

## Building Blocks to Partnership

### A Case Study of the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa

A Paper Prepared for  
NUFFIC Expert Meeting  
*A Changing Landscape*  
24-25 May 2005

Lisbeth Levey, Facilitator  
Partnership for Higher Education in Africa

#### Background

The Partnership for Higher Education in Africa is an initiative of four US-based foundations—Carnegie Corporation of New York, The Ford Foundation, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and The Rockefeller Foundation. It was formally established in April 2000, although the presidents and staff (both in the US and in Africa) began to discuss the needs of African universities, opportunities to work with them, and the desirability/practicality of a Partnership during the summer of 1999.

#### Four Foundations Pledge \$100 million for Higher Education in Africa

“The decision to provide this support was based upon two important trends. First a significant number of nations are implementing democratic and economic reforms, and second, despite very difficult circumstances, many higher education institutions...are responding in creative ways to these reforms and to the pressing needs of their countries.”

News release, 24 April 2000

The Partnership was launched at a gathering convened by the four foundation presidents, which was attended by Kofi Anan, the President of the Association of African Universities, and the vice chancellors of the University of Dar es Salaam, Eduardo Mondlane University, and Makerere University. The presidents pledged more than \$100 million in support for higher education over the next five years—2000-2004.

This paper is about our experience in building the Partnership into a partnership, i.e., a true collaboration among four foundations that do not always work in the same countries or have the same sets of priorities.

I have also selected one focus area on which to concentrate because it provides an excellent example of Partnership methodology and the value added of four foundations working together. I chose Partnership collaboration on Information and Communication technologies (ICT), particularly bandwidth, because it is an important priority area for us and because I thought it would resonate with participants at this meeting.

#### Getting Started Selecting Geographic Criteria and Commissioning Case Studies

##### *Geographic Criteria*

Rather than disperse grant making across the continent, the Partnership foundations decided at the very beginning to concentrate activities in countries undergoing systemic public policy reform in which two or more of the four foundations have a programmatic interest and mandate. Higher

education institutions in six countries were selected—Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Ghana and Nigeria. Kenya was added at the 2004 presidents' meeting. The Partnership also provides funding to regional and sub-regional organizations and consortia that support the development of higher education in Africa.

In 2004 the Partnership also agreed that participating foundations may, from time to time, invite African universities in non-Partnership countries to participate in select Partnership activities. This will be done on an *ad hoc* basis when a Partner foundation is actively involved with the institution concerned and the institution stands to benefit from a Partnership program.

### *Case Studies*

One of the Partnership's first steps was to commission a series of higher education case studies in all seven countries. Each study was highly participatory and designed to obtain full buy-in from all stakeholders, including students. The Mozambique study, for example, surveyed student satisfaction (or lack thereof) with their curriculum, learning environment, library facilities, quality and quantity of their lecturers, intellectual development, and ICT facilities.

Along the way, all of the case-study authors built feedback mechanisms into their methodology through consultative workshops, focus groups, and meetings in which case study results were presented and reviewed by stakeholders. Their goal (and ours) was to ensure maximum ownership from the university community and policy makers.

The studies describe and assess institutional and sectoral reforms in governance, strategic planning, financial management, information and communication technologies (ICT), course structures, and commitment to national capacity building. These studies helped the Partnership develop a list of target areas for systemic and institutional interventions.

The case studies proved useful to the authors as well as to us. The Partnership organized case-study workshops in Johannesburg, Nairobi, Maputo, Abuja, and Accra to which all of the authors were invited. These meetings gave them an opportunity to hear about progress on the other studies, compare notes, and learn from the experience of their colleagues. Just as a pot of soup becomes more flavorful when it is reheated, the later case studies benefited from those that had preceded them. Finally, these workshops furnished all participants with ample evidence that strengthening and publicizing higher education research capacity on the continent is of benefit to everyone.

The workshops also provided the Partnership with an opportunity to meet with a broad cross-section of representatives from the higher education community. At the Ghana case study workshop, for example, there was a special session on higher education in Ghana that was attended by the Minister of Education, the Parliamentary Select Committee on Education, vice chancellors of Ghana's public and private universities, and the case study authors.

Four case studies have been published thus far by James Currey in collaboration with local publishers. They are also available on the Partnership home page. The titles are:

*Higher Education in Tanzania*, Daniel Mkude, Brian Cooksey, and Lisbeth Levey (2003)

*Makerere University in Transition 1993-2000: Opportunities and Challenges*, Nakanyike Musisi and Nansozi Muwanga (2003)

*Higher Education in Mozambique*, Mouzinho Mário, Lisbeth Levey, and Arlindo Chilundo (2003)

*National Policy and a Regional Response in South African Higher Education*, Nico Cloete, Pundy Pillay, Saleem Badat, and Teboho Moja (2004)

Case studies of Kenya, Ghana, and Nigeria will be published in 2005 as well as a synthesis volume on lessons learned from all of the case studies.

It is worth noting here that the Partnership did not intend to publish the case studies at the outset. The case studies were meant to inform foundation and Partnership grant making not the scholarly community. Upon reflection, however, we decided to publish them. They have been distributed widely to libraries, higher education programs, and research centers in Africa and overseas. In addition, the case studies are among the most popular documents on the Partnership Website.

## **Rules of Engagement Strategic Interventions, Grant Making, and Organization**

### *Strategic Interventions*

Case study findings assisted the Partnership in conceptualizing and fine-tuning its initial round of grant making. Together with this, we began laying out strategic areas of intervention for consideration. Internal work among Partnership foundation staff was complemented by external consultations. Then, in February 2003, the Partnership convened a workshop in Bellagio, Italy, to determine future directions. Five experts on higher education joined us—four of them African and one from Europe—for five days of discussion and debate.

The Bellagio meeting led to drafting a strategic plan, which was approved by the presidents of the four foundations in December 2003. The strategic plan, which is available on the Partnership Website, identified four sets of activities that reflect the vision of the Partnership and derive from intensive discussion with grantee institutions. The activities are as follows:

- ICT and higher education
- Building higher education studies as a field
- Regional approaches to capacity building and research
- Establishing a roundtable for leaders of African higher education

Grant making in these four areas represents a mix between continued collaboration with higher education institutions engaged in reform in Partnership countries and more systemic work on higher education and issues that transcend individual universities. Each theme is one in which the individual Partnership foundations have themselves funded activities.

### *Grant Making*

For the decade or so prior to the Partnership's establishment, each of the foundations supported African universities, but much of the funding can be characterized as working *through* universities as opposed to focusing on the development of their institutional capacity. Although the foundations gave grants to universities to carry out specific activities or projects, little of this funding was defined as support for higher education *per se*.<sup>1</sup> The Partnership's creation was an affirmation by the foundations that support for African higher education was in and of itself a desirable goal.

---

<sup>1</sup> In preparation for the Partnership's launch, Nick Menzies, a program officer in the Ford Foundation Nairobi office prepared a typology of Ford Foundation grant making in Africa in the 1990s. He divided Ford grants into five categories: grants that work through a university, but in which the university itself is not an active player; grants where the university is an active player, yet are not designed to build capacity; grants to a university for activities in which the university is an active partner and which are designed to stimulate interest about a new issue of importance; grants for workshops; and grants that support reflection and questioning about the changing role of universities in society.

In 2000, when the four presidents announced the Partnership's launch, they declared their financial grant-making goal as \$100 million over five years. The Partnership has exceeded that goal by almost a third. As of September 2004 the Partnership foundations had contributed an aggregate of \$146.1 million toward higher education development in our six focus countries—Ghana, Mozambique, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania, and Uganda—and on an Africa-wide basis.<sup>2</sup>

Priority focus areas for joint funding are chosen by consensus. Even so, each foundation retains its autonomy in determining which specific activities and institutions to support. To accommodate instances when one foundation declines to fund an activity, we have agreed that in order for a grant to be considered a "Partnership initiative," two or more of the foundations must agree and no foundation object. All grants are awarded independently by each foundation, using its normal mechanisms for review and decision-making, although we do our best to standardize proposal and reporting requirements.

Grants are made through two funding vehicles—Joint Partnership Initiatives and Individual Foundation Grant Making. Joint initiatives are grouped into one of the Partnership's four priority areas:

- **Building Higher Education Studies as a Field:** The case studies, which were funded beginning in 2000, have been knowledge-producing exercises and are part of a Partnership effort to inform others of developments in higher education in Africa. Other notable examples of Partnership work in this area include funding of the *Journal of Higher Education in Africa* (published jointly by the Council for Social Science Research in Africa and Boston College) and support for the postgraduate training program in higher education studies at the University of the Western Cape.
- **Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) and Higher Education:** ICT, which is a major Partnership priority, is discussed in more detail below. Partnership support for ICT has ranged from organizing meetings and investigations to implementation of a bandwidth consolidation and management initiative for Partnership funded universities and the Association of African Universities (AAU).
- **Regional Approaches to Institutional Capacity Building and Research:** The Partnership is committed to regional networks that build economies of scale and critical mass in selected fields. Support to the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC), the AAU, CODESRIA, and the University of Cape Town's University Science, Humanities, and Engineering Partnership in Africa (USHEPiA) fall within this category. In addition, each of the Partnership foundations funds both regional and national networks.
- **Establishing a Roundtable for Leaders of African Universities:** The Partnership has been able to take advantage of regular gatherings of university leaders and higher-education scholars occasioned by the case studies to establish an informal network of higher education experts. These sessions have focused and elevated the level of debate within the African higher-education community and have provided valuable learning activities. We are now beginning to work on a more formal venue for these interactions.

In addition to joint initiatives, Partnership members engage in "individual foundation grant making," i.e., support of higher education institutions in the six countries according to the foundation's mission, priorities, and geographic mandate. These funding decisions are made independently by the

---

<sup>2</sup> As of this writing, we have not yet begun to integrate grants made to Kenyan universities into the Partnership's grant-making information.

foundation concerned, using its normal mechanisms for review and decision-making. Grants include support for advancing education systems, broad institution building, specific department activities, and regional activities.<sup>3</sup>

### Partnership Grant Making, 2000-2004

Year	Joint Initiatives	Grants Made by Individual Foundations	Grand Totals
2000	\$1,245,719	\$21,507,025	\$22,752,744
2001	\$3,805,453	\$35,803,787	\$39,609,240
2002	\$2,419,273	\$27,506,405	\$29,925,678
2003	\$1,627,721	\$24,732,132	\$27,191,482
2004 (through 9/04)	\$1,627,721	\$25,563,761	\$27,191,482
TOTAL	\$10,989,166	\$135,113,110	\$146,102,276

### *Organization of the Partnership*

The Partnership is not a legal entity. It does not make grants. It does not have a secretariat. There is a full-time facilitator, who is housed at New York University (NYU), and who is assisted by a part-time intern. NYU receives grants from the four foundations to cover administrative and some program-related costs (meetings in Africa and elsewhere, publishing, the Partnership Website, etc.)

The facilitator position was created in 2002, two years after the Partnership's launch, and I have filled this position since its initiation. The facilitator carries out a *potpourri* of responsibilities—from tracking grants, organizing meetings, and setting deadlines to staffing Partnership committees and providing programmatic expertise. Because of my background in ICT for African universities, I have assumed primary responsibility for the Partnership joint ICT work.

Each foundation appoints a staff member to serve on a steering committee, with which the facilitator works closely. The steering committee has a chairperson, who is selected biannually on a rotating basis. The chairperson is empowered to resolve any issues that arise, and consults, as necessary, with other steering committee members.

The Partnership meets at least six times a year, in person, by conference call, by video, or by some combination of these. Virtual participation is important because there are three foundations in New York and one in Chicago. In addition, staff from African field offices frequently attend these meetings—by video or conference call.

We initially thought that Partnership meetings would only include steering committee members. Interest in higher education in Africa and the Partnership has been so high, however, that meetings frequently include more than one person from each foundation.

These meetings are important because they serve, in part, as a forum to review incoming proposals, commission work, meet jointly with visiting grantees, and plan new initiatives.

---

<sup>3</sup> It is also important to remember that the four foundations support activities in “non-Partnership” countries, such as Madagascar, Namibia, and Zimbabwe in Southern Africa; several Francophone countries in West Africa; and Egypt in North Africa. Thus, even more support than is shown in the table above is being channeled to African universities.

## ICT as a Partnership Priority

### Foundation support for ICT

Even before the Partnership decided to designate ICT as a priority, the four Partnership foundations were making ICT-related grants. Examples include:

- Support for ICT strategic planning.
- Infrastructure support, including equipment purchase.
- Library support, including implementation of OPACs.
- Curriculum development using technology.
- Support for the Database of African Theses and Dissertations (DATAD).

Just as a linchpin keeps a wheel in place, ICT is essential to the running of universities. Early on, the universities that the Partnership supports recognized the pressing need to improve their ICT infrastructure and utilization. Selecting ICT as a Partnership priority was therefore an easy decision.

If determining that ICT deserved focused concentration was easy, deciding the Partnership's course of action was less straightforward. As a first step, we appointed an ICT sub-committee to be responsible for making recommendations to the Partnership. This sub-committee is composed of one person from each foundation and the facilitator. Because the Partnership foundations work in close collaboration with their grantees, it was essential to get grantee input on the way forward.

In 2002 we organized our first Partnership ICT activity—a workshop for African universities on ICT for teaching, learning, and research. The workshop, which was organized in collaboration with the UN Economic Commission for Africa and held in Addis Ababa, brought together senior policy makers, academics, techies, and librarians in order to learn their thoughts on where to start. Participants came from Partnership grantee universities and from regional and sub-regional consortia. We also invited a handful of resource people.

The agenda included presentations and discussion on the overall status of ICT implementation nationally and at participating universities; the work of regional and pan-African associations; using ICT for distant education and academic applications; and criteria for selecting different kinds of media. There was ample time for discussion during the plenary sessions, in addition to which the large group broke into small thematic groups twice a day. On the last day of the meeting we focused on priority setting and recommendations.<sup>4</sup>

Bandwidth quickly became the *leitmotif* of the meeting. Sufficient bandwidth may be essential to ICT planning and implementation, but it is in remarkably short supply in Africa for a variety of reasons.

Following the 2002 Addis workshop, the Partnership commissioned the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) to convene a task force and coordinate a short study, with a focus on how to obtain more bandwidth at lower cost. The UDSM task force, known as the BandITs, consisted of bandwidth experts from Partnership universities who were joined by a few outside resource people and myself as an *ex officio* member. The investigation entailed detailed surveys at the Partnership universities together with fact gathering about infrastructure, technology, and regulatory frameworks and policies in each of the Partnership countries. An important component of the study examined “out of Africa” issues. We met once face-to-face and frequently virtually.

Not surprisingly, we quickly learned that rates for bandwidth in sub-Saharan African universities can be up to 100 times more expensive than broadband connections in North America or Europe. For

---

<sup>4</sup> The Addis Ababa report, “*Securing the Linchpin: ICT for Teaching, Learning, and Research*,” is on the Partnership Web site together with ancillary documentation prepared for and during the workshop. The report, without additional documentation, is also available in print.

that reason, few sub-Saharan African universities can afford to purchase sufficient bandwidth to meet their needs. In addition, because universities typically purchase their bandwidth from an Internet Service Provider (ISP) or bandwidth reseller, they do not always receive dedicated bandwidth—even when they pay for it—and sometimes share “their” bandwidth with other customers.

The BandITs presented their report and recommendations to the Partnership in November 2003, after which we agreed upon strategies to meet the immediate needs of partner universities for cheaper bandwidth; begin work on critical aspects of bandwidth management and technology use; explore modalities to establish a permanent regional entity to carry forward a longer-term agenda of addressing technology for tertiary education and research.

*Meeting the Immediate Needs for Cheaper Bandwidth: The African Virtual University as Bandwidth Consolidator*

As a first step and in consultation with universities receiving funding from the Partnership foundations, the Partnership contracted with the African Virtual University (AVU) to undertake a three-month investigation focusing on the aggregation of demand to achieve economies of scale and lower bandwidth costs for the Partnership-supported universities and the Association of African Universities. The AVU team visited Mozambique, Uganda, Tanzania, Ghana, and Nigeria, and met with technical staff and academic leadership at each institution. Each institution also completed an extensive questionnaire with details on infrastructure, connectivity, applications, service providers, problems, etc.

AVU was selected to conduct this investigation because it already had considerable experience in identifying satellite companies and vendors willing and able to do business with Africa. With backing from the World Bank, AVU selected NetSat Express and New Skies Satellite to handle its modest bandwidth purchase (5 Mbps) at \$4 per Kbps. It was our hope that the price could be lowered if AVU were empowered to negotiate for additional bandwidth. It was decided to focus on NetSat Express/New Skies because the World Bank had already approved the bid.

AVU presented its final report at a Partnership roundtable for Vice Chancellors and senior technical staff in Dar es Salaam, September 10-12, 2004. Following discussion, the Vice-Chancellors signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) giving AVU the exclusive right to negotiate on their behalf through the end of the year, with the goal of decreasing bandwidth rates to \$2.50 per Kbps. Go to <http://www.foundation.org/pubs/avu> for the full AVU report.

Keeping both the vice chancellors and technical staff fully informed and involved has been an essential part of the process. Because NetSat would not lower its bid to the desired level of \$2.50 per Kbps and following unanimous positive feedback from the universities, the Partnership commissioned the AVU to identify qualified firms through an RFP. AVU requested bids for:

- The cost of dedicated bandwidth at 16, Mbps, 32 Mbps, and a full transponder.
- Equipment costs
- The cost of a 12-, 24-, and 36-month contract. We recognize that longer contracts result in larger discounts, but conditions are now so volatile that we wanted to know all of our options.

The RFP was released and widely circulated in November 2004; final bids were due by the end of December and were reviewed by technical and financial committees. One company met our goal of \$2.50 per Kbps and passed the technical and financial reviews. Final negotiations are underway for 93 Mbps at a cost of \$2.33 per Kbps. The Partnership foundations expect to make grants to AVU by June, and full implementation should follow shortly thereafter.

This consolidation effort will be restricted to Partnership grantees and AVU learning centers for the first year, at least. It is an experiment that is proving very complicated to put in place. The broader goal, of course, is to allow other African tertiary institutions with sufficient infrastructure and funding to participate.

#### *Bandwidth Management*

Bandwidth cannot be used efficiently if inadequate policies and management tools permit it to be wasted. Most of the Partnership universities employ some management strategies, but none of them have been systemic.

We heard two presentations on the Tertiary Education Network (TENET) of South Africa at the September Dar es Salaam roundtable. Brian Figaji, Vice Chancellor of Penninusta Technikon addressed the leadership issues; Duncan Martin, TENET CEO provided the context, administrative, and technical information, and his presentation can be found on the Partnership website, as well. The "techies" also met in breakout sessions, focusing heavily on setting appropriate management policies and putting in place enforcement procedures.

By the end of the meeting, participants agreed to ask for assistance from TENET to help the universities meet their priorities for assistance in areas pertaining to bandwidth policies, management and training. The TENET board of directors has approved this request. Implementation will begin at about the same time as the bandwidth consolidation initiative. The goal is to create a long-term sustainable training methodology, for training needs will always exist. Thus, we are interested in both meeting immediate needs of Partnership grantees and also in conceptualizing a model that might include the identification of regional nodes.

#### *Long-term Treatment of Technology for Tertiary Education and Research*

Although the Partnership focuses its programmatic efforts in six African countries only, other donors work across the continent and are active in ICT. SIDA-SAREC and NUFFIC are two European examples. In addition, the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) of Canada has worked on ICT for Africa for over a decade. IDRC is now exploring ways for African universities to take full advantage of the Internet through the establishment of consortia. As a first step, IDRC commissioned a study on Promoting African Research and Education Networking (PAREN), and is now reviewing possible options.

In Africa, the AAU received a strong mandate from its constituent universities at its General Conference in Cape Town last February to work more intensively on ICT, specifically bandwidth. To that end, the Partnership foundations are supporting the AAU to conduct a short consultancy to identify AAU's niche and role in promoting greater access to bandwidth for tertiary education institutions on the continent. The study has a number of objectives, which include identifying criteria for effective participation in a bandwidth-driven consortium, reviewing existing organizations on the continent that could potentially host or incubate a consortium, and identifying technological trends that would affect the choice of consortium design.

The Partnership hopes that other foundations and organizations will complement our efforts, which focus on a finite number of countries and institutions, in order to assist tertiary education institutions throughout Africa benefit from the potential of ICT.

### *There is Power in Numbers*

The universities and AAU will receive cheaper and more reliable bandwidth because they have joined together in a bandwidth consortium. The satellite company is providing cheap bandwidth because these institutions are purchasing bulk bandwidth and because AVU is acting as their agent.

On our part, the Partnership foundations would never have embarked on an activity of this complexity and size were it not for the fact that four foundations are working on this activity together—from planning it to sharing the costs.

### **Partnership Learning Experiences**

In 2004 the Partnership commissioned three higher education experts<sup>5</sup> to conduct a formative evaluation of the Partnership, bearing in mind that the Partnership had only been in existence for less than five years at the time.

The team carefully analyzed Partnership records, paying attention to both joint and individual foundation grant making, and carried out almost 200 interviews. It was a rigorous exercise.

Although the evaluation report is an internal document, not intended for outside circulation, I would like to share with you the major report findings and recommendations.

### *Impact of the Partnership*

#### **Using The Ford Foundation as an Example**

In the decade before the establishment of the Partnership, The Ford Foundation spent approximately \$150 million to support projects in universities in a variety of disciplines. Since the Partnership's creation, the Foundation has begun to assess ways to provide systemic support to African higher education. It has organized retreats, conferences, and studies, including on pipeline issues in East and West Africa. The number of higher education program officers has increased—from one for Southern Africa to a half-time program officer (PO) in the East Africa office and a full-time PO in Cairo.

*Systemic* support for African higher education has gone up, as opposed to *project* support. The foundation established an African Higher Education Initiative (AHEI), to which the New York office, and the four African regional offices contribute. In addition to Ford contributions to Partnership activities, program officer grant making is in the range of \$2.5 million annually. (Email from John Butler-Adam, higher education program officer, Johannesburg, 12 April 2005.)

Creation of the Partnership led to tripling of the annual investment of the four foundations in African higher education over what they had invested in the 1990s. Foundation grant making has begun to shift in favor of support for institutional transformation rather than concentrating on project-related funding.

Collaboration between foundations has brought about greater synergy in their grant making. This is particularly true in Nigeria, where Carnegie and MacArthur have large institutional university grants, and in Uganda, where Carnegie and Rockefeller both support Makerere University. Finally, the report pointed to the case studies and other activities, such as the *Journal on Higher Education in Africa*, as contributing to the production and distribution of knowledge on higher education in Africa.

---

<sup>5</sup> Anne Whyte of Mestor Associates was the team leader. She was assisted by Teboho Moja of New York University and Jairam Reddy, currently at UN University in Amman, Jordan.

### *Evaluation Recommendations*

The evaluation made a number of recommendations to enhance the effectiveness of the Partnership. The first pertains to more effective information sharing—within the Partnership by member foundations and with other donors. Together with this, the evaluation team recommended a higher profile for the Partnership, including development of a Partnership communications policy.

Together with the recommendation that the Partnership broaden its communications outreach, they also suggested that we consider increasing the number of foundation members in the Partnership, bringing in new countries, and involving more African institutions.

A third set of recommendations focused on strengthening organizational and operating modalities, including more joint work on signature programs, and sharpening strategic *foci*. The bandwidth initiative, which was just getting started during the evaluation, is an excellent example of joint work on a signature program. The report also called for tighter and better coordination among the foundations to achieve greater efficiency and effectiveness.

### *Next Steps*

The evaluation was submitted to the Partnership in October 2004 and discussed at a meeting of the presidents of the four foundations in November. A number of steps have already been taken to address the report's recommendations:

- The presidents agreed to continue the Partnership for another five years. We have proposed to them a level of investment of \$150 million, and this recommendation is likely to be accepted. We have decided that the focus of the re-launch must be on the accomplishments and contributions to higher education of the institutions with which we collaborate rather than on Partnership grant making *per se*. We are now considering the most appropriate ways to convey that message—both inside and outside of Africa.
- Partnership staff drafted a set of “organizing principles,” which was adopted at the November meeting. These principles lay out in writing the Partnership's terms of reference for selection of countries, grant-making decisions, priority areas, and coordination.
- Discussions are underway with several US foundations about membership in the Partnership, and we are interested in exploring broader collaboration with other donors—both in North American and in Europe.
- We have added Kenya to the list of Partnership countries. We expect that Rockefeller and Ford, which both have offices in Nairobi, will collaborate closely on Partnership higher education grant making. The immediate focus of activities will likely be on bandwidth, which is such an important strategic initiative.
- Now that bandwidth has progressed so far, we are now thinking about how best to tackle the Partnership's other strategic areas, including collaboration with other donors and organizations working on the same issues. We are now planning to convene another small meeting in Bellagio in the fall to work on strategic planning and implementation.

In conclusion, the Partnership is an unusual organism. Although it began as an initiative of presidents, it has been taken on with enthusiasm by program staff of all four foundations and has served to galvanize how they perceive higher education grant making in Africa.