positioned to benefit from the initiative, 829 (41 percent) of the 2,000 research chairs will be allocated to only 5 universities (Alberta, British Columbia, McGill, Montreal, and Toronto) with 6 percent of chairs being specially allocated to smaller universities. Given that there has been a general assumption that Canadian universities are roughly equal in quality and homogeneous in institutional form, one possible impact of the CRC program may be the emergence of a more diverse university sector with an institutional hierarchy based on research intensity.

The CRC allocation protocols prescribe the share of research chairs that will fall under each of three broad research areas: 45 percent for natural sciences and engineering; 35 percent for health; and 20 percent for social sciences and humanities. The regulations also establish a framework for the distribution of chairs between a combination of existing faculty research “stars” and new appointments, though each university will have flexibility in determining how best to use CRC funds to strengthen its research infrastructure.

While program regulations prescribe the number of chairs that each institution will receive, universities have considerable autonomy in allocating the chairs within each institution, though the procedures and timelines of this decision-making process represent another important deviation from Canada’s traditional approach to research funding. Prior to 2000, institutional research plans were essentially a synthesis of investigator-initiated research plans with the investigator or research team as the unit of analysis. The CRC approach assumes the existence of a rationally planned and managed university research enterprise. Given that the CRC program guide was disseminated in April 2000 and university research plans had to be submitted within five months, the processes employed to develop these statements of research priorities ranged from autocratic administrative decrees to ostensibly participatory planning exercises conducted during a time period when it was difficult for many active researchers to participate. In short, the planning process was largely at the discretion of university administrators and frequently bypassed traditional academic decision-making structures.

The CRC is one of a number of recent initiatives designed to increase the research capacity of Canadian universities, including the creation of the Canadian Foundation for Innovation, the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, and a number of new provincial government research funding mechanisms. Aside from providing additional resources for university research, these initiatives will undoubtedly have an important impact on the current institutional arrangements and they signal potentially dramatic shifts in what was a unique, Canadian approach to higher education policy.

Endowing African Universities—Success Stories
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Following Damtew Teferra’s clear argument in this newsletter (see International Higher Education no. 20) in support of endowing universities on African soil, the cases of three universities may serve to demonstrate that endowments can be well managed, contribute to institutional sustainability, and lead to transnational collaboration with students, faculty and administrators throughout the world.

The three institutions are the University of Nairobi, the American University of Cairo, and the University of the Western Cape. Each institution received a U.S.$1 million endowment under the Ryoichi Sasakawa Young Leaders Fellowship Fund (SYLFF) Program, a collaborative project of the Nippon Foundation and the Tokyo Foundation. The same conditions applied in each case—that is, the universities should be committed to managing the endowments to ensure that a predetermined portion of the earnings are returned to the capital to sustain growth over the long-term and use disposable income to provide fellowships to graduate students in the social sciences and humanities. Each institution is empowered to administer the fellowship program and to promote follow-up programs that are separately implemented and funded by the Tokyo Foundation.

Endowing African universities is not an audacious initiative but a sound investment in the future by the recipient and the donor.

Profile of Endowments and Contributions

When the University of Nairobi received its SYLFF endowment in 1989, it already had one other small endowment for general institutional support that was established in 1970 during its period as the University College Nairobi. The university has sought additional endowments from national and international sources but has not received further contributions thus far.
In 1992, when the SYLFF endowment was presented to the American University in Cairo, there were already 45 smaller endowments for scholarships and visiting, short-term scholars. The SYLFF endowment was the largest, and SYLFF fellowships derived from the endowment became the most prestigious. Since then, the university has actively sought further contributions and currently reports 110 funds of varying amounts, including two endowed chairs and substantial foundation support for the university’s Center for Arabic Study Abroad. Endowments and contributions comprise 28 percent of the university’s total annual revenue.

**Effective Management Produces Growth**

The establishment and management of SYLFF endowments, administration of SYLFF fellowship programs, and promotion of follow-up programs have called for close cooperation between the foundation and the universities. The relationship has shifted from guidance in the early stages of preparing for the presentation of the endowment to collaboration in the current stage of fine-tuning of fund management and administration of the fellowship programs, and program development beyond the shores of the African continent.

Issues related to endowments are not exclusive to the African continent. The conception and implementation of an endowment is not widely understood by many prospective recipients. However, the SYLFF experience of empowering the receiving institutions, ongoing collaboration between the foundation and universities, networking among more and less experienced institutions in the network, and providing follow-up programs, including professional development training demonstrates that institutions on African soil and elsewhere can indeed manage endowments and administer programs. University administrators acquire the requisite knowledge, understanding and skills that carry over to other programs. Furthermore, in an increasing number of cases, existing endowments are used as leverage to attract other contributions.

Endowing African universities is not an audacious initiative but a sound investment in the future by the recipient and the donor. The recipient commits to fulfilling the conditions put forward by the donor, which in the best cases are jointly developed, and to ensuring that the endowment is integrated into an institutional strategy and action plan for sustained growth. The donor supports the university by providing the funds and offering follow-up programs and activities that not only help ensure sustained growth but also expand the opportunities for the university beyond the parameters of the endowment.

---

**Center Publications in Other Languages**

Several recent books relating to the Center have been published in translated editions:  


In addition, Philip G. Altbach’s *Comparative Higher Education: Knowledge, the University, and Development* will be issued in a Chinese-language edition by the People’s Education Press, Beijing, China, in early 2001.