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Foreword

This is one of a series of reports on policy seminars organized by the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank. Policy seminars provide a forum for an informal exchange of ideas and experiences among policymakers from different countries, leading experts in development, and World Bank staff with respect to major issues of development policy.

Policy seminar reports focus on issues raised during seminars that may be of interest to a wider audience. They are not intended to be comprehensive proceedings. They seek, however, to convey the essence of the discussion that took place and to bring out any principal areas of agreement or disagreement that emerged among those participating.

This report is the result of a Seminar on the Policy Environment of African Management Development Institutions, hosted by the Lesotho Government in Maseru, Lesotho, September 18-23, 1989, and organized by a Task Force of Directors of Management Development Institutions participating in the UNDP/EDI/ILO Program to Strengthen African Training Institutions. The quotations in this report refer to the presenters of papers at the seminar, and to contributions made by the participants during plenary and group discussions. A list of papers and authors is given in Annex D.

Christopher R. Willoughby
Director
Economic Development Institute
of The World Bank
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Summary

Key Recommendations

1. Effective mechanisms of governance are essential for the future impact of African Management Development Institutions (MDIs). The mandate of the MDI may need to be reviewed for relevance and clarity. Where lacking, a governing board should be established, made up of representatives from the MDI's key client population in both the public and private sector. This board should have clear powers enabling the MDI to achieve a high level of operational autonomy balanced by transparent accountabilities.

2. Effective communications should be maintained between the board and management of the MDI, and the key policy managers in government. The aim should be to increase the involvement of the MDIs in the development planning process, and increase the utilization of MDI trainers, consultants, and researchers in implementing development projects. MDI directors have a special responsibility for initiating dialogue with senior government managers, and demonstrating the responsiveness of their institutions to priority national needs. Policymakers have a special responsibility for providing access, and for inviting formal MDI participation at an early stage in the planning cycle.

3. MDIs should be given greater flexibility in their access to and control of resources, both human and financial. MDIs should earn this privilege by demonstrating a high public level of efficiency and responsibility in their utilization of scarce national resources. The approach to increasing autonomy and flexibility in resource management will vary from country to country. However, all are likely to share the importance of providing MDIs with the financial resources that will allow longer and more reliable planning horizons. Equally important is the goal of improving the incentive and reward structures within the MDIs to encourage the attraction and retention of high caliber faculty.

4. MDIs need to improve their capacity to respond quickly to national challenges, and to increase their range of services to key clients with more emphasis on tailor-made training, consulting, and research into priority management topics. Special attention should be given to the contribution of MDIs to improving the management of policy formulation and implementation.

5. To encourage the move towards greater managerial autonomy within the MDIs, improvements need to be made in the way in which the performance of the MDIs is evaluated. This evaluation needs to focus both on the impact of the institutions' training and other services, but also the MDIs' performance as organizations: their success in fulfilling their mandate, meeting their objectives, maximizing their financial and human resources, broadening their market, and establishing greater viability as enterprises.

6. The attempt to improve the policy environment of the MDIs, begun at this seminar, require follow-up through active initiatives by the directors and their boards; national consensus building meetings on the need for reform in the way the MDIs are governed and their relationship with governments; donor support of the reform efforts; follow-up regional meetings at which policymakers and directors can share experiences and discuss progress; and government initiatives to institutionalize the process of review and reform linked with strategic planning.
Key Issues

The paper deals with many detailed issues relating to the policy framework in which African management development institutions (MDIs) operate. This summary covers some of the general, key issues which emerged during the seminar:

**Potential role of the MDIs**

In the future, African MDIs will need to improve their capacity to engage in consultancy and research, to complement their traditional training role. This is necessary to increase the MDIs' understanding of their clients' needs and problems, and to provide a more rigorous basis for their training models. It is also important that the MDIs respond more effectively to the needs of business executives and enterprises given the growing importance of the private sector in African development strategies. Management training will continue to be very important, but with greater attention given to training tailor-made to fit the needs of particular clients, and to reach beyond specific skills building to organizational improvement goals. African MDIs need to become more directly involved in management improvement activities directly related to national reform efforts. A special area of contribution would be in the area of public policy formulation, by providing consultancy and training services in policy analysis. This should emphasize policy design as well as implementation, and the management of the policy formulation process. It is also important both in this discipline and their broader management role, that African MDIs go beyond their more traditional concentration on human resource development and finance, and tackle some of the complex problems concerned with the institutional frameworks needed to support economic reform, the relationships among different economic sectors both public and private, and the problems of centralized, decentralized, and community level management of the development process.

**Conditions for fulfilling that role**

African MDIs' failure to fulfill their potential role is due to a variety of reasons. Chief among them are a lack of flexible funding for program development and research, a somewhat static clientele, lack of freedom to develop the agenda of priorities, and problems in attracting and retaining faculty of the calibre required to improve the profile and contribution of the institutions. If African MDIs are to respond to their emerging roles effectively, they will need greater flexibility in their access to and control of resources, in their relationship with their market, and in their determination of priorities and strategies. In addition, the MDIs will need a special type of leadership: one that inspires dedication to self-reliance in place of traditional dependence on outside expertise and resources; a determination to generate valid models of management effectiveness based on African conditions; and the imagination and energy to break away from routine supply-driven training, and to bring the services of the institutions closer to the needs and problems of their clients.

**Relationship between MDIs and African leadership**

If African MDIs are to support the development and implementation of development policy, the institutions need effective communications with senior government managers. At the core is the relationship between the MDI head and the most senior official to whom he reports. This person should not only be closely involved in the MDI's strategic planning, but should also help to build communication links with other key policy officials, and help the MDI participate in important debates and forums concerned with reform. The Senior MDI staff need to do everything possible to
keep themselves informed of the government's development priorities and strategies, so that their involvement with senior officials demonstrates the institution's commitment and currency of information. Further, the MDIs need to take some appropriate initiatives to demonstrate that they have something positive to offer. This may take the form of written think-pieces on important development topics, conferences held on topical issues, data gathering, and the like. "Appropriate" implies a sensitivity to ways in which commitment and competence can be demonstrated without arrogance or unwarranted assumptions concerning the MDI's perceived role in the country. Much testing of the boundaries can be done through informal contact, which can be as valuable as formal communication. One of the most important of all challenges, both to the MDI heads and government officials, is to increase government willingness to use MDI experts in place of foreign technical assistance personnel in the execution of development projects. This requires strong commitment from the policymakers, and demonstration of competence from the MDIs.

**Governance of the MDIs**

Two over-riding concerns should drive the governance and management of African MDIs. First, the mechanisms for governance, preferably through a board or governing body rather than direct ministry control, should be fully representative of the clients and important stakeholders of the MDI. A properly constituted board should help align the orientation and activities of the institution to its market. There should be a balance in representation between public and private sector, and among government, agencies, enterprises, and employers' associations. Second, the members of the governing bodies should be selected not only for their stake in the MDI's outputs, but also for their positive interest in helping to solve the problems of the institution's long term development. While it is healthy that the board audit the institution's performance and financial discipline, the board must avoid becoming a purely bureaucratic layer that adds to the MDIs problems. The members should identify closely with the institution's future success, and build a level of supportive trust with the Director. They should maximize delegation of responsibility wherever possible to the MDI management, and offer positive assistance in long-term strategic planning, marketing and client outreach, identifying sources of income and funding, and resolving human resource problems within the institution. Where necessary, the board should take the lead in helping to improve the policy framework in which the MDI operates, arguing for the removal of constraints, and opening opportunities for constructive dialogue with government. African MDIs need champions to help support their cause if they are to meet future expectations. The board can play an important role where it includes influential and experienced managers from the public sector, commerce and industry.

**Focus on faculty development and management**

The success of MDIs is to a large degree a function of the quality and motivation of their faculty. Quality involves a number of things. Among these are the capacity to work effectively with a wide range of clients and to develop credibility with executives and senior managers; the capacity to move beyond the routine classroom training role to work directly on problems in the clients' organizations; the capacity to broaden the MDI's market; and the capacity to generate theory from practice concerning the factors which produce effective management and organizational performance in an African context. MDIs find it difficult to attract faculty of the right caliber, and often have to train young graduates with the help of donor-funded overseas fellowships. Once a trainer or consultant reaches an advanced level, the institution has to struggle to retain the person because the career opportunities and earning potential are limited. This is partly a reflection of economic conditions in most African countries that have stimulated a brain drain of professional
skills. In the case of many African MDIs the situation is more directly a result of civil service salary and career structures. Talented African trainers find more attractive prospects in private sector or even parastatal organizations, in their own consulting businesses, and in assignments for international agencies.

The board and management of African MDIs therefore face a dual priority: to provide development programs that create the faculty skills and experience needed to strengthen the image, relevance, and contribution of the institution; and to create the conditions and incentives that will attract and retain high caliber faculty. In terms of the faculty development programs, board and management action involves careful assessment of skills needs directly relevant to the institution's strategic plan, and great care in the selection of outside training. It has been found, for instance, that many overseas fellowship programs are of only vague relevance and lead to the institution offering training driven by models and concepts that do not fit the African management reality. Shorter training courses offered by donors, are often duplicative or do not build on one another in a systematic way. Better models are required to plan and design faculty development, and special strategies are needed to increase the number of effective women faculty.

Improving the incentive structures will be difficult, and therefore requires the highest policy level support. It is a special responsibility of the board to harness such support based on feasible strategies. No one formula will suit every MDI. In general terms, however, the goal is to ensure that recruitment selection and promotions are based on merit rather than influence. Efforts need to be made to provide salary and career opportunities that can compete with other attractive employers. This will be difficult within rigid civil service structures. Therefore the board needs to identify and negotiate with the government strategies for building salary and career structures on the earnings of the MDIs, which in turn places a strong emphasis on running MDIs as profitable enterprises. Many MDIs have already found that additional income can be generated through consultancy assignments, and are sharing the earnings with faculty. This formula will not suit all MDIs. Some MDIs are placing a limit on their regular faculty establishment, and are employing part-time consultants, experienced managers from industry, commerce, and the public sector, who help raise the credibility of the MDI and who can generate sufficient income to cover their own fees. There are many other creative possibilities. The key is that the MDI boards focus on this issue as a priority, and that the directors of the MDIs actively use their network contacts to exchange ideas.

**Financial structure of the MDIs**

Much of what has been said above underlines the importance of MDIs gaining greater control over their own financial affairs. Ideally, MDIs should be able to base the fees for their services on the real economic costs of providing these services. Furthermore they should be able to cover the costs of training and consultancy from the fees charged for such services, and where the market is willing to respond, generate additional income to cover the costs of essential research and development. In reality, few if any institutions have yet attained such goals. There is still strong dependence on government subventions or donor money to fund participation, and little research and development is carried out outside of donor-funded projects. However, the MDIs, their boards, and the policymakers responsible for the MDIs need a strategy and plan to move towards goals of financial self-reliance, whereby MDIs, by responding effectively to the needs of their clients, can be sustained on a progressively expanding basis, by fees earned in the market-place. For those MDIs which operate on a non-fee basis within the civil service structure, thought needs to be given to alternative financial mechanisms, which provide budgets directly to public agency executives, who then in turn make demands for training and other services on the MDIs. The MDIs would retain fees earned rather than returning them to the Treasury. This model will produce better incentives for
responding to client needs, and will help those MDIs diversify their funding sources by expanding their services to other sectors of the economy.

Responsibility for taking initiatives for reform

Many policymakers are open to ideas on how to improve the performance of their MDIs, and for increasing the partnership between government and the MDIs in improving the quality of management and implementing national development plans. The responsibility is that of the MDIs to demonstrate to government that their institutions are able to play a more significant role responsive to priority needs, offering high caliber programs and services that senior managers can take seriously. In addition, MDI directors need to model effective financial management, planning, and administration in the running of their own institutions to earn the confidence of policymakers and the willingness to grant the institutions greater levels of autonomy. This requires the institutions to engage in a thorough process of strategic planning rooted in a candid evaluation of their programs and organizational effectiveness, an improved approach to client development and needs analysis, and programs which link their own resources realistically to national priorities. Reform of the policy environment in which MDIs operate should go hand-in-hand with measures to strengthen the institutions rather than being seen as a strict prerequisite for such strengthening. The directors, with the help of their boards, should take the initiative.
1

Introduction

Management Development Institutions (MDIs) in Sub-Saharan Africa have come under increased scrutiny with the renewed focus on indigenous human resource development and institution strengthening on the continent. Potentially, MDIs in Africa have an important role to play in building local management and organizational capacity. More particularly, they can help improve the performance of the civil service and public enterprises, strengthen sector policy, program, and project management, and support the growth of the private sector. MDIs should also be valuable partners to those responsible for the reform efforts taking place in many African countries. "The magnitude and complexity of the management of the reform programs...has two major implications for management and management development. The first is that...managerial expertise will have to be institutionalized within government ministries, as well as within parastatal and private sector enterprises. The second implication is that the essential training of this vastly expanded number of African managers can no longer be conducted in an ad-hoc fashion, and it can no longer be provided primarily outside the continent" (Habte). The challenge for Africa's MDIs has never been greater.

There have been two decades or more of assistance provided to African MDIs by governments, outside foundations, partner institutions in the developed world, and donor funded programs. However, the progress of African MDIs has been disappointing. Few have reached any level of excellence. Few are regarded seriously by policymakers as significant players in important reform programs despite the emphasis on improving African management and using local expertise to do so. Most African MDIs are still trapped in their traditional role of offering standard skills training to mid- and low-level managers in the civil service and state-run agencies and enterprises. When African governments seek management specialists to participate in the design and implementation of programs of reform, the tendency is still to look outside the continent for expertise. There are some institutions that have effectively absorbed years of assistance, and are making promising progress. But even the stronger MDIs are still very dependent on outside assistance, and experience significant obstacles and constraints to further progress.

The disappointing records of the MDIs is exacerbated by the deteriorating condition of African economies. A study by the African Association of Public Administration & Management on the impact of economic conditions on the MDIs shows that despite the increased need for management training, "subscription for regular programs had declined" and "overall financial resources available to the institutions had declined considerably; little or no money was made available for capital expansion or even for the regular maintenance of buildings and equipment... (In addition) there was an exodus of the best talents from MDIs to other institutions...with inflation running at 50% per annum in some countries, but salaries remaining stagnant" (Mutahaba). The World Bank experience is similar: "The spending by governments on management training, out of their own budgets, is negligible...almost all training is financed with donor resources" (Habte).

In addition to these deteriorating conditions, many African MDIs face constraints within their operating environment. As is often the case with African institutions, an important part of the problem (and source for solutions) lies in the policy framework in which the MDIs operate. This is not surprising. African MDIs vary in their statutory or legal status, ranging from those that are integral parts of the national civil service, to those that are regional NGOs. Nevertheless most African MDIs were created by governments, who remain their most important clients and are involved in their regulation, through direct reporting channels or through representation on their governing boards. It is generally true, that those institutions directly managed by governments face
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more policy constraints than the semi-autonomous institutions. It is also true that MDIs' policy environments vary according to the outlook and practices of individual countries. Some authorities are more aware of and responsive than others to policy constraints facing their MDIs. Not all MDIs face exactly the same categories of problems, although there are some common patterns. In general, it is safe to say that policy reform is a factor in the future progress of every African MDI, although for some it is a key prerequisite to progress, and for others, an important enabling condition.

Background on the UNIDEL Program and the Origins of the Seminar

The seminar which produced this report was held under the UNDP/EDI/LO Program to Strengthen African Training Institutions, known by the acronym UNEDIL. This program, launched in late November 1987, is an effort to promote self-reliance through the collaboration of 16 of Africa's leading MDIs (Annex A). The institutions combine their experience and talents in a network to build capacities and solve common problems. The program is a complementary approach to more traditional reliance on outside assistance, especially expatriate technical assistance and overseas fellowships. UNEDIL operates as a collection of interlinked projects in areas prioritized by the directors of the participating MDIs. These projects include strengthening the management, strategic planning, marketing, and administration of the institutions; improving the skills of faculty in training, consulting and research; and developing programs, management models, and cases and other teaching materials based on African needs and conditions. All activities in the program are designed, implemented, and evaluated by teams of African experts drawn from the participating institutions and the broader network of African resources. In addition to the core funding provided by the United Nations Development Programme, UNEDIL is also supported by a consortium of donor agencies which include the Commonwealth Secretariat, the Canadian International Development Agency, the University of Alberta, the Netherlands Government, the Swedish International Development Agency, and the United States Agency for International Development.

When the priorities for the program were determined, the directors of the Anglophone MDIs gave great importance to a seminar which would create a forum for directors and their policymakers to explore ways to improve the policy environment in which the institutions operate. The seminar was designed and managed by a Task Group of Directors chaired by J. Kimura, Director of the Kenya Institute of Administration, and included S. Baholo, Director of the Institute of Development Management in Lesotho; K. Mutukwa, Director General of the Eastern & Southern African Management Institute; and Mr. T. Wereko, Acting Director of the Ghana Institute for Management & Public Administration. The Task Group was supported by R. Murapa, Field Project Manager of UNEDIL, and J. Wallace from the International Labour Organization. The meeting, hosted by the Government of Lesotho, was attended by policymakers from the Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Nigeria, Swaziland, Tanzania, and Zimbabwe, as well as representatives from the World Bank and Economic Development Institute, the International Labour Organization, the Canadian International Development Agency, the Swedish International Development Agency, the African Association of Public Administration & Management, and the National Institute of Public Administration of Malaysia whose attendance was funded by the Commonwealth Secretariat. A full list is given in Annex B.

Purpose and Organization of This Report

This report presents some of the most significant policy issues facing MDIs in Anglophone Africa, as they were debated in the seminar held in September, 1989, in Lesotho. The seminar brought together the directors of some of Africa's most important MDIs, and policymakers and
officials that are directly responsible for their governance and regulation. The aim was to identify those factors in the MDIs' policy environments that most directly influence their future growth and prospects, and to explore the scope for policy reform. Some of the factors discussed in this report equally affect the MDIs in Francophone Africa and among the Portuguese-speaking African countries, although there may be some factors distinct to the different regions. Future similar gatherings of MDI directors and policymakers for the other language groups, will determine how far the findings of this report can be generalized across the continent.

The report does not provide a detailed account of the seminar itself. Rather, the aim of this report is to present the issues and problems that emerged from the seminar, as themes and patterns which may interest readers concerned with the strengthening of training institutions in Africa. There have been few comprehensive studies of this topic across the region. Although the views captured in this report fall short of rigorous research, the sample of MDIs and countries represented at the seminar was varied and wide enough to justify some broad generalizations that are likely to hold true in most situations. It is also true that individual political and administrative structures in different African countries will produce special problems, and for that matter, special solutions. Although most of the views and experiences during the seminar were expressed in the context of individual countries (or sub-regions) and institutions, it is not the purpose of this report to catalogue the specific problems experienced by identified institutions or governments. Rather, the report is concerned with broader generalizations justified by the consensus expressed by the seminar participants. On a few occasions examples of reform involving specific countries or institutions, will be briefly presented as illustrations.

The sources of information and views contained in this report come from three seminar sources: papers presented by directors and policymakers (the working papers presented at the seminar are listed in Annex D); views expressed during plenary discussions which followed most of the presentations; and reports of smaller group discussions.

Overview of the Nature and Significance of the Policy Issues

The policy issues fall into a number of areas which will be outlined below, and then discussed in greater detail in the remainder of the report.

Relations between the MDI and the policy structures

As governments constitute the key clients of MDIs, their relationship with the policy managers is very important for the relevance of the MDI's contributions and its access to opportunities. The relationship also influences the degree of autonomy the MDI enjoys in the management of its own affairs. The fortunes of an MDI are strongly influenced by the understanding, the expectations, and the commitment towards the MDI at the policy maker level. This is partly a function of the structural relationship, but is also influenced by interpersonal relationships, and by competence of both the MDI director and policymakers. Also important is the overall climate and attitudes towards management performance and management improvement that exist within ministries and public agencies.

The mandates that govern the MDI's role and operations

Mandates define what the institution is expected to accomplish, how it should operate, and its rights and obligations. An appropriate mandate does not ensure institutional effectiveness, and a mandate with flaws doesn't automatically predict ineffectiveness. However many problems that MDIs experience can be traced back to a lack of clarity and gaps in the mandates, and features of the
mandates that are out of date. The revision of a mandate may be very important in giving an MDI a new lease of life, or in facilitating opening a new line of business.

**Degree of autonomy in staff management**

The quality of the MDIs' contribution depends upon their capacity to attract and retain high quality faculty and administrators. The director of an MDI is held accountable for the performance of his institution, and it is vital that he be able to recruit, promote, select, and discipline based on objective performance criteria. Given the shortage of and competition within Africa for skilled resources, it is also important that MDI directors are able to create incentives that will justify investment in faculty skills development. African organizations in general often face difficulties in institutionalizing the philosophy and processes of meritocracy. MDIs have a special responsibility to reflect the rational and performance based methods of human resource management that they teach, in the way they manage their own people. In part, this is an issue of the degree of autonomy the director of the MDI enjoys in staff management. For those MDIs which operate as a branch of government, the use of objective criteria to drive human resource management decisions is likely to be increased if these criteria are specifically contained within the operating procedures of the governing board.

**Degree of autonomy in financial management**

Access to funds and the flexibility with which they are managed determines many aspects of an MDI's existence: the capacity to carry out essential research and development, build new programs, reach out to new markets, preserve the quality of its infrastructure and supporting services, and provide incentives to stimulate and retain excellent performers. The issue of financial autonomy hinges on the view of MDIs as enterprises capable of responding rapidly and effectively to changing conditions and opportunities, demonstrating their success not only in terms of stated objectives, but also business results. This issue is specially relevant in Africa today as more and more governments grapple with measures to reduce the protection surrounding public agencies, and increase their financial accountability.

**Measuring the performance of MDIs**

At the heart of policy reform is the question of balance between responsibility and freedom, and the degree of autonomy that should accompany responsibility. In some cases the question of balance is complicated by ideology and precedent. There are political systems that believe strongly that accountability and performance are best ensured through unambiguous policy control exercised in the nation's interests. Other more pragmatic political systems are hampered in degrees of autonomy they can hand down because of the implications (and inevitable claims) that may come from other parts of the public sector. Given the current reform movement in Africa, while ideologies and problems of precedent differ, few governments take a position at the extreme of these issues. Most governments are convinced that some degree of autonomy must accompany accountability; and that institutions maintained on public funds to fulfill a national mandate require fulfill some degree of governance. Getting the right balance within each political system is the tricky task. Whatever the differences may be, policymakers are increasingly interested in more objective and systematic ways of measuring the performance of public funded agencies, including MDIs. Progressive MDI directors see systematic performance measurement as a boon, not only in increasing the likelihood of greater autonomy, but as the starting point for more effective strategic planning and dialogue with policymakers about their institutions future role.
The process of bringing about policy reform

Even where consensus exists on the need for policy reform, bringing it about raises fresh questions and problems. Some of these include: Who should take the initiative? Should a regular review and change process be institutionalized? How should problems of precedence be handled? Where does the authority lie to carry out the reform and whose support will be needed? Directors and policymakers participating in the seminar formed country teams (or institutional teams in the case of regional institutions) and produced plans for policy reform. Although this report will not cover the specific details of each plan, some generalizations can be made about the processes envisaged and the prospects for reform.
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Relations between the MDIs and the Policy Level

Variations in Reporting Structure

Although there are many variations in the way MDIs are governed, there are some broad categories (drawn loosely from Mwanahiba):

First, there are national institutions established at independence (or inherited and reshaped from colonial regimes), primarily with the purpose of training Africans to take over from expatriates and settlers in managing the government and public sector. These institutions, generally known as national institutions of public administration (or NIPAs) were almost always created by legislation, with a reporting relationship directly to a central civil service department, either personnel management in a ministry of labor/public service, or the office of the head of the civil service. Most NIPAs in Anglophone Africa have progressed slowly and still work within a somewhat narrow framework. A few have grown and broadened their roles to include activities other than formal training (especially consultancy services), as well as private sector clients. This trend has not always been matched by a change in the direct reporting structure.

The second broad category contains something of a blend, institutions that were established by and are accountable to governments, but which report to a board of directors or governors. Some, like the Management Services Board in Zambia, were created at the outset as parastatal with a broader mandate to improve the caliber of management in sectors including but broader than the civil service. There are also some NIPAs whose role has grown to the point where the government has delegated direct responsibility to a board that represents diverse interests in the economy, including parastatals and state enterprises, and employers' federations. (In some cases the creation of a board simply follows a broader government trend in the management of public agencies). These institutions frequently enjoy somewhat greater autonomy in certain areas, especially product planning, program design, and marketing. Whatever the case, the government occupies a strong position on these boards, through chairmanship, membership, and defined government powers, and maintain important influence in the oversight of the MDIs affairs. There is also a small group of MDIs contained within the structure of the national university, including the Sierra Leonian Institute of Public Administration and Management, the Ghana School of Administration, and the Liberian Institute of Public Administration.

The third category covers a small group of specialized MDIs established to serve the needs of a particular sector or grouping of enterprises, such as ZIM, (the ZIMCO Institute of Management) which serves, and is part of the state enterprise Zambian Industrial and Mining Corporation. ZIM has a direct reporting relationship to a board of ZIMCO management, and only indirectly to the responsible ministry.

Fourth, there are some small private national management institutes in Anglophone Africa (such as the Institutes of Management in Kenya, Mauritius, and Zimbabwe). These institutes have their roots in the business community and associations of management. In some cases their origins go back to the settler community prior to independence.

An important group are the small number of regional MDIs. These do not form a category as such because the status and structure of each is somewhat unique. One or two are private companies registered under the companies' act (such as the Mananga Agricultural Management Center (MAMC), a regional institution based in Swaziland). Others are intergovernmental organizations with relatively high degrees of autonomy, operating under a board of governors.
These include the Pan African Institute for Development (PAID), perhaps the only genuinely bilingual MDI which operates in all subregions of Africa; the Eastern & Southern African Management Institute (ESAMI); and the Institute of Development Management, which is based in Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland (IDM-BLS), but plays a broader role within the SADCC region. However, each of these institutions has its own structural characteristics. IDM-BLS, for example, is registered as a private company, but has a board with representatives from the three founding governments, and receives a subvention from these governments. ESAMI has a number of governmental members, and the status of the institution is enshrined in legislation in a number of member countries. Yet despite their relatively autonomous status compared to national MDIs, these regional organizations are still closely monitored by government representatives on their boards.

The final category are not strictly MDIs, but are added to this list for sake of completeness, because to some extent they are in the same business as MDIs. These are the management and administration faculties or centers at many African universities (such as the Faculty of Commerce and Management at the University of Dar-es-Salaam, the Management Center at the Polytechnic which is part of the University of Malawi, and the School of Administration at the University of Mauritius). These are administered as part of the university structure, and subject to the same freedoms and restrictions as the universities themselves.

Policymakers' Basic Stance on MDI Oversight

A common starting point for most policymakers is that MDIs created directly by government to fulfill a nationhood-building mandate must accept that "there is a proprietary relationship between Government and these MDIs. Governments are entitled to exercise a regulatory responsibility over MDIs...and would like to be assured that they get value for the monies they invest in these institutions" (Sai). Whatever change may take place in the level of a national MDI's autonomy, the "linkage with a Ministry should remain because it is a way in which public funds utilized by (the MDI) can be accountable" (Agere). This may present few problems if the overall policy framework is supportive and effective. While policymakers differ on details, there is a general willingness to consider increased autonomy within an overall framework of governance. Attitudes depend a great deal on the political climate in the country for decentralized responsibility, the track record and reputation of the MDI, and the supportiveness of the relationship between the MDI management and policy managers. The gap between MDI aspirations for greater autonomy, and policymakers' willingness to grant it, is sometimes not materially great. Nevertheless some continuing tension and difference of outlook is inevitable. There is a dialectic between two very legitimate sets of concerns: on the one hand accountability for and control of the use of scarce government resources; on the other, a growing realization that institutional development and effectiveness require scope for management enterprise and initiative. A prominent African constitutional lawyer summed it up: "What seems to have lagged behind is the acceptance by governments that these institutions can work well without being manned and controlled by government officials" (Zamchiya). Some policymakers may reasonably respond: "We wait to be convinced."

Issues and Problems in the Policy Framework

Most African governments have taken steps to ensure that there is some policy framework within which their MDIs should operate, but getting it right is notoriously difficult. The policy framework reflects the mechanics of the governmental: a hierarchical chain and inter-ministerial processes. If there are a few weak links in the chain at critical points, the process cannot be saved by the stronger links. Agere outlines the essential links in this "policy chain":

(a) The statement of a management training policy at the highest level of government;
(b) The establishment of an agency within government (a ministry or a commission) with responsibility to ensure that the policy is carried out;

(c) The establishment of responsibility among all other government agencies to set standards for management performance, and to effectively utilize management training;

(d) The establishment of mechanisms in government to provide the resources needed to implement the management training policy;

(e) The establishment of institutions (MDIs) with effective governance and review processes, to implement this policy;

(f) The provision of sufficient enabling factors to ensure that the MDIs are able to effectively analyze needs, design and deliver training based on that analysis at a high and relevant standard, and evaluate the impact of that training and make changes where necessary.

Many of the problems that may exist in this chain have important policy implications. They may be the result of weak policy formulation. They may reflect poor design in the structures or processes set up to implement the policy. Or they may involve practical issues (sometimes ad hominem or political) that have to be addressed at the policy level. This section describes some of the most important problems identified by presenters and participants during the seminar. There is no implication that every African MDI experiences all or most of these problems. In fact there are African governments that have attended to many of the issues. However, where problems in the "policy chain" do exist, they are likely to feature in the items discussed below.

Selection of officials in the structure

There are usually three key levels in the structure: the government manager and staff in the ministry or office responsible for government oversight; the members of a council or governing body (this level is sometimes missing); and the Director of the MDI and his management team. How well the system works depends on the caliber of the individuals selected to fill these positions. Problems begin when "the criteria for the appointment...are either not spelt out, or are not recognizable apart from mere deduction" (Agere). This, together with political pressures may result in a board that is "a dumping ground of failed administrators and politicians" (Agere). Even where political pressures are controlled, selection is complicated as there are probably few civil servants with a knowledge of, or even interest in, the role, contributions, and problems of a training institute. Civil service experience often reinforces the approach of containment (of activities and costs) of public agencies. The atmosphere created by such an outlook does not encourage attention to broader debate on current and evolving management training issues, and the role of the MDI. Unhappily some MDI directors are appointed without adequate experience or qualifications for the job, and this adds to the complication of the interaction between the MDI and the policy levels.

Lack of continuity

It is difficult to establish and retain a common understanding of an MDI's purpose, and ensure effective working and review relationships, when the incumbents (both among policymakers and MDI directors) change as frequently as they do in many African countries.

Remoteness within the policy structure

Where policy has been developed at the highest levels, and there is a long chain of command, the MDI may have "no access to the upper level management in government. (And when) the
policymakers to whom they are answerable are not known to identify with them...before their concerns reach the (top management), often they are watered down and diluted, or disregarded" (Pitso).

**Lines of reporting**

For those MDIs managed directly by the civil service, which part of the civil service may be important. Sai favors the arrangement which he calls an "extra ministerial organization" (EMO), locating the MDI outside of any specific ministry, and preferably "closest to the highest corridors of policy" (Sai). This may be the cabinet or head of state's office. This arrangement helps the MDI focus on its cross sectoral role without undue dominance or demands from a parent ministry. It also enables the MDI to reflect and act upon expectations at a high policy level. However, Sai points to some dangers in this arrangement, especially the possibility that such a powerful authority could "politicize the MDI and undermine its professional posture" (Sai). Nonetheless, it has been observed that some of the national institutions that have made the most rapid progress, are those that report to the highest levels of government.

**Rigidity of financial resource management within the government**

In some cases, although the MDI falls under the Ministry of Public Service or Cabinet Office, important management training initiatives requiring resources must be approved by the Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning, or some other financial management agency. These procedures often lead to long delays and even rejection, especially as management training finds it hard to compete for scarce resources. This is a special problem in the case of national MDIs which must transfer all revenues to the Treasury, and are not permitted to receive funds directly from outside donor agencies. Such institutions are totally dependent on the financial decision-making processes in government, and the commitment and advocacy skills of their government manager.

**Procedures for the appointment of MDI staff**

The appointment of faculty at the MDI is often controlled by a body like the Public Service Commission. When the procedures do not work effectively, this results in unqualified appointments, often transfers of officials with no training background and questionable management track record, those who "have failed to perform well in their previous positions in the Public Service" (Agere). There are also often long delays in filling important vacancies, which hampers the MDIs operations, leads to missed opportunities, and harms the institution's image with clients.

**Regulations regarding remuneration levels**

In many cases, faculty salaries and grading prospects are pegged to civil service regulations. Directors find it difficult to attract or retain the caliber of faculty required to implement the institution's mandate, carry out effective needs analysis, design training suitable for senior managers, widen the MDI's client network, and make an effective contribution to policy formulation. This problem will be discussed in greater detail later, but it is important to describe here the two crippling "double-binds" that the management of the MDI face. First, the profile and contribution of the MDI depends more than anything else on its reputation among senior government managers. Would they attend training at the institute? Do they regard the MDI as a natural partner in the development of policy or reform programs? In many countries the local MDI
is viewed as a place to send lower, or at best, mid-level managers for routine skills training. It is not regarded as a major resource to the top managers, regardless of publicity statements or mandates. It is common to hear a senior public official say: "Why should I attend a program there? What do those young men have to teach me?" And yet it is the government's own remuneration and grading policies which contribute to the malaise. The second "double-bind" is that while the salary and career incentives remain unattractive, the very success of a faculty skills development program will result in turnover. For example, many MDI directors report that faculty on overseas fellowships do not return, or leave shortly afterwards for better prospects elsewhere.

Preferences for external training and experts

Public officials often prefer to attend training out of the country, without much enquiry about the availability of such training at home. This may be linked to the reputation of the local MDI, but it may also be linked to prestige, opportunities to obtain foreign exchange, or "attitudes of pure adventure" (Pitso). The problem is even more serious when officials show a preference for selecting foreign management consultants and trainers to design and implement projects or programs of reform, even where suitable local experts are available. In some cases, this may be a result of "external credit-specific conditionalities which our governments have yet to do something about", or "the absence of a deliberate policy on the part of our governments in giving the first chance to our MDIs to take on assignments relating to national policy planning and development programming" (Sai). It is, of course, another issue where the expertise is genuinely not available locally.

Involvement of MDIs in policy reform/project planning

MDIs are sometimes expected to help implement important policy or program initiatives, with little or no involvement at the planning stage. The result may be poorly designed management objectives, inadequate resourcing, or uneven commitment to the role the MDI will play. It is also often the case that planning and negotiation processes requires management skills that officials may lack. Agere gives the example of officials "that were made to purchase obsolete equipment, drugs, and technologies because the staff who negotiated the deal did not have the know-how and skills of negotiation" (Agere). He lists a range of management skills essential for development planning and design, that government managers often lack: "development administration in the context of growth..., the impact of international systems on development and management, choice of technology and transfer policies, human resource management strategies,...entrepreneurship, manpower planning, training and development" (Agere). There was a consensus among directors and policymakers that MDIs should play a greater, direct, and early role in assisting the formulation of policy and the planning of important programs and projects. This could be done through a number of methods:

- Representation on task forces and committees working on policy reform or program design;
- Representation by MDI senior staff on the boards of important national development agencies;
- Direct consultation of the MDI by government on specialized aspects of policy reform or program design in which the MDI has expertise;
- Specific tasks for the MDI to assist the policy analysis and formulation process, such as data gathering and research; and in specific tasks of program design such as feasibility-testing;
- Use of the MDI to test public views and build community commitment to policy change or new programs;
• Constant informal communication and dialogue between the MDI director and other key faculty, with key policy officials and development managers.

While there is general agreement that the MDI management should be proactive and enterprising in securing this role for the institution in policy formulation, "there is also the question of the political will to get the MDIs involved in this way. It is not just a question of the MDI's capacity or the theoretical advisability of their playing this role. The issue lies in the hands of the persons in power. Do they want to solicit and use advice?" (Mbandi).

**Duplication and overlap of roles among MDIs**

Important policy issues arise when two or more MDIs play roles, or carry out activities, that compete, duplicate, or in some way cause friction. This may happen within a country, involving national institutions. It may occur between a national institution and a regional institution operating within that national institution's market. And finally, it may be a problem between two regional institutions that cover some of the same territory. In the most complex cases, some aspects of all three situations may be present. The simplest situation to handle involves reviewing the mandates of two duplicating national institutions. Even where the practices and ambitions, rather than the mandates, are not the root cause, reviewing and tightening the mandates may be an effective tool for rationalizing the MDIs activities and better utilizing scarce resources.

Where one or more of the competing partners is a regional MDI, the problems of resolving the dispute is much greater. Each mandate taken on its own may be perfectly unambiguous and reasonable. The duplication may occur because different authorities were involved in developing the mandates. Secondly, one or both of the institutions may have developed quite legitimately since the mandates were originally drafted, and have expanded beyond their original mandates. Pulling one or the other back to the original mandates could be a retrograde action. Where duplication between regional and national institutions (or between regional institutions) occurs, questions of national pride arise also, and the situation may become quickly politicized. It is no surprise that problems which cross national boundaries are seldom confronted successfully. As a result, some long-term problems of duplication and friction have yet to be resolved. In some cases, the attitudes have hardened to the point where the actual duplication is difficult for the outside observer to identify, especially given the enormous demand for management training and the relative scarcity of training resources. Some situations are a matter of disputed territory, with all sides able to refer to policy mandates or demand as justification for their own strategies. It is important that the type of policy intervention accurately matches the problem, and in some cases improving relationships is the appropriate remedy. There is much to be said for the benefits of healthy competition and diversity in maintaining high standards. Clear criteria need to be set to identify the kind of "duplication" that is dysfunctional.

A complex illustration is pointed out by Mwanahiba: the MDIs that offer degree programs in the tradition of universities. It has been a trend in Africa over the last decade or more to place great weight on diplomas and other forms of certification. In fact access to employment often makes this essential. It is no surprise that some MDIs have joined this trend. Whether MDIs running degree programs, (including MBAs and MPAs) represents duplication of mandates and efforts, simply meets an existing gap, and whether such programs are effectively credentialed, cannot be resolved in this report. But the trend and its implication for the relationship between MDIs and universities in the field of management and administration, deserves some policy attention.

**Lack of commitment to training and management standards in government**

Although the government may have created a policy on management training, a parent ministry or office, a structure, and institutions to implement this is seldom enough. It is commonplace, not
only in Africa, for training to be viewed as a perfunctory or token activity, or a perk or reward to staff. Despite the widespread acknowledgement of the importance of management improvement to Africa's economic revival, there remains the "nagging question concerning the real demand for the training and consultancy services offered by African MDIs. While we know that the need for these services is there, we have not yet succeeded in translating it into demand" (Habte p. 11). Attitudes towards the quality of management and efforts to improve management within the various sector ministries and public agencies, are as important as all of the factors described above and are equally the concern of the policymaker. In practice, the definition of management training needs and the selection of participants are often regarded as routine tasks delegated to poorly trained staff low in the hierarchy. The value of management training is often diluted by careless or politically influenced management appointments of candidates lacking effective management skills and attributes. Often, little is done to reinforce or transfer the benefits from management training back to the work place. If anything, the manager returning from training faces resistance to change. The right policy framework for management training must be accompanied by respect for standards in management selection and effective needs analysis and participant selection. Government should be committed to using the MDI not simply as a provider of training courses, but as a partner in bringing about management and organizational improvement. This means encouraging the MDI to carry out consultancy and research assignments, and developing special training programs tailored to the needs of groups of managers and diagnosed organizational problems. While policy proclamations may help to set the framework for such conditions, they will not be sufficient. The task requires active advocacy and standard-setting by senior policymakers themselves.
MDI Expectations for Policy-Level Support: The Case of Ghana

MDIs are concerned with the responsiveness and attitude of their policymakers in a number of ways: government willingness to involve their MDIs in the development of policies and in the implementation of programs of reform; willingness to use MDI staff in preference to foreign consultants; willingness to free up resources that are essential to the MDIs' development; seriousness in using the services of the MDIs to bring about improvements in management and organizational performance; openness to reviewing mandates and increasing areas of autonomy; and the quality of the routine contact and the willingness of policymakers to address problems and requests quickly. The experience of MDIs differs considerably. Some find their policymakers remote, disinterested, or generally suspicious. They carry out their training role without a strong sense of useful impact. They struggle to have problems addressed. And a serious policy review concerned with role or resources seems, at best, a distant likelihood.

By contrast, some MDIs enjoy a close and supportive relationship with their policy level. The case of Ghana provides an important example of the constructive relationship. When Ghana launched its Economic Recovery Program (ERP) in 1983, followed by a second ERP and two Structural Adjustment Programs, the national MDIs (especially the Ghana Institute of Management & Public Administration, the Management Development & Productivity Institute, and the School of Administration) played a full role in the reform process. The MDIs provided chairmanship or membership of most of the task forces and committees that were responsible for the reform programs. Not only were the MDIs integrated into program, but the program in turn included a review and reform of the MDIs themselves as part of the effort to strengthen national manpower capacity.

Factors that favor supportive relationships between the MDIs and the policy level

In addition to attending to problems in the "policy chain", what conditions are likely to produce this kind of collaborative relationship? As a senior policy maker directly involved in the Ghana experience, Sai's views are especially pertinent. He lists the following important factors:

(a) Areas for confusion or ambiguity should be reduced through shared understanding of a clear mandate, and clear reporting relationships.

(b) The overall style and image of the MDI will have an important influence on policy makers' receptivity to MDIs problems and aspirations. He summarizes these as "a respectable PR posture...that is sensitive and responsive to all its statutory obligations towards Government...(adopting) a flexible conciliatory posture...cost-conscious...(seeing) themselves as partners with government in the management improvement process." Sai contrasts this to MDIs that seem insensitive to Government positions on important issues, that "adopt a confrontational stance...are negligent (of their cost-consciousness responsibility) leaving their accounts...unaudited for years...aloof ivory towers."

(c) The MDI's program profile can also inspire Government confidence: the balance between short and long programs; among training, consulting, and research activities; and the flexibility and responsiveness of the MDI's services to changing policy and manpower needs.

(d) While many Governments have displayed some tendency to use foreign consultants rather than their own indigenous experts from local institutions, Sai points out that this is may not be a deliberate
government policy. It may result from donor pressures, or from the lack of an affirmative policy to utilize local experts. In any event, Sai stresses that "such collaboration must not be taken for granted", and depends on the MDI displaying the competence necessary to build government confidence that the MDI is qualified to participate in important policy-shaping and reform activities.

(e) MDIs need to focus on the needs of all their key clients, and move away from their traditional sole focus on the civil service. As the head of a state enterprise commission puts it: "The programs (of MDIs) are usually not suited to the specific needs of the state owned enterprises, particularly those which are profit oriented" (Adda). A broader orientation to all sectors, including the private sector, can be assisted by including sector representatives on MDI governing boards. MDIs can take initiatives to bring in other sectors through marketing campaigns, advisory groups, national productivity conferences (such as that held by the Institute of Development Management in Botswana), and the like. Adda underlined that if MDIs are able to convince public and private enterprises of their willingness to contribute to the improvement of their performance, these organizations, either directly or through employers' associations may be willing to help fund the research, development, and program design needed to strengthen the MDIs' capacity to work outside of their traditional areas.

(f) Underlining all of these factors is perhaps the most important of all: the quality of MDI leadership. Sai emphasizes three important aspects. First, the MDI head should be seen to have been properly selected for his/her capacity to do the job, not as a result of "political lobbying". Second, the MDI head should focus on building esprit de corps and staff motivation, equitably sharing development opportunities among the faculty. He contrasts this style with the MDI leader that is a "divide and rule strategist...presiding over a house divided against itself", showing special preferences to certain staff and operating in a secretive style. Finally, Sai stresses the need for proactiveness. MDI leaders should update themselves and their institutions on government policy changes and thinking on national issues. And they should alert policymakers to the need to review the mandates, resource needs, and working relationships of the MDIs.

(g) Sai summaries the overall issue of increased autonomy as follows: in addition to the positive image and achievements of the MDI, the Government's willingness to consider increased autonomy will be influenced by the MDI's understanding of and respect for the limits of autonomy prescribed at the time. Increasing autonomy should be the result of mutual negotiation rather than bringing pressure or raiding the boundaries. Greater autonomy should be granted "within the general framework of the Government's total regulating responsibility".

(h) Finally, Sai strongly favors a willingness by the MDI to engage in an open process of self assessment. This helps prepare the way for MDI management and policymakers to work together to solve problems, innovate, and respond to the institution's weaknesses.
The Mandates that Govern the MDI’s Role and Operations

Some Definitions

Each MDI operates under some form of mandate, which lays out "the duties, responsibilities, powers and privileges exercised by the MDI...and defines the functional relationship between the establishing or supervisory authority and the MDI" (Mwanahiba). Depending on the nature of the MDI, the mandates may be in the form of statutory instruments, articles of association, charters, or decrees.

Anatomy of an MDI Mandate

Although the details of mandates differ according to country usage and specific purpose, most mandates contain a number of the following (based broadly on Wereko's presentation):

(a) Institutional Establishment: The name of the institution, its statutory form, and the instruments which define its status.
(b) Mission: The overall objectives and purposes for which the MDI is established.
(c) Activities: Specification of the activities the MDI is mandated to undertake. This may be general, typically "training, consulting, and research" or detailed in describing programs and topics.
(d) Beneficiaries: The groups, managers, sectors targeted for the MDI's services.
(e) Rights and Powers: The MDI's level of autonomy in decision-making and action in academic, financial, and staffing matters.
(f) Governance & Structure of Reporting: Specification of the authority to which the MDI reports: government office, other public agency, governing body or council (and if the latter, the persons that constitute that body). There may also be a description of the reporting hierarchy; and the powers and responsibilities of the governing authority.
(g) Management and Major Officers of the MDI: Their titles, responsibilities, and level of authority, and mechanisms for their recruitment, grading, remuneration, discipline, and dismissal.
(h) Financial Provisions: Sources of funding and regulations governing these sources (grants, donor contributions, fees and revenues, gifts); rules governing the deposit, destination, and disposition of funds (including the rights of MDI access to them); and budgeting, accounting, and auditing requirements.
(i) Staffing Procedures: Size of the MDI establishment; categories of staff; and procedures and systems governing recruitment, salaries and benefits, grading and career development, and discipline.
(j) Supplementary Provisions: A miscellaneous section which can be used for matters such as the procedures for passing bylaws; procedures for the review and revision of the mandate; tax and rates exemptions; procedures for resolving dispute; types and classes of institute membership; accreditation procedures; and definition of terms used in the mandate.
Some Generalizations on the Broad Significance of MDI Mandates and Their Characteristics

An MDI's mandate can have an important influence on its scope and performance. This influence is fairly self-evident, but worth summarizing. The first two examples concern the way the mandate defines important aspects of the MDI:

(a) The mandate defines the business of the institute. This may be narrow (training for civil service administrators) or broad (upgrading the quality of management in all sectors of the economy), thus establishing the scope and ambition of the MDI's activities.

(b) The mandate defines the reporting relationship, and consequently, to a large extent the MDI's level of autonomy in staffing and financial matters. MDIs reporting directly to a government department generally have less control over their revenue earning capacity, and less autonomy over staffing decisions, than regional MDIs reporting to a board. The reporting relationship may also affect the MDI's flexibility in launching new programs, and the speed with which initiatives are sanctioned and problems resolved.

Three other characteristics concern the quality of the mandate, and the way it operates:

(a) Adequate levels of specificity and lack of ambiguity of the mandate, gives the MDI management some assurance that their plans, strategies, and programs are fulfilling a clear purpose and will receive support. By contrast, ambiguous mandates and those lacking specificity may result in misunderstandings, charges of exceeding responsibility, clashes with other institutes, constant reference to authorities for sanction, and a general atmosphere of insecurity. Specificity should cover aspects like the overall mission of the MDI; the target groups for the MDI's services; and the responsibilities and powers of the mandators, the MDI management, and the intermediate board or council (where it exists). However, as will be seen later, specificity can also constrain development where the role of the MDI is drawn narrowly, with insufficient anticipation of the MDI's development, and without simple processes for review.

(b) The relevance of the overall mandate and its various parts: There are a number of aspects of relevance: the extent to which the mandate is a convincing response to priority management development needs in the country, and is constructively linked to other important capacity building policies and programs; the extent to which the mandate is realistically placed within the resource limitations and capacities of the economy and reflects the "economic backwardness and dependence, political and ideological diversity, low literacy rates and low scientific and technological development" characteristic of much of Africa (Wereko); and the extent to which the various parts of the mandate support and are in tune with one another. For example, is the structure and level of delegated authority in line with the responsibility and mission defined for the director? Is the establishment and grading levels of the faculty defined in the mandate consistent with the level of programs and clients the MDI defined for the MDI?

(c) The flexibility and frequency of the review process: Even an effective mandate may become outdated with important developments and changed priorities. And as long as regular, open review processes are possible, poorly developed or over-restrictive mandates can be improved with experience. Reviews may be difficult where mandates are enshrined in legislation which makes no provision for a review other than the political process.

While mandates may strongly influence the quality of the MDIs' management and performance, there is no simple cause-and-effect relationship or inevitability about the impact of the mandate. There are a number of qualifications and mediating factors concerning the mandates and the way they operate in practice. Some of these are described below:
The commitment, competence, and style of the policymaker/s responsible for the MDI can make a huge difference. Take the case of an MDI with a relatively restrictive mandate but a policymaker with a strong background and interest in management improvement. If the policy maker has confidence in the director, and is impressed by the past contribution of the MDI, he or she can find ways of involving the MDI in the planning and implementation of important national development initiatives and reform programs. The policymaker can also delegate a great deal of day to day operations to the MDI management. A restrictive mandate may not be a major factor, if a policy maker has a direct interest in working around or reforming regulations that interfere with the MDI's performance. A broad and liberal mandate may not guarantee operating flexibility and autonomy, where, for example, the board members are unqualified part-timers, or where board reviews are highly politicized.

The realism of the mandate is another important factor. It does not automatically follow that a small, national NIPA will be given a narrow mandate. There are examples of national MDI mandates that wildly exceed the capacity of the MDI, and have never been fulfilled. The mandate may provide no practical constraint, but there may be a lingering sense of frustration and disbelief among policymakers, the MDIs staff, and clients. Mwanahiba points out that a broad mandate may tempt an institution to over-diversify and spread its resources too thin, resulting in a lack of strategic focus and declining quality. It is important that there is congruence among the mandate, the needs, the MDI's resources, and the performance standards that are set. The mandate should also take into account the other training capacities that exist.

The drive and past performance of the institution can play an important role in winning for the institution a broader operating mandate, as well as and opportunities than may be predicted from the content of the written mandate. Regional MDIs with their broader mandates, have often shown some of the more impressive progress. However such progress has also been made by some national institutions that are more closely and directly governed, such as the Kenya Institute of Administration, the Ethiopian Management Institute, the Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration, and Nigeria's Centre for Management Development. In part this is due to policy level support, initiative of the leadership in using formal and informal channels to keep close to policymakers and clients, and the performance of some excellent faculty. One way or another, they have been able to transcend some of the restrictive aspects of their mandates. Another factor that can help an MDI's performance and development rise above a restrictive mandate, is the level and continuity of donor support. Many national MDIs have somewhat restricted donor backing, perhaps one or two programs often as part of a broader donor public sector reform initiative. By contrast, regional MDIs have often enjoyed substantial, long-term donor support, working with as many as a dozen, and in some cases even twenty donors at any time. The openness of the mandate of a regional MDI, and the freedom from close government supervision, have been important factors in attracting such donor investment.

Some Issues and Problems Relating to MDI Mandates and the Way They Operate in Practice

The seminar identified a number of issues relating to the way MDI mandates work in practice. This section summarizes some of these issues:

(a) Subverting and protecting the mandate: Despite the fact that an MDI may have a very clearly defined role in its mandate, this is no protection against pressures from above, especially "off-the-cuff demands" for the MDI to operate in ways which contravene its mandate. Sometimes this happens because those responsible for MDI governance are not familiar with the mandate, or are responding to pressures from their own hierarchy. There was consensus that this is essentially a management problem and the mandate itself is unlikely to provide much protection. It is less likely to happen
where the MDI director is proactive in building understanding with the policy level, planning together the MDI's role linked to national development priorities. There is no real alternative to the director taking responsibility for safeguarding the MDI's mandate. There are also no assurances that this will be a smooth process: "the political risks go with the job of director" (Sai). It is also an inescapable reality that some directors are "better placed...to use the right channels of communication...In Africa it often depends on who you are" (Achonu). Furthermore, "the constraints are not limited to MDI directors, but may exist among policymakers as well" (Adda).

(b) Mandates, policy change, and development: Most MDI mandates clearly link the function and contribution of the MDI to nation-building and developmental goals. There are of course exceptions. As Zamchiya points out: "One should not presuppose that the decision to form an MDI was always the result of careful deliberation. Sometimes the decision was just a carry-over from the colonial era, ...or in other cases the MDI may have been created by a few enthusiasts no longer in government." Whatever the case, with the passing of time since the MDI mandates were established, policymakers and politicians have not always ensured that the MDI has been used within its mandate, or that the mandate has kept track with policy changes and new development priorities. One reason is the tendency in many African governments to dichotomise administration and policy development. Governance of many MDIs has been confined within the administrative enclave of government. Sometimes, inadequate attention has been given to the influence of senior party officials, who play a key role in the development of policy, but have little contact with the MDI which may help to implement policy. It is important that government oversite of MDIs fully integrate policy and administrative concerns. This also underlines the fact that the MDI management represents a continuity that may not exist in the political process. The MDI director is in the best position to ensure that the MDI's mandate is well understood among policymakers, and is adjusted to changing needs.

(c) Mandates in operation: the conservative tendency in MDI activities: As most MDI mandates were created some years ago, they reflected the beliefs and theories of management capacity building current at the time. Those theories usually gave primacy to training among the MDI's activities (although some mandates also mention the MDI's consulting and research responsibilities). Development experience in Africa has revealed the limitations of the impact of training, and the importance of integrating training with consultancy and research. Insufficient has been done in Africa to generate practical research findings on the management methods and organizational structures that operate most effectively in Africa's special conditions. As a result, much training is eclectic, combining techniques and concepts imported from outside with inadequate regard for local conditions. Similarly, it has proven to be extremely difficult to transfer the benefits of management training to the workplace in Africa. Organizations resist change, and the individual seldom has the power to bring about significant change alone. Yet despite the clear need for African MDIs to bring their services closer to the workplace, it is easier for policymakers to conceptualize, observe, and monitor the traditional training role of the MDI. This acts as a conservative influence. Some MDIs have found it difficult to expand their consulting and research roles, or to take on other types of initiative that vary significantly from the role and activities defined in the original mandate.

(d) The mandate as an instrument for dynamic institutional development or as a brake on change: An MDI mandate enshrined in legislation at a great level of specificity, may obstruct the MDI's subsequent development unless the emerging role of the MDI is recognized in the original concept. This may limit the MDI's capacity to broaden its markets, enter new management sectors, diversify its funding base, provide incentives necessary to raise quality, and engage in research and development. Such MDIs are likely to slip into a routine role (however competently) and remain basically unchanged over long periods despite changing needs. As has been pointed out before, the commitment and attitude of the policymakers themselves can help to mediate this tendency.
Recommendations for Processes of Reviewing the MDI's Mandate

What has been said about MDI mandates may be of largely theoretical significance for MDI's already established. What may be of more immediate importance are the mechanisms for reviewing a mandate. These need not be restricted to a formal reviews, and can include one or more of the following:

(a) A regular corporate planning process involving the policymakers, focusing on past performance, future goals, changing requirements, planned activities, and resource requirements;

(b) Annual institutional performance and financial audits as part of an annual board meeting;

(c) The establishment of a special academic or advisory committee to identify parts of the MDI's mandate that requires review and change. Such a board could include governing board members, MDI management and staff, client representatives, and selected alumni;

(d) Stakeholders' conferences of clients, national agencies, donors and others that have special interest in the MDI's role and contribution;

(e) Formal reviews by major user agencies.
The reputation and contribution of an MDI is dependent on many factors. Probably the most sensitive is the caliber of the leadership and faculty. How they are recruited, selected, trained, and given incentives to remain, are vital determinants of institutional effectiveness. In this, African MDIs do not vary from other important development institution on the continent. Like their sister organizations, African MDIs have has an uneven history. The last decade has seen the rise and fall of many institutions in Africa, perhaps most dramatically, the universities. The capacity to attract and retain high quality human resources has been the most important single factor. African institutions have been savaged by brain drain, or only a little less painful the frequent loss of talented staff to prestigious government or diplomatic positions, or to attractive private sector posts.

No training institution expects to retain its faculty for very long periods. They are training grounds for other sectors of the economy. A healthy training institution should regularly bring in new talent and foster an interchange between the training setting, and the practical world of the manager and organizational life. However, this needs to be a planned process, not only to ensure that the right talent moves at the right time, but also to preserve institutional continuity. This has not been the experience of African MDIs. In many cases, the director has little warning of, or control over the exodus. However, directors anticipate that an overseas fellowship, success with a donor assignment, or an effective consulting contract with a key client, may all be a catalyst for staff to leave. Many MDI directors frequently have to start over with new, inexperienced staff after much investment in faculty development. It is often a struggle to maintain business as usual, although there is no simple way of hiding the dislocation caused by top staff leaving. Many MDIs are unable to retain really talented and experienced staff. They have to make do with staff who, however bright and well educated, do not have the experience and solidness needed to carry influence with a senior government manager. It is no wonder that MDI directors are especially concerned with ways in which the policy environment in which they operate affects their staffing problems. This section of the report covers issues that were debated at the seminar concerning levels of institutional autonomy in staffing matters.

Categories of Staff

There are a number of different categories of staff that make up a typical MDI. Although the policy framework concerns some categories far more than others, the effectiveness of the MDI can be seriously affected by poor staff in any function. It is worth taking a quick look at the important staff groupings and their contribution. What follows is a generalization based broadly on patterns found in a number of the MDIs participating in the UNEDIL Program, and is not necessarily accurate for any one of them:

(a) Most important is the head of the MDI, usually a Director, or Principal, or in the case of a regional MDI, a Director/Secretary General. This person is responsible either to a policymaker in government, or to a board of governors, for the performance of the institution. The head typically combines the role of business executive, negotiator, leader, and institutional administrator;

(b) Senior administrative/managerial staff, among which the most important are a registrar responsible for administration of the MDIs activities; and a financial manager responsible for accounting, cash flow, revenue collection, payments, product costing, and investment of liquid assets. There is also
usually an important management function concerned with property and infrastructure maintenance. Larger institutions may also have a specialist in marketing/client development;

(c) Academic and faculty management: most MDIs have some form of program manager: an academic dean, director of studies, or heads of departments or faculties. In some larger institutions, there may also be senior staff responsible for special functions, such as consulting, research, and the computer bureau. Academic deans, and heads of departments or functions often carry some delegated responsibility for managing members of the faculty, especially work programming, performance evaluation, and staff development;

(d) Teaching staff, consultants, instructors, researchers, audio-visual specialists, training material designers, and so on (the variety depends on the size of the MDI). These are the key staff responsible for designing and delivering the institutions' products and services. All MDIs have some form of grading and seniority, and a few limited opportunities to rise into the academic, faculty, or administrative management ranks. In some MDIs staff specialize as trainers, researchers or consultants. More often they combine roles. Although practices vary, by and large it is the more senior and respected staff who carry out the consulting assignments, design tailor-made training programs, or lead projects funded by government agencies or donors;

(e) Library manager/supervisor, responsible for the books, publications, and often the store of institutional materials and aids;

(f) Administrative support staff, including course administrators, secretaries, clerks, telephone staff, print-shop staff, maintenance staff, drivers, catering staff, and others. In any institution these staff play an important role in ensuring that things function on an everyday basis. In African MDIs their role is especially vital. The success of seminars, workshops, and conferences depends as much on factors like timely communication, travel arrangements, banking, document production, copying, continuity of power supply, and sheer capacity to improvise in uncertain conditions, as it depends on the content, academic substance and teaching skill. This is especially true for regional or international events held at African MDIs.

**Supply and Demand**

Within every category staff described above, there is a critical shortage of well qualified people. There is not a wide choice of available candidates for the vacant directorship of an MDI. This position requires a person with many attributes. These include enjoying the confidence of top policymakers; a broad and successful track record (not simply in the civil service); entrepreneurial effectiveness: experience and knowledge of development management issues; some academic credentials; exposure to the problems and special skills needed in running a training institute; and the leadership qualities needed to influence clients, inspire staff, and attract funding. This unique combination means that some MDI directors are lacking in some aspect. This can be compensated for by careful selection of the management team. But candidates for such positions are in very short supply, and may well be attracted to more lucrative opportunities. Some MDI directorships may be graded as high as deputy principal secretary or principal secretary; others lower. But even at the higher level, the job may not compete effectively with senior parastatal or private sector opportunities.

Likewise, it is difficult to find faculty who have the right blend of management experience, academic background, and practical exposure to the use of training, consulting, and research. Few trainers have been directly involved in efforts to bring about management and organizational improvement. Invariably, African MDIs end up recruiting less experienced staff, and develop them on-the-job and through continuing education and training. Retaining them once they have reached the required standard is a continual and often futile struggle. Competent specialist management and
administrative support staff are equally difficult to attract and retain especially as the private sector and state enterprises can generally offer superior conditions or prospects.

There is also the issue of professional and support staff mobility in African organizations. Traditionally, the African civil service has provided attractive job stability and many educated and trained Africans spend their working life within a larger organizational setting, maybe moving from one section or agency to another every few years. However, although there are few well documented studies of professional and semi-professional labor mobility in Africa, there are signs (stronger in some African economies than others) of increasing job movement among the small cadre of skilled and experienced experts and administrators. African MDIs may be suffering the consequences of a broader trend, and feel it more acutely because MDIs are smaller than many other organizations, firms, and agencies. Only very few exceed 50 or 60 staff.

Women Faculty—A Special Issue

On average, the faculty in the network of African MDIs include only about ten percent women. Behind this average, there is in fact a wide range. At the regional Institute of Development Management, for example, women have constituted 25% or more of the faculty at one time or another. A few MDIs have none or very few. In the past, the small number was probably mainly a function of prevailing attitudes which questioned women in professional roles. Another factor was undoubtedly the very few suitably qualified and experienced women eligible for appointment as management development practitioners. These factors have not vanished, but in recent years, the situation has been changing. Many directors of African MDIs are now positive about identifying and recruiting women, and the profile has improved noticeably in some cases. Some directors still, however, make the point that most managerial clients are male, and many of them are reluctant to work with a woman management practitioner on serious organizational problems. There are signs that these attitudes may also be changing, but very slowly. From a policy point of view, such changes can be encouraged, but policy in itself is unlikely to accelerate culture change. Much depends on the capacity of the few women management specialists to demonstrate their expertise in the face of skepticism. They will be important agents in bringing about cultural change.

There are also some other changes happening, which will help the situation. Women-in-development and women-in-management issues have become increasingly important items on the reform agendas of many African governments and donor agencies. Predictably, as activities in these areas began to attract policy attention and funding, so women professional HRD specialists were given an opportunity to build a market for their expertise. This was accompanied by active networking and the establishment of women's groups to share experience, pool talent, and generally bring pressure for greater recognition of women among the professional ranks. It is probably fair to say that African women HRD specialists now have something of a monopoly in this field, both because of their greater expertise and assertiveness, and because male management specialists have been skeptical or overawed by this new area of endeavor. This development has been valuable in giving women an important and recognized stake in African HRD, and has increased their attractiveness to training and research institutes. Many donors are placing great importance on the involvement of African women in training schemes and consultancies. Some even set quotas. The challenge now is to broaden the involvement of women HRD specialists so that they are not restricted to activities involving women-in-development and women-in-management, but are viewed as skilled resources in many areas of individual and organizational development. It is also important to ensure that male HRD specialists become more actively involved in women-in-development projects, which contain many constraints and problems that require insight and joint action of both genders.
Despite the gradually increasing representation and recognition of women among MDI faculty, many problems remain. To some extent there are still problems on the supply side. Highly skilled and experienced women management specialists are few and actively sought after. In the immediate future, it may be difficult for some MDIs to offer enough in incentives to attract them. The problem will reduce as more women graduates emerge and build up management experience. In some MDIs women faculty face problems in terms of recruitment, selection, training opportunities, promotion, access to outside conferences and meetings, chances to take on consulting and research assignments. In some cases, limited opportunities for women faculty may be a reflection of their lack of experience and consequent junior status. As in any situation involving an emerging group, there will be cases of unrealistic expectations. However, it is equally true that prejudices and skeptical attitudes continue to prevail in some environments. Policymakers can make a helpful contribution by emphasizing that merit and individual capacity should be the major criteria guiding staffing decisions, ensuring wherever possible that women candidates are presented and considered for recruitment and fellowship decisions. It is also important to identify the real problems restricting the progress of women, and remain alive to the director's constraints.

Temporary and Permanent Staff

One way in which some MDIs are dealing with shortages of good candidates for faculty is to contract part-time experts on an "as needed" basis. This strategy has a number of advantages. It enables a Director of an MDI whose faculty is already quite large, to bring in additional expertise as needed without having to campaign for additional scarce staff slots, or make long term salary commitments. Ideally, the contracting of these special services can be tied to specific assignments and the cost covered by the income generated. Part-time, or as-needed contracts also allows the director to bring in up-to-date expertise in specialized management fields (including carefully selected practicing managers), in a way that the institution may not be able to afford or justify through regular recruitment. Finally, testing individuals in such assignments is an effective method of assessing a candidate for recruitment into a regular position. Although there are many merits in this scheme, especially as a cost effective way of keeping the MDI abreast of recent developments, the director needs to be very cautious not to harm the incentive structure within the institution. Full-time faculty will become understandably resentful if outside-contracted experts are given all the innovative assignments while they are expected to carry the load of routine work.

Issues Concerning Responsibility for Staffing Decisions

Directors of some MDIs, especially national institutions reporting directly to a government department, cite lack of autonomy over staffing decisions as an important constraint on improving the reputation of the institution. In the worst cases, they have little freedom to select or promote their own candidates, and have to accept poorly qualified individuals identified by the civil service commission or parent ministry. Cases are cited of "deadwood" (failed civil servants) being dumped on the institution as a last resort method of dealing with redundancy or poor performers. Not only do such actions waste valuable faculty slots, they demoralize the faculty, and harm the reputation of the MDI among its clients, including government managers.

An MDI's degree of autonomy over staffing decisions is a function of its broader mandate and structure. At the one end of the spectrum, a regional MDI with NGO status has the greatest degree of autonomy. It is interesting, however, that the boards of some prominent regional MDIs still retain a degree of control over major staffing decisions, for example, reviewing the establishment and termination of hiring contracts. At the other end of the spectrum are government run MDIs.
They supported proposals to reduce the problems arising from too great civil service control. These proposals included:

(a) Where one does not exist, establish an intermediate board between the MDI and the parent government office. The director and perhaps other senior MDI staff would be represented on the Board;

(b) This board should be given delegated authority on staffing decisions within a clear policy framework and within a stated establishment figure;

(c) The board should participate with the director in placing senior staff who should, wherever possible, come from within the institution. The board should also have an input into the selection of a new director should a vacancy occur;

(d) The board should delegate to the director and his management team, under clearly stated groundrules, the recruitment of all regular faculty and administrative positions;

(e) All vacancies should have measurable criteria based on the major job requirements; positions should be advertised and selection should be competitive and based on the criteria;

(f) The board and the director should be permitted to deal with disciplinary issues and the removal of redundant staff and inadequate performers. While some rights of appeal should exist, something should be done to streamline the existing procedures in countries where protracted appeals can be made on almost any pretext, and cause serious dislocation in the management of the MDI;

(g) The board should have the right to review the overall establishment size based upon agreed strategic plans and programs, and recommend changes where needed.

The Appointment of the Director of the MDI

The most damaging of all mis-appointments can be that of the MDI director. This position is usually a senior appointment from a government perspective, and it is not uncommon for the appointment to be made by the Head of State himself. Because there are not a large number of candidates with the right blend of qualifications and experience, the tendency is to treat the appointment in a similar way to other senior government manager selections. The quality of such selections vary widely from country to country, not only in Africa but throughout the developing and developed world. At their worst these decisions lead to the appointment of a bureaucrat or administrator with little understanding of the functions and problems of a training institutions, or the skills to ensure that the MDI will prosper. The complex blend of attributes needed in an MDI directorship is not very typical of public administration posts. Policymakers are aware that the director's effectiveness may be the single most important factor in determining the MDI's reputation and performance. It is also a very public and visible position, to staff, government, clients, and donors alike. Poor selection decisions quickly become obvious. Such errors are often notoriously difficult to reverse, and as a result they lead the MDI into a "period in the wilderness" during which few remedial measures are likely to work. The eventual replacement of the director becomes the only alternative, followed by a period of painful rebuilding.

Because of the centrality of the position, policymakers have a special responsibility to ensure that vacant directorships are carefully filled, resisting any temptation to offer such positions as a perk or twilight job to unqualified senior civil servants. The seminar recommendations included a provision for the board of the institution to have an involvement in the selection. In this regard, one African MDI has experimented with a radical approach. In Tanzania, identifying candidates for the vacancy for the Principal of the Institute of Development Management was delegated to a search committee that included representatives from government, client groups, and senior members of IDM's staff. The committee established criteria, the position was advertised, and in addition, the committee was free to approach suitable candidates. Finally, a short-list of candidates which
included someone working at the institution, all regarded as suitable for selection, but listed in order of priority, was submitted to the Head of State for the final selection decision. This approach demonstrates a way of preserving decision-making prerogative at the top of government, while ensuring that the decision will be well informed.

**Special Problems Affecting Faculty Incentives**

A major problem faced by MDI directors is their capacity to attract and retain the caliber of staff needed to build the institute's reputation for high quality. Lack of adequate incentives combined with attractive opportunities elsewhere is cited as the main reason. The exact nature of the incentive problem will vary, but is likely to contain a blend of some of these factors. There is the problem of an uncompetitive basic salary structure. Sometimes this is due to pegging salaries to an unattractive civil service scale. Sometimes the level of salaries for faculty within such a scale has been fixed below that of comparable professionals (for example university lecturers). The uncompetitive salary is made worse by the lack of benefits, often very important to African professionals, such as housing or transport. There is often a lack of career prospects, and this is worsened where promotion decisions are made on vague or "political" grounds. Many women faculty feel especially vulnerable in this area. Finally, some MDIs have rules (or follow civil service rules) that constrain the opportunity of a faculty member to generate additional income through other professional activities. The result is that many talented staff treat an assignment at an MDI as a career step, rather than viewing the MDI as a career institution. Outside training opportunities and professional development experience may be more important in preparing the individual for "life after the MDI" than for professionalizing the work of the institution.

Directors and policymakers alike agree that improving incentives is a matter of greatest urgency for the MDIs. At this stage, there is not yet a fully articulated strategy as to how incentive structures can be improved, and in any case the formula is likely to differ from MDI to MDI. However, some general guidelines have emerged. Directors and policymakers agree that the core salary should not be the vehicle for improving incentives. However, where the salary base is uncompetitive to start with, then it is vital to review this problem, and bring base salaries up to the level of similar professionals. One strongly expressed view was that the base salary should be based on the parastatal sector, and should include the accompanying fringe benefits, because "that's where the real fat lies". Exactly which groups represent appropriate comparators for MDI faculty remains an unresolved problem. Some feel that university lecturers constitute the best comparitor, but views vary as to whether MDI faculty salaries should be pegged to, above, or below that for university lecturers. In some cases parity already exists. Given the poor quality of job evaluation in most African governments, this issue is unlikely to be resolved on a purely rational basis in the short term. Perhaps the most important policy starting point is the one articulated informally by one of the policymakers at the seminar: "It's simply a matter that you will get what you pay for. The first thing we need to decide is what we want to get, and to do that we need to go back to the mandate and purposes of our MDIs. What kind of role do we want them to play in our economic regeneration? If we envisage that they have a major role to play, then we have to be prepared to pay the necessary price. If we falsely economize, they simply won't fulfill their mandate however gloriously it reads on paper. This way we may eventually defeat ourselves." Beyond this, there was a consensus that the base salary levels must be accommodated within national structures, otherwise there will be other groups "with equally good cases" that will insist on becoming exceptions too.

The recommendations proposed that once the salary base is equitable, MDIs should be encouraged to develop a wide range of incentives which may include some of the following: bonuses for exceptional performance, accelerated promotions, training schemes and allowances, housing and other benefits, travel funds, sabbaticals and attachments, opportunities to represent the
MDI at important conferences and international events, special research and publication opportunities, and so on. These incentives:

- should not change the base salary structure;
- should be specially linked to and emerge from the work and functions of the MDI, so that they cannot be used to argue for precedents elsewhere in the public service;
- should be funded by MDI revenues and not constitute an additional burden on overstretched national exchequers;
- should be administered equitably and openly, based on rational criteria.

The Sharing of Income Generated from Consultancies

One aspect of policy on faculty incentives has proven to be controversial. As MDIs have expanded their consultancy activities, some have followed the practice of sharing the consulting fee with the faculty member/s who carried out the assignment. In many MDIs this is an important incentive, because access to consulting opportunities represents a higher level of professionalism for which they expect recognition. Sharing the proceeds of consultancies is an obvious, direct form of reinforcement. In addition to the professional growth recognition argument, those MDIs that follow the practice cite other supporting arguments. Consultancy work, they claim, requires efforts beyond the normal course of duty, often taking up the person's free time. Staff have to combine consultancies with a normal annual teaching load, and are therefore giving something extra to the institution which should be rewarded. Consultancy represents the kind of entrepreneurship that helps institutional outreach to clients, and entrepreneurs must be stimulated by the fact that they can earn through their efforts. Consultancies are valuable ways in which the MDI can generate new business and improve the quality of training, and therefore deserves a special reward. Many national MDIs simply do not have a sufficiently attractive base salary and a range of incentives to retain their best staff, so developing their consultancy role with its attendant earning capacity has become an integral part of staff development. And finally, some MDI Directors argue that if you do not share the proceeds of consultancies with faculty, either consultancies will not get done, or they will be of a poor quality. This is based on the premise that consultancies require greater effort and risk. If the rewards are to be the same, faculty will choose the simpler routine teaching schedule.

MDIs that share consultancy earnings use a range of different formulae. Some make an upfront deduction to cover institutional overheads for the period of the consultancy, and share the remainder according to a prescribed split. Some pay "finder's fees" to staff who identify a consultancy through the course of their training work that materializes into a paid assignment, whether or not the staff member is involved in the assignment. Other MDIs prefer a simpler percentage share scheme. As an example, the Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration share consultancy proceeds by allocating one-third to the institution, one-third to the individual consultant, and one-third to a faculty development fund. Many MDI Directors who implement such systems point out that participating staff have the capacity to substantially increase their income through consultancies (sometimes up to 100% or more). They also believe that the system produces higher quality consultancy work and staff motivation.

The majority of MDIs appear to favor this incentive in principle even if they are not utilizing it. However, there are MDIs which operate under different conditions and do not favor the practice. These are largely the more prosperous regional institutions that have wider scope for rewarding staff, and better basic working conditions. In the case of some national MDIs, the faculty are officially employed as civil servants, and the civil service code prohibits the earning of money in addition to the civil service salary. Furthermore, some MDI directors disagree in principle with the practice of sharing consultancy revenues with the faculty member. They argue that the individual
has accepted a salary for carrying out an agreed role, which includes where appropriate, consultancy assignments. Therefore the person is not entitled to additional payment for discharging agreed responsibilities. It is also argued that rewarding consulting assignments through revenue sharing will result in faculty "chasing consultancies" and neglecting their training role. The practice may also risk the creation of first and second grade faculty: those who do not carry out consultancies may come to be seen as second-class, and this will breed resentment. Some directors feel that if an individual has demonstrated extraordinary talent in conducting a complex consultancy assignment, this should be recognized during the annual performance review, perhaps with a bonus payment. Such special recognition would not be restricted to consultancy assignments.

While sharing the earnings of consulting assignments is a valuable incentive and development tool for many MDIs, it is not an approach that suits every institutional context, and it is important that each MDI develop an incentive structure that fits its own history, culture, and circumstances.

The Importance of Faculty Development

Finally within this broad topic of staffing issues, the seminar underlined the urgency of accelerated faculty development programs to raise the professionalism of the MDIs and to cope with rapid staff turnover. It has been emphasized many times that faculty development plans must go hand in hand with efforts to improve faculty incentives. Otherwise effective faculty development will stimulate additional staff loss. Wherever possible, faculty development programs should be developed within Africa, either on a national or regional basis, using talents both within the MDIs themselves, and within the universities. Dependence on overseas fellowships, which are often inappropriate and further stimulate brain drain, should be reduced through pooling of African talent and networks. Donors should divert some part of their funds for overseas fellowships to support these indigenous efforts. In addition, faculty development should be planned on the basis of much more carefully determined criteria and evaluation of performance at three levels: the overall institutional performance; the impact of MDI programs and assignments; and the performance of individual faculty members.
The financial profile of African MDIs varies according to their mandate and reporting relationship. National MDIs which are directly administered by government usually have a similar financial status to any civil service department. In the most regulated case, the MDI is funded largely by a subvention, supplemented perhaps by occasional donor grant money negotiated by the government. Their earnings go directly to the treasury. In some cases there are no fees charged for attending the institution's training programs. The least regulated MDIs operate as NGOs or as registered companies. Fee earning plays a much larger part in meeting the institution's costs, and it is conceivable for the institution to make a financial surplus. In reality, there are few pure models at either end of the spectrum. Some national MDIs are able to charge and retain fees; and some fee earning MDIs with NGO or company status are closely regulated on financial matters by their boards. There is even a case of a fee earning regional MDI, registered under the private companies act, still receiving some government subvention.

MDI directors share a common aspiration of making their institutions more market oriented. The capacity to generate and use revenue is important if the director is to improve the quality and scope of the institution's response to priority management needs. Revenue enables the institution to attract and retain the highest quality staff ("staffing autonomy largely flows out of financial autonomy" [Haile, p. 1]). Revenue can be used for research and development which is essential if the MDI is to retain its relevance in a quickly changing scene. In addition, revenue can be used to upgrade infrastructure, facilities, office systems, and teaching aids. MDIs which rely on government handouts live with the consequences of austerity that afflicts the public sector generally throughout Africa. In the face of other pressing demands, their needs seldom emerge as high priority.

The term often used to describe these aspirations is financial viability. There are two aspects of financial viability: financial control and financial independence. Greater financial control gives the director the ability to make financial decisions without continual close regulation. At a general level, this may be summed up as the right to generate revenues, and to use those revenues for a wide range of purposes (staff incentives, product development, infrastructure improvement, and so on). At a more specific level, there are a number of dimensions of financial control. One is the ability to establish fees for training course attendance and for consultancy services based on the real economic cost of these services and the willingness of the market to pay. Another is the ability to establish salary levels, grading structures, and performance rewards based upon the competitive levels in the market. A third is the ability to transfer funds among budget lines under broad guidelines delegated by the board. A fourth is access to foreign exchange. Also important is the scope of the MDI to engage in discussions with international donor agencies for development support or project assignments. Finally, there is the predictability of cash flow.

There are quite a few MDIs that have relatively little control in any of these areas. Some have greater control over certain dimensions and less over others. A lack of control in a number of areas leads to severe dislocation in the management of the institution. Among the most severe are:

- a lack of funds to carry out essential product upgrading and research and development;
- deteriorating accommodation and infrastructure because of the lack of capital and maintenance funds;
- salary and incentive levels that fail to attract or retain high caliber staff;
- interruptions in cash flow which in extreme cases places the MDI in debt, or results in delays in paying salaries;
• inability to obtain foreign exchange necessarily for involvement in international activities, or the acquisition of essential materials, equipment, or parts from overseas;
• fees fixed by regulation well below real economic cost of providing services, and below the willingness of parts of the market to pay.

These factors underlie many of the evident problems MDIs experience: conservative markets, outdated products, deteriorating infrastructure, non-functional equipment, recurring staff discontent.

Financial independence is a far more complex goal for African MDIs to accomplish. Ideally, financial independence suggests the MDI's capacity to survive, expand, and prosper on funds generated by selling its services and products to the market. While there are differences in degrees of financial independence, it is safe to say that there are few, if any, African MDIs that have achieved this status fully. Furthermore, the prospects of this happening are not that strong. Financial independence is, in any case, a complex concept within the African setting, and there is probably no commonly accepted definition of what it involves. A lack of financial independence is fairly evident, for example among non-fee charging MDIs that are fully funded by government. It is important to distinguish between degree of financial independence, and level of available financial resources (although there is sometimes a relationship between the two). Broadly speaking, resources can come from three sources: government exchequer, fees paid by clients, and international donors. (In a few cases, there may also be profits made from investments or property leasing). Government funding may be made in the form of a subvention, or it may come in the form of fees for services. Some combination of the two is common. There are national MDIs that rely very largely on this source of funding, with occasional donor support.

Donor funding may come in a number of different forms. The most common include components aimed at supporting the institution as part of broader technical assistance projects; funded fellowships to pay for national participants to attend training programs at the institution; and project assignments where MDI experts are commissioned to carry out work. Regional MDIs and a few national MDIs have succeeded in attracting considerable donor support; in the case of a few MDIs there may be support from more than a dozen donor agencies. As indicated above, the quantity of resources attracted does not in itself define the level of financial independence, unless the term is taken to mean "financial independence from government sources." The key issue in determining the level of financial independence is not the source of funding, but the circumstances under which it is provided. An MDI has a greater degree of financial independence to the extent that the providers of its resources have made a free and independent decision to use funds which they control. Because public agencies in Africa have such limited funds to purchase training, donor agencies play an important role in providing such funds. Where the officials responsible choose freely among a number of alternatives, to use those funds to purchase training or other services from an African MDI, the fact that the funds were provided by donors does not diminish the fact that the MDI has taken an important step towards greater financial independence. However, there are many donor projects which involve the donors funding both the supply and the demand: helping the institution to establish a program, and then providing funds for managers to attend that program. While such a strategy may be an admirable institutional development device, it doesn't constitute a step towards greater financial independence, regardless of the size of the revenue generated. Similarly, the fact that funds may originate within the government is not, per se, of significance. Supposing instead of providing a fixed, routine subvention to the local MDI institution, or free training at that MDI, the government were to provide a training budget to sector ministries to purchase training in the open market with no monopoly for the MDI. The national MDI that is able to compete successfully for that business, has taken an important step towards greater financial independence.
While the source of funding does not in itself define the level of financial independence, it is nevertheless important to note that none of the sources of funding are very reliable. The availability of public agency funds is tied to the state of African economies. The scaling back of public sector expenditure is certain to reduce the funds available for conventional training. Donor money has played a very important role in institutional development in Africa. But, in essence this is a skittish form of funding which can be suddenly influenced by changes in donor goals and programs. Donor funds will continue to be important over the next decade. The hope is that increasingly, donors will turn their support towards providing untied funds directly to MDI clients; and commissioning the MDIs to carry out development assignments previously once dominated by expatriate experts. Over time, most institutions would like to reduce their reliance on donor funding, and to devote less time to co-financing, which often robs the MDIs of their key management staff for many weeks each year. The third obvious source is revenue from training and consulting activities in the private sector. In the case of most MDIs, this is a market that has yet to be properly developed. Everything said above reinforces one main point. In the next decade, MDIs will not be able to rely on secure funding, and will attract funds (in the form of revenue or commissions) only by being able to demonstrate tangible impact on the performance of managers and institutions. This has very important implications for the product mix of African MDIs. Increasingly they will need to take their services out into the market place, offering a blend of tailor-made training, consulting services, and applied research into issues of managerial and organizational effectiveness in the African setting.

Increasing the financial viability of African MDIs will continue to be an important developmental goal for the next decade. The goal focuses attention on strengthening the institutions' market and business orientation, on rigorous financial management practices, on more accurate pricing of the institutions' products and services, and on the disciplines of strategic planning and management. African MDIs cannot hope to improve the management practices and productivity of their clients while they remain exempt from the disciplines they teach. At the same time it is important to set attainable goals. Realistically, for national MDIs, government financial support will continue to be essential, and with that will go restrictions in the freedom of financial decision-making. Haile (p. 10) sums up the situation as "the unsettled dilemma of: (i) enjoying full financial autonomy but at the expense of incurring a constant risk of financial uncertainty as a result of uncertain financial base; or (ii) enjoying relative financial stability but at the expense of reduced financial autonomy and entanglement in a maze of bureaucracy." It is conceivable, however, that continued government support could become increasingly flexible, providing more incentives and opportunities for directors to make innovative decisions and upgrade the quality of their services. This could attract donors to increase their support to national MDIs to help provide some of the valuable flexibility that regional MDIs enjoy. Regional MDIs will continue to rely on donor funding, hopefully with more donor coordination than currently exists, and with more stimulation to constructive market competition. For the foreseeable future, it is also likely that donor support will be needed for the essential research and development that will ensure that MDIs are familiar with the nature of management problems and best practices in Africa. It is unlikely that such costs can be met from revenues, except in a very few cases.

Naturally the pace of such developments will be tied to broader economic trends in Africa. For the meantime, for most African MDIs the goal will be "sufficient financial autonomy" (Haile, p. 10); and it is to understand what this involves, that we will now turn.

**Dimensions of Financial Autonomy**

From the point of view of the MDI director, there are a number of important areas where "sufficient autonomy" is important. These include:
(a) Basic financial security that enables the MDI management to operate with a long-term perspective, and to meet daily operating costs;

(b) Sufficient funding flexibility to upgrade and maintain the quality of the institution's faculty and facilities;

(c) Access to funds or control over revenues that can be used for longer term development projects, especially those requiring management research and materials preparation;

(d) Access to foreign currency;

(e) Capacity to price services and charge fees based on more realistic economic-costings and the willingness of the market to pay;

(f) Flexible access to grant-funding and donor agency support.

From the viewpoint of national policymakers, there is an equally important series of concerns about financial accountability that are a natural corollary to the fact that these institutions are national assets:

(a) A high level of ethics and public responsibility in the MDI's conduct of its financial affairs;

(b) Up-to-date, accurate, transparent, and professionally presented financial accounts and records;

(c) Some convincing demonstration that the MDI has used its funds to make tangible contributions to the improvement of management and organizational effectiveness in the country;

(d) An MDI management that is both effective and realistic in presenting financial demands: effective in demonstrating how the investment will contribute to the national development effort; realistic both in terms of the institution's capacity, and in showing an appreciation of the country's available resources and the various claims on these resources.

In theory, these concerns are perfectly compatible. In reality, many MDIs complain about bureaucratic red-tape, arbitrary budget cuts, and lack of financial security for long term development and recurrent expenses. Policymakers sometimes counter that the institutions' financial management practices are poor; the MDIs make unreasonable financial demands; and there is insufficient evidence to convince the holders of the purse strings that investments are bringing tangible results.

Scope for Reform

The seminar participants emphasized that finance is an area in which levels of accountability and responsibility need to be linked to the history, mandate, and reporting structures of the individual MDIs. However, some broad proposals for reform emerged:

- In general, there was support for the medium or longer term reduction of MDI's dependency on government subsidy. As far as possible, funding which the government controls (whether from the exchequer or from donor agencies) should be made available to ministries, public agencies, and enterprises, to purchase training and other services from the MDIs. Ideally, there should be no monopoly for any one institution because monopolies foster stagnation. However regulations should ensure that the funds are spent within Africa. Converting from subventions to alternative forms of funding should be done as a planned program, agreed by all parties. Subventions should be gradually decreased as the MDIs own income earning capacity increases. For some institutions this might be done over a three year time-scale. For others it may take longer. In any case progress should be reviewed regularly, and adjustments made where the original time-table appears later to be unrealistic.

- The chief executives of some MDIs may need to be given clearer statements of financial management responsibilities and accountabilities, and would need to build a model of effective and open management and accounting practices.
• MDI directors should be allowed greater freedom in financial management, including the transfer of funds among different budget categories, and the setting of fees within broad guidelines.

• To achieve greater autonomy, MDIs should improve their capacity to increase revenue and other forms of funding through improved pricing of institutional products and services based on improved cost accounting and market forces.

• MDIs should receive the full benefits of outside grants and contributions (with some allowance made to cover treasury costs).

• MDIs should focus on income generating activities such as consultancy, and tailor-made training assignments, with appropriate incentives for staff to participate.

• Operational budgets and cash flow should be reviewed to ensure that they are adequate to cover important cost categories such as salaries.

• Improvements should be made to increase MDIs' access to foreign exchange and to foreign funds earned by the institution.

• In line with the need to improve faculty incentives as discussed above, MDI salary structures should be made competitive with other sectors of the economy.
Evaluating the Performance of MDIs

In many ways, the various issues and concerns relating to the MDIs' policy framework come together in questions of institutional performance and how it is measured. Throughout the debate on the policy framework, there are a number of recurring themes. On the side of the MDIs there is a need for greater autonomy; a desire for closer involvement with the policy making process; a demand for a fairer share of government generated consulting business; and a wish that the administrative structure were more understanding of and responsive to the MDI's needs and problems. The attitude of policymakers is also expressed in recurring themes. MDIs that draw on public funds are accountable for demonstrating that they are fulfilling their purpose. MDIs that hope for greater involvement with government in policy development and in the implementation of consulting assignments must be able to demonstrate the capacity to play these roles effectively. MDIs which expect to receive favorable consideration in terms of greater autonomy or special needs have to build up confidence at the policy level that they are realistic, responsive, and effective institutions with a sound public image. Again and again, the debate underlines the clear relationship that Toure describes in the following way: "Government tends to intervene when the links break down. On the other hand, MDIs tend to be autonomous when they are properly managed."

Evaluating the performance of the MDIs, to demonstrate their tangible contribution and organizational soundness, lies at the heart of future policy reform.

This presents a problem for a number of reasons. Most MDIs were established to run training courses for public officials, and unless they are patently failing to deliver this mandate, it is difficult to specifically evaluate their performance. It is true for many African countries that despite decades of training management, performance in the public sector is still very weak. However, most managers and trainers realize that skills improvement is only one of many variables involved in improving management performance. As long as the political climate and incentives to improve managerial performance are discouraging, the quality of the training may matter little. Beyond this, there has not traditionally been an effective discipline or framework for measuring the performance of public agencies, especially those whose product is as intangible as an MDI. MDI mandates state their purpose in terms of the national managerial capacities the MDI's is expected to strengthen. However, the mandates seldom emphasize expectations for the MDI's organizational performance. So, while it is in the interests both of MDI directors and policymakers to be able to evaluate MDI performance, the tools available (beyond standard auditing procedures) are somewhat undeveloped.

Levels of Evaluation

It is useful to differentiate various levels of performance evaluation that may be of interest to both MDI directors and policymakers. As will be evident, these various levels are interrelated, but different methods of evaluation may be required at each level.

The most obvious level involves the evaluation of training and other MDI activities and services. Training evaluation usually includes two steps. The first is the judgement of participants, usually during the final phases of a training course, as to whether the course has accomplished its purpose and whether they have learned something of value and relevance. The second is an assessment in the workplace (usually involving the participants' supervisors as well as the participants themselves) as to whether job performance has improved in a way that can be traced to the benefits of the training. Increasingly, as training has been influenced by consulting activities and is being tailor-made to fit organizational needs, this latter type of evaluation is emphasizing the way the
The performance of the organization has been enhanced rather than simply the work of individual participants. Evaluating the impact of MDI activities is of great importance to directors and policymakers in determining how effectively the MDI is fulfilling its mandate. It is equally important to the management clients who are supposed to benefit from such training. As Baholo proposes, both program design and evaluation should involve close collaboration between the MDI and the client organization.

The next level involves evaluating the performance of staff, which includes the performance of faculty (as trainers, consultants, and researchers), management staff, administrators, support staff, and so on. Staff performance is evaluated in terms both of how effectively individuals fulfill their job requirements, and in terms of their contribution to overall organizational performance. Thorough and rigorous staff performance are important to directors and policymakers as a way of assessing the effectiveness of recruitment and promotion decisions, and as an objective yardstick for providing incentives and rewards.

The third level is the evaluation of the MDI as an organization. In practice, this is a complex collection of evaluations of many different aspects of organizational performance, and some of these will be discussed below. Both directors and policymakers are increasingly concerned with this level of evaluation, as a basis for effective strategic planning of the institution's future direction and emphasis, including appropriate policy and funding framework. Donor agencies are also concerned with this form of evaluation in determining whether future programs of support to an MDI are justified.

The final level concerns evaluating the impact of institutional improvement programs, whether government or donor funded. This evaluation helps determine whether investment in a program of support to an individual institution has been worth it. Even more important from a policy point of view, when the results of many such evaluations are consolidated they help to determine the effectiveness of particular strategies of institution building. For example, of great concern to directors and policymakers is the question of the effectiveness of programs of faculty development that rely on overseas fellowships. There is increasing concern as to whether these programs provide sufficiently relevant and transferrable skills, and the extent to which such programs fuel turnover and brain drain. This level of evaluation is strongly dependent on effective evaluation of the MDI as an organization (the previous level), because the criteria for determining organizational progress should be used as the yardstick for judging the impact of programs of support.

**Dimensions of Institutional Performance Evaluation**

Although all levels of evaluation are important from the policy perspective, the evaluation of the MDI's performance is the most comprehensive and inclusive. It can be argued that it incorporates all the other levels. There are many dimensions or factors that should be included in such an evaluation. Detailed consideration of these lies beyond the scope of this paper. However, it is useful to provide a summary of these dimensions. The following summary is loosely based on Toure's paper on "Evaluating and Monitoring MDIs":

**Strong internal management**, evident in the quality of strategic planning, leadership vision, and institutional identity.

**Effective relationships with government, clients, donors, and other stakeholders**, evident in the responsiveness of the MDI's programs and services to analyze needs well, and the positive reputation of the institution.

**High quality of product development and services**, evident from the level of client evaluation and satisfaction, repeat business, development of new products to respond to emerging needs, and the regard for the MDI's work in the local and international management community.
Entrepreneurial approach, evident in the MDIs capacity to generate revenue, attract funded assignments, open new markets, and produce a financial surplus to be used for institutional growth.

Effective financial analysis, management, and control, evident in the realistic costing of products and services, highly ethical and open financial practices and accounting procedures, and smooth financial routines.

Positive climate and high morale, evident in surveys of staff attitudes and loyalty towards the leadership, views about their career prospects, faculty turnover rates, and the extent to which staff go beyond normal work requirements to strengthen the institution's achievements.

Effective management information systems and performance indicators enabling the management of the MDI and the interested policymakers to readily monitor and evaluate the MDI's operations, efficiency, and accomplishments.

Effective administrative systems, evident in the smooth running of training events, participant relations, billing and payment procedures, communications, secretarial support, and organization of travel and accommodation.

Effective maintenance of infrastructure, evident in functional and attractive premises and reliable facilities for faculty, participants, and administrative staff.

Approaches to Institutional Performance Evaluation

Traditionally, MDIs have been extensively evaluated from outside, especially as a part of donor appraisals carried out in preparation of development projects. Understandably, MDI management have become increasingly disenchanted by constant uncoordinated external evaluation and have pushed strongly to gain greater control over this important aspect of their affairs. This is not to argue that the results of such evaluations should remain the private concern of the MDIs. Although the MDIs themselves have the most to gain from an accurate assessment of the different dimensions of their performance, government, clients, donors, and other stakeholders also have a strong right to know how the MDIs are doing. The question is rather where the responsibility should lie for carrying out these evaluations. This becomes a non-issue if the MDIs can establish an open and comprehensive form of self-assessment that is seen to be comprehensive, candid, accessible, and technically sound. Of all of these conditions, that of candor is likely to be the most controversial. Many will question the likelihood that an MDI, eager for increased business and funding support, will openly reveal its weaknesses, failures, and short-comings. The MDIs can replace this somewhat cynical outlook by demonstrating openness and realism in their own presentation of their capacities and achievements. Presenting a credible, self-evaluation represents one of the most important challenges to both MDI directors and policymakers. Are MDI directors willing and able to establish their own institutional performance evaluation procedures that will be accepted by their various stakeholders, and that will provide the basis for planning the strategy for future institutional strengthening? And are policymakers willing to provide a climate and incentives in which positive self criticism will be appreciated and lead to supportive responses? The future of African MDIs may hinge on these questions.
Strategies for Policy Reform

The MDI directors and their policymakers met during the last part of the seminar in country or regional teams to plan the changes in the policy framework that would help the institutions to prosper. It is not the purpose of this paper to report on these details, which at one level, were derived from the various points made in this paper, but which were also very specific to institutional and country conditions. However, at a broader level, it is possible to generalize about some patterns that emerged from many of the specific action strategies:

Emphasis on MDI Initiative

Reflecting the view that has been made a number of times in this paper, the consensus is that the director and the management staff of the MDI should identify the agenda for reform and create the conditions which encourage policymakers to respond.

Building National Consensus

A number of directors and policymakers recommended holding national meetings which could bring together a wider group of government officials and stakeholders to debate and reach decisions about the reforms that are feasible and the way they can be implemented. One possible model for such consensus building meetings are the "appreciation seminars" that have been run in Tanzania for a range of senior government managers to help improve the understanding in government of the potential role the MDIs can play, and the problems they experience in fulfilling their mandate. In building the national consensus, some policymakers emphasized that the consideration of changes in the mandate, governance, or autonomy of MDIs, be carefully integrated into the normal political decision-making processes and into the debate concerning national programs of reform.

Donor Encouragement and Support

Some seminar participants emphasized that while the process of reform should be the responsibility of the national/regional team, nevertheless donors can play a valuable role in providing objective perspectives, facilitating the internal discussions, and generally maintaining the impetus.

Follow-up Regional Meetings

The seminar demonstrated the value of starting a dialogue on policy reform in a regional setting, where a wide range of views and ideas can be debated, and where national problems and constraints no longer appear unique or insurmountable. Many participants felt it would be valuable to meet again after a period to discuss progress and share experiences. Knowledge of a future meeting can also act as a discipline to encourage action.
Institutionalized Policy Review

There was also support for finding ways of making the review process a regular part of the governing board procedures, so that problems and constraints can be tackled before they become ingrained, and so that policy reform can be integrated with strategic planning.
It is widely agreed that African MDIs have an important role to play in the future African development effort, and that few have yet to satisfactorily fulfill their mandate. At first consideration, the policy constraints surrounding the MDIs appear to be an important part of the cause for their uneven progress. It is undoubtedly true that some loosening of policy regulations is necessary if MDIs are to be able to respond to the challenges and opportunities that face them. However, a closer look at the dynamics of the policy framework and the process of reform shows that there is not a simple cause and effect relationship. Although it may appear logical that policy reform is a prerequisite for institutional progress, it will often be a case of institutional progress and policy reform going hand in hand. Although policymakers do have a special responsibility to cut away out-dated and prescriptive regulations and limitations, the directors have equally to demonstrate to their governments or governing bodies that they are capable of operating responsibly with less direct governance, and to deepen the impact of their contribution to the development effort.
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**Annex D**

*Policy Environment Seminar*
Maseru, Lesotho, September 18—22, 1989

**List of Papers Presented**

(Enquiries concerning the availability of the following papers should be addressed directly to the authors.)

| 1. | Dr. M. M. Sefali | Opening Statement |
| 2. | Mr. C. Willoughby | Welcome Remarks for Seminar Opening |
| 3. | Mr. A. Toure | Remarks for the seminar opening |
| 4. | Mr. A. Habte | Policy Reform in Education and Training in Africa |
| 5. | Pr. G. Mutahaba | Managing Change: Issues and Strategies |
| 6. | Dr. N. H. Ibrahim | Meeting the Country's Needs for an Efficient and Effective Civil Service through Development Oriented Management Training: A Case Study of INTAN |
| 7. | Mr. D. M. Zamchiya | Law and the Process of Institutional Change in Africa |
| 8. | Ms. M. Pitso | Public Sector Perspective |
| 9. | Dr. S. T. Agere | The Creation of an Enabling Environment for Policy Development on the Management Training Institute |
| 10. | Mr. E. A. Sai | Role of Management Development Institutions and Need for Policy Change as Viewed from Government Perspective |
| 11. | Mr. W. A. Addah | Expectations of Role and Contributions of Management Development Institutions |
| 12. | Dr. T.B. Wereko | Mandates of MDI's and their Relevance: Overview |
| 13. | Mr. Max Mwanahiba | Mandates of MDIs: The Case of Eastern and Southern Africa |
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| 14. | Dr. Joseph Kimura | Staffing in Management Development Institutions |
| 15. | Capt. A. Haile | Autonomy in Staffing Research and Consultancy Functions |
| 17. | Mr. S. Baholo | Strengthening of MDI in Sub-Saharan Africa |
| 18. | Mr. A. Toure | Evaluating and Monitoring MDIs: Ensuring Autonomy and Accountability |
| 22. | Mr. E.L. Setswaelo | The Case of IDM (BLS) |
| 23. | Government Secretary | Closing Speech |
EDI Policy Seminar Reports make available summaries of EDI policy seminars that are of particular interest to readers concerned with public affairs. The reports seek to convey the essence of the discussions and to bring out the principal areas of agreement or disagreement among the participants, who represent a wide range of governmental, academic, and professional backgrounds.