion we would restrict the concept to only universities (Knight 2008; Gibbons 1998). Universities are, by definition, ‘multidisciplinary institutions in charge of both teaching and research, (and) entitled to award advanced academic degrees notably the doctorate...’ (Teichler 2007:15).¹ The National Accreditation Board (NAB) in Ghana defines university elaborately as an ‘educational institution designed for advanced instruction and research in several branches of learning, conferring degrees in various faculties, and often embodying colleges, schools and similar institutions’ (NAB 2013). Within institutional governance, systems like universities, leadership according to Kezar & Eckel (2004) is a ‘collection of individuals that influences and shapes and creates change in a particular direction.’ The leadership roles in universities are dispersed among various actors; as universities are polycentric in nature. These institutions, nevertheless, have an integrative organic structure from which their governance systems emerge. And in higher educational context where roles change frequently, it is safe to posit

that leadership in universities is not permanently lodged in the hands of a given set of individuals. The governance culture that was traditionally associated with universities was primarily established on a consensus building mechanism.

Not until the last decade of the 20th century, university governance was mostly influenced by the traditional understanding that higher education was a public good; with socially beneficial returns (Ochwa-Echell 2013; Mamdani 2008; Materu 2007; Sawyerr 2004). The governance cultures and the goals which institutional leadership pursued were couched to be in line with the public good philosophy. However, through the instrumentality of neoliberal ideology that now awash the African political economy, the philosophy of higher education as a public good is fading.

The new understanding that has emerged is a marked departure from the public good notion to a new conception that university education is a private good as any other commodity in the marketplace for potential consumers (Ochwa-Echell 2013; Lulat 2005). With a change in the philosophy that had driven higher education in the past, there has been a corresponding universal shift in the tenets that underpinned its governance; from the traditional collegial system to managerialism. It has become necessary for higher education leadership in Africa to realign their institutional goals to meet the commercial interests in public service delivery (de Boer *et al.* 2007; CHEPS 2006). The global drive to redefine the essence of higher education has sparked debates regarding whether leadership of African universities have the capacity to manage the consequences of managerialism in a competitive global context. The importance attached to this discourse, particularly in Africa, is understandable; as the traditional public higher education governance systems were established on the conception that these institutions were integral to the post-colonial development agenda. Hence, the services that these institutions provided were public goods in character. Apparently, such notions now collide with the emerging commercial ideas of the new public management (NPM) system.²

Transformations in the notions of public management and the corresponding governance systems that come with it have engendered splits within the academic community about how to run public universities. In consequence, the debate on public higher education governance has taken many turns. And the literature on this subject has become a growth industry to depict the ideological schisms that have emerged.³ The sceptics about the NPM system are not particularly sure of the outcomes of managerialism on academic quality; and how that would affect the pivotal roles of teaching, research and general academic quality assurance within the higher education sphere. In fact, there are trepidations regarding

experimentations with governance systems that move away from the accustomed one, in which the state serves as the founder, funder and the setter of the mandate of universities.

The fear has been that such movements away from the familiar governance system could reduce the pedigree of higher education in Africa to being a mere 'teaching only' institutions and their contributions to national development through knowledge production could be compromised. The consequences of that for the continent that is already, the dawdler in development could be dire. Due to the tribulations of underdevelopment and bad governance at national levels, higher education in Africa has not been immune to the turbulence generated by these externalities. The change from the collegial systems to managerial arrangements has posed new forms of challenges to leadership of these institutions in meeting their mandates; as the universities take on a posture of capitalist corporate entrepreneur (Sawyer 2004).

In the traditional governance arrangement, higher education leadership was largely absolved from the stress of finding alternative sources of funding for their institutions, as the state was supposed to deliver on its obligation. Nonetheless, the higher education landscape has since the last decade of the 20th century witnessed massive transformations, caused by such factors as globalisation, internationalisation, privatisation, state downscaling and managerialism (Wolhuter 2013; Altbach *et al.* 2009; Ahmad *et al.* 2007). These developments have had significant consequences on higher education governance, as there has emerged downscaling of state funding and a new demand on the leadership of public universities to corporatise their operations (Ahmad *et al.* 2007). The public universities are to make up for the shortfall in their funding from alternative sources, as the social contractual obligation on the state as the exclusive funder of public universities has changed. The liberalisation wave of the higher education sector has brought into being many private academic service providers from both in-country and offshore sources.⁴

The mainstream public universities have thence faced competition from offshore universities (mainly religious-based plus a few secular private universities) as well as from non-university centres of knowledge production and research (Atuahene 2014; Cobbah 2010; Manuh *et al.* 2007). Consequently, the leadership in public universities have singularly, or in concert, adopted different strategies to expand enrolment, generate additional funding and review curricula and modes of operation in an attempt to respond to these challenges (Cobbah 2010; Manuh *et al.* 2007). The changed context has also elicited new demands from stakeholders regarding the relevance of programmes and curricula for the university clientele. The traditional professional working environment and its associated academic ethics are thus crumbling, as commercialisation takes the centre position. The

capacity of higher education leadership to deal with the emerging challenges have been called into question as views are divided about whether the adoption of managerial tenets by public universities would not negatively impact quality of services and even the orientation of academic staff.

The debate about the role and the future of higher education within a commercialised setting has drawn much attention, and the literature on this subject has become a growth industry that depicts the ideological cleavages that have emerged.⁵ The sceptics about the NPM system, which advocate for the corporatisation of public universities, are not particularly sure of the outcomes of managerialism on academic quality; and how that affects the fundamental roles of teaching, research and academic quality assurance. In fact, there are trepidations regarding experimentation with governance systems that are at variance with the accustomed one, in which the state funds academic services. The argument is that within the African context, there is the need for the state to remain; to provide the necessary support for higher education. The state's financial support is required in ensuring equality of access and in creating the atmosphere for academics to concentrate on their core responsibilities. This would then enable African universities to pursue programmes and research activities that will help position the continent well into the global knowledge economy. The expected role of the African university is thus captured by Akilagpa Sawyerr (2004):

The principal contribution of a university to society turns on the quality of knowledge it generates and imparts; the habit of critical thoughts and problem solving it institutionalises and inculcates in its graduates...

The lessons of economic breakthroughs, made by natural resource underprovided countries like Japan, Taiwan and South Korea, among others, have pointed to the rest of the world that the greatest economic asset of a country is the quality of its human resources; and not necessarily the lavishness of nature. The paradoxical situation in Africa, whereby in the midst of nature's abundance, the people languish in poverty and underdevelopment, has brought home the recognition of the need to quicken the pace for the establishment of higher education with the requisite leadership capacities. So, even before the attainment of independence, the nationalist leaders made the lack of universities on the continent a political grievance in their anti-colonial mobilisation and struggle (Teferra 2008; Lulat 2005; Okafor 1971). The lack of universities on the continent, therefore, became a political subject around which the anti-colonial struggles were waged.

In the otiose effort to stall the conjuncture of forces that began to corrode the legitimacy of colonial rule, the establishment of university colleges became

part of the give-ins by the colonists to placate the agitated nationalist leaders. In British colonial Africa, university colleges were, for instance, established in Accra (Ghana), Ibadan (Nigeria) and Makerere (Uganda) to meet both national and regional aspirations for higher education (Lulat 2005; Agbodeka 1998). The demands for the establishment of universities in British colonial Africa, however, had a longer genealogy, which stretches back to the last quarter of the 19th century (Atuahene 2014; Lulat 2005).⁶ The university colleges which were established in the last decade before independence were placed under the tutelage of the University of London. The governance of the colonial university colleges were placed under the Inter-University Commission (IUC) that consisted of the universities in Britain.⁷ These were done, ostensibly, for the transmission of the metropolitan collegial philosophies; and the traditional Oxbridge culture of quality assurance (Agbodeka 1998). From their origins in the late 1940s, the establishment of public universities became part of the prestige symbols for meeting national aspirations (Mamdani 2008; Adesina 2006; Hoffman 1996). The project of establishing national universities was seen as being apposite for the training of the critical human resources that were required for meeting the aspirations of the newly independent African states (Materu 2007; Lulat 2005; Sawyerr 2004).

This was the era wherein African universities, and their products, were essentially conceived as being socially beneficial in dealing with the development challenges of the continent; given the dearth of skills available in Africa (Adesina 2006; Ajayi *et al.* 1996). The exigencies of the time and the reality check of the African situation demanded that the state took the responsibility for the establishment and funding of the universities (Agbodeka 1998; Ajayi *et al.* 1996). The role assumed by the state was in consonance with the orthodoxy of state-centric political economy of the immediate postcolonial period that lasted until the late 1970s (Gasu 2011a). This created a socioeconomic paradigm in which higher education governance fitted into.

These institutions, like the many other types of the establishment that had colonial roots, were set up with philosophies that were exogenous to the African situation.⁸ In this regard, liberal metropolitan epistemic structures became the baseline for higher education governance and leadership culture; for the newly established university colleges. The college status of the newly established African universities to the metropolitan ones, were primarily meant to be the mentoring stage for ensuring that these new African institutions became the umbilical cords for imbibing the liberal tenets of the prevailing collegial governance cultures (Materu 2007). The faculty and leadership of the universities were essentially

manned by European expatriates, as the paucity of expertise among indigenous Africans, at the time, created the space for the foreign control.

As the African states bore the dual responsibilities of not only establishing the universities but also funding them, the role of the state in complementing faculty for the maintenance of standards in academic service delivery became paramount. This was to be delivered through the provision of infrastructure and logistics. But in the emerging African situation, the role of the state in the promotion of high academic standards went beyond the provision of only the tangibles. Globally, the success of universities in meeting standards is also hinged onto the intangible governance culture of guaranteeing institutional autonomy (CHEPS 2006). Institutional autonomy refers to the tripartite elements of: (a) autonomy as an academic freedom of individual academics in the sense that they can research the topics they decide on without interference from the state or any other institution; (b) autonomy of the collegial bodies which can govern the academic life of the university without interference from the state or any other organisation; (c) the institutional autonomy to govern not only academic but also administrative and financial matters (Pechar 2003).

This could only be realised if the relationship between the principal actors in this process, namely the state and faculty, were clearly defined to allow the academia the freedom, and environment to operate and to express views without recrimination. This was meant to enable the academia to have the needed ambience to engage effectively in critical thinking, and the search required for breaking the bounds of existing knowledge. This notion was, of course, based on the tacit assumption that the public spheres in these polities were themselves liberal and expansive enough to tolerate divergent views. This was a liberal metropolitan principle, which required the granting of autonomy and immunity for the practitioners in the academic environment to freely express views based on research and expert knowledge. This principle was also made an integral part of the higher education systems in Africa. This was instituted to forestall the stultification of critical thinking and the emergence of a culture of silence that was often associated with the ethos of patrimonial supplication, which is found in many an African social context (Gasu 2010). These liberal principles were largely adhered to during the colonial period, as European dominance in leadership left very little recourse for manipulation (Wiseman & Wolhuter 2013).

Even though the African universities made substantial efforts during the period to domesticate some of their courses, they were not done by sacrificing standards (Agbodeka 1998; Ajayi & Tamuno 1972). It is in this respect that within the first decade of independence such African higher education institutions as Makerere

University in Uganda, University of Dar Es Salaam in Tanzania, University of Ibadan in Nigeria and University of Ghana, Legon, became world known institutions of academic excellence (Adesina 2006; Sawyerr 2004).

There was a displayed tenacity to maintain the respectable standards that were associated with the African universities during this period, as the key stakeholders strived to make higher education relevant to the continent's development needs (Manuh *et al.* 2007). This was evidenced at the 1962 'Tananarive Conference on Higher Education in Africa' which was organised by the government of the Republic of Malagasy (Madagascar), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), and the United Nations Economic Commission of Africa (UNECA). The resolution at the conference was to commit universities in Africa to the mission of championing the development of the continent and this was to birth the notion of 'developmental university' in Africa. The effort was to boost what Vught (1997) describes as the extrinsic and intrinsic qualities of universities. He indicated that 'the extrinsic qualities refer to the capacities of higher education institutions to respond to the changing needs of the societies of which they are a part (Vught 1997:80). The intrinsic qualities of higher education refer to the basic values and ideals, which form the very heart of higher education: the unfettered search for truth and the disinterested pursuit of knowledge (Vught 1997:81). Intrinsic quality is the linchpin to the traditional notion of academic quality. It focuses on knowledge production and student learning processes. Even though many academics today will agree that quality in higher education covers more than this, intrinsic quality represents the core of academic quality. The academic community can be seen as guardians of intrinsic quality (Giertz 2001).

Extrinsic quality concerns the demands that society directs towards higher education. These demands will change with societal dynamics but as long as higher education is part of society, they will always exist in some form. It could be argued as to whether extrinsic quality should refer to the market or to the state. But the view is that both the market and the state could be seen as representing society. The market is seen as representing extrinsic quality, since qualified labour is an important part of what society wants from higher education and because, today, the state is using the quality human resources to promote purely political purposes (Giertz 2001). The pursuit of intrinsic and extrinsic quality of African universities was done to make higher education relevant through research knowledge that would promote the development agenda of bridging the social and economic gap between Africa and the industrially developed world.

The state managers, at the time, were quite steadfast in their commitment to the funding and the provision of essential services, including municipal ones, for

the universities to function well. But the collaboration between the state managers and university leadership was short-lived. A combination of factors that included a lack of democratic culture, inexperienced public servants and interference from politicians that were eager to control the public space, created the context in which higher education governance and leadership operated (Wiseman & Wolhuter 2013). The eagerness to control the public space was in itself at variance with the low administrative and economic capacity of the state (Fukuyama 2004; cf. Diamond 1988). The relationship between the state and leadership of higher education in the emerging political and economic circumstances became dotted with frictions and rivalries (Sawyerr 1994). The state control agenda was often veiled by such refrains as domestication of courses, indigenisation of staffs and realignment of university programmes to the national development goals. However, it is difficult to dismiss that power play was the driving factor in the unhealthy developments that defined the internal struggles of the period (Assie-Lumumba 2006; Girdwood 1999).

As indicated, the first generation African universities were established by the state; and like many other public sector organisations, they were run to fall in line with the programmes of the state managers. In the specific case of higher education, the leadership was largely entrusted to the academic class. The state, however, exercised some superintendence; as was for instance done through appointments to the university governing councils and due to the prestige associated with the position of chancellorship, the position was entrusted to Heads of State. The concentration of power in the state was largely meant to be in tandem with the colonial monocephalous power grid. The embryonic postcolonial African state, during this era, epitomised massive centralising tendencies (Boone 2003; Diamond 1988; Bates 1983). This was obviously an endeavour to have control over competing sources of power, which perhaps the university constituency had become, given the prestige and the knowledge power at their disposal (Olowu 1997).

The successful operation of public institutions of higher education, just like other state organisations, depended on a number of factors that include: macroeconomic factors, political governance system, and the dominant global ideology (Girdwood 1999). One persistent character about African economies has been their unreformed nature since the colonial period (Onimode, 1988; Ake 1981). African economies continue to engage with the rest of the world in primary commodities. The fortunes of these commodities are often linked to the vicissitudes that characterise the primary commodity market (Gasu 2011b). The boom that characterised the commodity market in the immediate post-World War II period, to the end of the 1960s, produced positive multipliers for the national

development efforts; and thereby enabled a reasonable room for the funding of higher education in Africa (Gasu 2011b).

The bust that subsequently occurred in the commodity market, which became a nightmarish commonplace in the mid-1970s, produced uncomfortable knock-on effects across the continent (Adesina 2006). This situation was aggravated by the shocks that quadrupled crude oil prices. It invariably caused maladies for the primary commodity producing economies. Consequently, the 1970s largely became a catastrophic decade for Africa; especially as widespread hunger and famine ravaged the continent in this period as well. By the beginning of the 1980s, many African economies including that of Ghana, were unmistakably exhibiting textbook symptoms of failure.⁹ These developments emanated from the contraction of the various national fiscus. African states came under heavy debt burdens, which were brought about by heavy borrowing to meet its postcolonial social obligations; including the provision of a well-funded higher education (Adesina 2007; Mkandawire 2005; Hutchful 2002). The effects of the diminished capacity of the states to meet such social contractual obligations were most felt in the running of the universities.

The dwindling economic capacity of the states subsequently generated a plethora of challenges for higher education leadership around the continent (Sawyer 1994). And as funds dried up, the basic infrastructures of these institutions fell into disrepair (Hutchful 2002; Gyimah-Boadi 1998). It therefore became a terrifying experience for leadership of these institutions to maintain academic quality. Certainly, this marked a period of frustration and non-fulfilment within the academic community. The evidence of this was shown in mass voting out by faculty, as well as the other forms of high level expertise for greener pastures (Manuh *et al.* 2007; Girdwood 1999; Gyimah-Boadi 1998; Sawyer 1994). Invariably, the economic challenges of the time also undermined the learning environment in which students were; as libraries for instance became nothing more than museum pieces of antiquated reading materials (URC 1988). Thus, in the circumstances, universities in Africa had palpably lost their quintessence; and to import the descriptive words of the minority report of the Elliot Commission of 1945, they were reduced to sheer 'continuation schools' (United Kingdom 1945a:144).

The economic crisis that had engulfed the continent, of which the falling fortunes of the universities were a by-product, called for a forensic diagnosis, and comprehensive therapy to cure the bleak situation. This was what was supposed to be provided by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, when African leaders marched to their offices for financial bailouts. The solutions to the economic malaise, in the form of loans, came but these were accompanied by

unusual bang effects on the continent's socioeconomic formations. The loans that were granted were now predicated on the implementation of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs). The SAPs were anchored on economic liberalisation and the promotion of capitalist ethics. At the policy level, it required the removal of all distortions to the operationalisation of the market system (Ochwa-Echell 2013; Bangura & Gibbon 1992).

The nub issue in this new scheme of socioeconomic conception was the notion of 'small state' and 'bigger market' (CHEP 2008). Among other things, this entailed the removal of subsidies and other related distortions, for an unfettered operation of the market. The old public administration system was criticised for being the cause of the poor performance of the state and in the 1980s it became target for reforms under the rubric 'public sector reform.' The purpose was to retune the public sector to adapt the new governance philosophy of 'small state' and 'bigger market' (World Bank 2008; Maassen 2003; Gruening 2001). The 1990s witnessed the scaling up of these reforms to New Public Management (NPM) that embraced such neoliberal criteria as: accountability, transparency, efficiency and profitability (Politt 1993; Hood 1991). But these neoliberal prescriptions for public administration ran into conflict with the extensionist state welfare ideology of the immediate postcolonial era. This contradiction thereby triggered a wave of restiveness across the continent.¹⁰

In the emerging neoliberal environment, the state was made to bear the indictments for all the wrongs that had afflicted the continent. This was the case, mainly because the doubters were sufficiently armed with evidences of failure, to lambast the African countries for carrying responsibilities that were in excess of what could sustain them (Gibbons & Bangura 1992). In consequence, the state-centric and social welfarist ideological stance was to be discontinued. The market order thereon was to be nurtured to acquire institutional maturity (Beckman 1992). Notwithstanding an initial resistance that accompanied the paradigmatic shift, it became obvious that Africa constituted the weakest link to undo the neoliberal imperative. Hence they were impelled to put in place measures that retuned their domestic policies and institutions to fit into the new orthodoxy. Africa states, thence, had to undergo massive pupilage, which was provided by imported 'experts' to groom and to institutionalise neoliberal policy formulation, planning and implementation.

Since then, there has been a vivacious debate among African scholars and state managers as to whether to uphold the old top-down public administration practices or to replace it with a bottom-up system. The debate has brought into its ambit, discussions on all fronts of public service delivery systems that include

utility service delivery, education, local government and health care. This issue gained prominence because the liberalisation and competitive drives opened the channels for consumer interests to be inputted into matters that affect them. These matters cover many of the services that the state was providing without recourse. The services that the state provided were inspired by attitudes of paternalism. In such circumstances, the consumer interests were easily ignored. This was what the NPM system was meant to address, among other things, by discarding inefficiency and in ensuring value for money in public service.

The education sector in particular came under a close scrutiny. The sector had been conceived as a haemorrhage on national coffers and yet was inundated with mediocrity. To deal with the problems that the education sector posed to the economic health of their respective countries, the World Bank sponsored a host of educational reform programmes. These were efforts that involved a wholesale re-examination of educational policies across the continent; and to redefine the role the state was to continue playing in the scheme of things (Wolhuter & Wiseman 2013). As should be expected, economism was the denominator that was meant to bring efficiency through cost-recovery measures. The dictates for economic rate of returns undergirded the policy directions to place premium on basic education, which did not require heavy capital investment. In the case of Ghana, the reforms abridged pre-university education from 17 years to 12 years (Hutchful 2002). The reform programmes indeed enhanced enrolment at the basic levels; but this was to unleash drubbing effects on downstream educational institutions (Sawyer 2004).

The de-prioritisation of higher education in the World Bank's scheme of things in Africa, at the time, led to a lack of the Bank's support for infrastructural development in the universities. This was the case, irrespective of the fact that large student numbers were being rolled out from the secondary schools. The anaemic conditions in the lecture halls, seminar rooms and at the students' residential facilities had begun to create problems for leadership of the universities to deal with. The emerging situation became an unfamiliar terrain for many to tackle, especially as the government, which is the key stakeholder, was eager to downscale its responsibilities (Girdwood 1999).

Again in the case of Ghana, the Universities Rationalisation Committee (URC) which was set up by the government in 1986 to investigate into the challenges that confronted the tertiary educational sector made a number of recommendations aimed at introducing liberalisation, cost-sharing and cost recovery into the governance system of higher education (URC 1988). The implementation of the URC report was done through the government's White Paper *Reforms of the Tertiary Education System*. The report was to give a gradual

lease that was to eventuate in the privatisation and commercialisation of many services that universities were providing (URC 1988). Consequently, fees were introduced in the 1988/89 academic year. The introduction of fee paying in the public universities, in the absence of scholarship support schemes for distressed students, created problems for the vulnerable. This pitted the rich against the poor within the higher education space; as lumpen subculture became pronounced among the struggling students in the university community.

The liberalisation of higher education also made it possible for private providers to now operate within this sector. The participation of the private sector in the educational sector was consummated in Article 25(2) of the 1992 constitution, which spells out that ...

[E]very person shall have the right, at his own expense, to establish and maintain a private school or schools at all levels and of such categories and in accordance with such conditions as may be provided by law.

These developments definitely broke the monopoly that the state had in providing higher education, and thereon private participation at this level of education became institutionalised.

The private providers were buoyed by the potential market that the large number of applicants for higher education had created. This was especially the case as the public institutions could only admit a fraction of the qualified applicants. Since the early 1990s, a large number of private tertiary institutions have sprung up in the country to take advantage of the situation. And once the terrain was no longer hostile to private sector participation, as evinced by an assured clientele to pay for such services, the commercialisation culture became largely accepted.

The ability of the private tertiary institutions to successfully commoditise higher education has demonstrated to the public ones that they could also follow the same track. This has resulted to an undeclared tussle in the higher education space, between the public and private providers as to how to deploy commercial instruments in mobilising funds for their respective institutions. The shift towards commercialisation essentially meant an injection of a new set of attitudes and conceptions about higher education governance and the corresponding leadership styles to deal with the situation.

To deal with the expected challenges, which the liberalised landscape has portended, statutory regulatory and quality assurance bodies have been set up across Africa to address the concerns that are being raised. The disquiet about whether the liberalised higher education sector can provide the standards that can meet the development needs of the continent calls for the strengthening

of leadership capacities to enable them rise to the occasion. This demands that leadership of higher education institutions should be able to adjust their internal governance structures to produce the results that the external environment places on them. Herein, lies the crux of the matter as to whether higher education leadership in Africa has the capacity to march up with global players in the field of managerialism.

The Issues Being Addressed

The book is divided into five sections. Section 1 discusses the context and the general challenges that higher education leadership currently face in Africa. This is done in the wake of the shifts in the conception of the nature of services provided by higher education. The shifts are essentially the byproducts of the neoliberal revolution that has undercut the prior notions of the state's responsibility towards higher education. The prior notions of higher education as a public good and its graduates as being a social good, has been questioned by the apostles of neoliberalism. The collegial governance culture in public universities is subsequently receding as corporate managerialism is establishing grounds across board. The implications of the managerial culture on academic service delivery have thus become a matter of concern in Africa. The debate is alive because Africa is deemed not to have the luxury of experimenting with unfamiliar governance cultures.

The liberalisation and commercialisation experience has thrown up new challenges to higher education leadership in Africa. How this situation bodes for the role of higher education in the national development agenda cannot be ignored. The liberalisation wave is being pushed further around the carousel of globalisation and internationalisation of higher education. This has raised many other questions as to whether the national agendas for higher education in Africa are not being hijacked by the very forces that have caused its underdevelopment. The matter of quality assurance in higher education and the various institutional efforts dealing with such concerns are also examined.

Thus in section 1 the focus is on the theoretical positions that undergird the discourse. This is important as it touches on the core concerns and the context of the challenges that currently confront higher education leadership in Africa. The issues and the corresponding discourse are found in chapter 1.

Section 2 deals with the measures that are being taken to assure quality in higher education in Africa. The transnational approaches toward quality assurance in Africa, as well as Ghana's specific endeavours in this direction, are discussed in this section. While in chapter 2 the focus is on the transnational efforts for quality

assurance in Africa, in chapter 3, the attention is on the statutory bodies in Ghana that are assigned the roles of superintending tertiary institutions and in assuring quality service in Ghanaian universities.

Sections 3 and 4 of the book respectively examine public and private institutions of higher education in Ghana. The sections address how the challenges to leadership of higher education, as discussed within the Africa context play out in the Ghanaian situation. To address the issues that are problematised, six universities are chosen for the study in both the public and private sectors. The choice of these institutions is influenced by their respective mandates, geographical location and ownership (founding authority). The public universities chosen for the study are: University of Ghana in Accra; Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology in Kumasi; University of Cape Coast; and the University for Development Studies in Tamale. Two private universities – the Valley View University in Accra and the Catholic University College of Ghana in Sunyani are also chosen for the study. In these specific institutional situations, which are covered in chapters 4-9, we seek to examine such matters as:

- a. In what ways do higher education leadership structures meet the challenges for academic excellence?
- b. Are leadership capacities within the higher education institutions adequate in ensuring high academic service delivery?
- c. What measures are there to build the capacities of staff to enhance efficiency?

Section 5 of the book places the public and private universities in a comparative perspective. This is done in chapter 10. Chapter 11 draws conclusions from the study; and also makes policy recommendations for remedying the identified deficiencies.