RESULTS FOR DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

AN INTERIM EVALUATION OF THE

Master's in Development Practice Initiative

OF THE

JOHN D. AND CATHERINE T. MACARTHUR FOUNDATION

EXTERNAL REPORT

February 22, 2012

*Prepared by Ruth Kagia and Michelle Engmann of Results for Development Institute
at the request of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.*

Acknowledgements

Disclaimer

Results for Development Institute (R4D)

R4D is a not-for-profit organization whose mission is to unlock solutions to tough development challenges that prevent people in low- and middle-income countries from realizing their full potential.

INTRODUCTION

From 2007 to 2012, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation invested approximately US$17 million to train a new generation of development practitioners with the technical and practical skills necessary to diagnose and address the interlinked global problems of sustainable development and poverty. Foundation grants were provided to establish 19 multi-disciplinary MDP degree programs and a Secretariat that would coordinate the Global MDP Network. With the addition of five programs that have joined the MDP network without Foundation funding, the Network now includes 24 MDP programs at institutions of higher learning in 17 countries around the world.[1]

This report presents the findings of an interim evaluation of this Master's in Development Practice (MDP) programs initiative, including the quality of the individual programs and Global MDP Network, the capacity of the Global MDP Secretariat, and the future viability, sustainability, and replicability of the MDP model at other institutions of higher learning. As requested by the Foundation, it is a formative evaluation[2] conducted with the expectation that it will be followed by a summative evaluation in 2014, by which time more program experience and data will be available and trends will be clearer about longer term issues such as performance, quality, sustainability, outcomes and impact.

In 2006, the MacArthur Foundation's Board approved a proposal to examine how best to train a new generation of development practitioners.[3] The reasoning behind this proposal was that achieving sustainable development, including the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), requires a holistic and integrated approach, a solid conceptual understanding, and the ability to work across boundaries of culture and geography. The proposal noted that few existing programs offering a degree in "development" are sufficiently preparing development professionals to solve complex global problems, and that there is the need to create a systematic, cross disciplinary education for a new cadre of development practitioners.

To investigate this question further, the Foundation subsequently provided a grant to the Earth Institute at Columbia University in January 2007 to establish an International Commission on Education for Sustainable Development Practice ("the Commission")[4] to identify existing gaps in training for development professionals and to recommend improvements. The Commission considered the core cross-disciplinary educational needs to support problem solving in sustainable development and the design of a program that would prepare practitioners to confront major challenges of sustainable development in the 21st century. The possibilities for reshaping the field were examined, with reference, by analogy, to how the Flexner Report transformed medical training in the early 1900s.[5]

---

[1] At the time of the evaluation, 22 programs had launched a first cohort. Two programs are poised for fall 2013, and a further two are in development for 2014.

[2] In brief, this (formative) evaluation seeks to learn as much as possible about the progress of the initiative thus far, recognizing that it is still at an early stage and that more data, time, and money will required for a deeper (summative) evaluation, which will only be possible subsequently.

[3] McArthur, John W. "Creating an Academic Field for Development Professionals," a letter to the MacArthur Foundation Board, February 9, 2006. Referred to here as "the proposal".

[4] The Commission was made up of nineteen distinguished members around the world. A list of the names of the Commissioners is provided in Annex 2.

[5] The Flexner Report presented a review of 155 medical schools across Canada and the USA, highlighting the extensive variation in the quality and rigor of programs, and recommending the standardization of key elements of a medical

The Commission's key recommendation was the creation of two-year Master's in Development Practice (MDP) programs at universities around the world to provide graduate-level students with the core skills and knowledge required of a generalist development practitioner. The training would be interdisciplinary, with a focus on practical application. It would be anchored in four core disciplines: health science, social sciences, natural sciences, and management. A global network would be established to provide a supportive platform for sharing ideas, experiences, and expertise. The network would be supported by a global Secretariat.

Following the Commission's final report in October 2008, the Foundation Board approved an investment of $15 million over three years to seed MDP programs worldwide and to establish a Global MDP Network and Secretariat.[6] Criteria for the selection of universities included: (i) strong institutional support; (ii) high academic standards; (iii) sufficient institutional capacity; (iv) potential as a regional center of excellence; and (v) financial commitment. Universities would present a business plan, including how an MDP program would be sustained over time.

An initial three-year grant was approved for Columbia University's Earth Institute – where the Commission had been housed – to establish a Global MDP Network and Secretariat, and to establish the first MDP program in Columbia's School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA). Fourteen universities were awarded grants in the summer of 2009, and a further six were awarded grants in the spring of 2011. Another five programs have since joined the Network without Foundation support and two more are preparing to join (see full list of MDP programs in Annex 1).

At the time of this evaluation, 22 full MDP degree programs had been launched, with two more planned for the fall of 2013. One program had graduated two cohorts of students, and ten programs had graduated one cohort. The evaluation assessed indicative results at this midterm point in the initiative.

Evaluation Purpose and Methods

Objectives. The objectives for the evaluation were outlined in terms of reference provided by the Foundation. The main areas of focus in these questions include:

1. The quality and strength of the individual programs and the Global MDP Network.
2. Capacity and effectiveness of the Global MDP Secretariat to support the MDP Network.
3. Demand for the program as demonstrated by the quantity, quality and caliber of students attracted (e.g. number, quality, diversity, age, etc. as compared to students in similar programs such as Master's in International Affairs or Development programs).
4. Early outcomes for students (e.g. number of students employed since graduation).
5. Early indicators of sustainability of the individual MDP programs and future viability and sustainability and replicability of the MDP model for other universities.

---

training program including prerequisite requirements, bed-side "clinical" training, faculty engagement in research, and stronger state regulations for licensure. The findings and recommendations presented in the Flexner Report resulted in the standardization of medical education.

[6] This collective investment and related activities are the focus of this evaluation. Initially, it was expected that the Foundation would support up to 12 universities (or possibly fewer programs at a higher level of support), and would work to engage other foundations in the effort.

More broadly, it was hoped that the evaluation would test the Foundation's expectation that an MDP program would result in a new way of training development practitioners to better address the interlinked, and interdisciplinary challenges of sustainable development in the 21st century. The evaluation would assess the validity of the assumption that demand existed for new, rigorous, cross-disciplinary professional degree programs in the field of development, and that such a model would be replicated by others once some initial programs were given seed support—broadening its ultimate impact.

Methodology.   The evaluation was conducted from October to December 2012. The evaluation team used a mixed method approach for this formative evaluation, drawing upon an online survey designed for the evaluation, targeted in-depth interviews with MDP directors, program staff and students, and an extensive review of documents related to the inception and implementation of the initiative.

Limitations.   As the Foundation appreciated from the outset, an evaluation undertaken mid-stream, while the initiative is still evolving, cannot provide a complete picture of what may emerge with the full passage of time. That reality is particularly true in this case as many of the individual MDP programs are still at very early stages of implementation – at the time of this evaluation, two of the 24 MDP programs have not yet launched, four launched only in 2012, seven in 2011, ten in 2010, and only one in 2009. In addition to varying stages of implementation, differences in the pre-existing capacity of individual institutions makes evaluating overall impact an inexact science. This diversity of existing capacity also makes it more difficult to chart trends in the overall evaluation of the initiative.

Furthermore, the terms of reference, timeframe, and budget constraints that circumscribed this evaluation precluded methodologies that would have provided more precise answers with narrower confidence intervals. For all these reasons, the findings here are best regarded as preliminary hypotheses to be confirmed (or overturned) by the definitive evaluative assessment slated for 2014.

MAIN FINDINGS

Twenty four institutions from 19 countries offer an MDP degree program and form the Global MDP Network (or the Global Association of MDP Programs), which provides a platform for sharing ideas, experiences, and expertise. All MDP students from across the world participate synchronously in a "Global Classroom" via video connections. The core curriculum emphasizes four disciplines – health science, social sciences, natural sciences, and management – and a three month field practicum is required for all students. The program also offers an interactive website and an annual conference, the MDP Summit, for members and other stakeholders. A Secretariat coordinates all components of the initiative. Thus far, a total of 1,154 students have enrolled in MDP programs since the launch of the first program; 376 of them have graduated.

This roll-out of a single framework across a very diverse set of institutions, resources endowments, cultural contexts, and locations around the world is a noteworthy accomplishment in just three short years (less in many cases). This section details findings of the evaluation team related both to

individual MDP programs and to the overarching elements of the initiative, including the Network, the Secretariat, and the Global Classroom.

THE MDP PROGRAMS

Twenty-two full MDP degree programs are currently being implemented, with two more poised to launch in the fall of 2013. One program has graduated two cohorts of students, and ten programs have graduated one cohort. Participating programs are on widely varying trajectories, in terms of both their track records and their prospects. Several of them have made a strong start with good chances for long term success. A few others are facing considerable difficulties that threaten their survival. The majority that fall in between are in differing stages of implementation, with good potential but also facing substantial challenges. In some respects, the differences between programs raise the possibility that the initiative, though packaged as one undertaking, is in fact several different ventures pooled into one, with different evaluation issues arising for each.

Curriculum, content and pedagogy. The core MDP curriculum proposed by the Commission and its emphasis on four core disciplines – health science, social science, natural science, and management – has been adopted as a basic framework by all the programs. A set of core competencies has been accepted by the Association, building on ideas in the Commission's report. The curriculum task force has addressed many concerns relating to curriculum overload and knowledge gaps, though the refinement process will take several more iterations as the implementation experience of individual programs is harmonized with the core curriculum. The initiative's pedagogical approach takes advantage of three principles: multi-disciplinarity, experiential learning (through the field practicum), and extensive networking with others (through the Association). This shared framework among MDP partners, as supported by the Secretariat, helps to keep faculty and students on a well-structured trajectory.

With these features as a foundation, the quality and effectiveness of the teaching and learning in the participating programs have the potential to meet the high standards set out in the Commission Report. Whether they do in fact meet these standards is harder to assess, particularly in this early-stage formative evaluation. However, nothing in the evidence examined for this evaluation suggests that teaching and learning are a problem, although it is likely there will be considerable variation across programs. Preliminary evidence suggests that some students are well served and greatly stimulated by the teaching methods.

Faculty. On the basis of data available to the evaluation team, all the programs appear to have assembled a technically strong, multi-disciplinary faculty from existing departments across the university. All MDP directors and faculty appear to be highly qualified for their positions. Many institutions surveyed noted the time and effort it took to establish the inter-departmental structures necessary to deliver the program and to generate buy-in. In most cases, the program directors and their deans have led this complex negotiation process. Those partner institutions that have been successful in generating this buy-in from different departments are able to offer their students the breadth of courses necessary, while also avoiding additional costs of hiring new faculty (which is quite costly in the establishment phase of the program). While most programs have been successful at creating these opportunities for students to access different departments, and a few have established university-wide academic committees to oversee the programs, many still struggle with varying levels of commitment, and not all have achieved true inter-disciplinarity.

The field practicum. The field practicum is widely seen as "the capstone experience of the MDP." Students participate in "hands-on" field-training sessions of up to three months' duration. Though the approach differs by program, the course typically starts after completion of the first academic year, and constitutes a structured training program, giving students the opportunity to gain first-hand experience of integrated approaches in a real development context. The Association has prepared a Field Training Manual which is currently being updated by a task force to reflect the various field training models that schools are using and to include a section on best practices. Joint field practicum arrangements, such as those emerging between UFRRJ and Columbia/Emory or between UCAD and Sciences Po, can help level the playing field in terms of resources and capacity, and should be replicated among more MDP programs. Many programs also seek to establish longer term partnerships with field placement organizations to ensure future collaboration and a job market for graduates. The employment successes of MDP graduates can, in part, be explained by the experience and relationships established during the field practicum.

Program demand. One critical question assessed in this evaluation is the extent to which there is demand for the MDP approach. This question has multiple dimensions: will sufficient students be attracted to it; will the training and credentials they get enable them to thrive professionally; will employers value the degree and hire graduates strongly; will universities and faculty gravitate toward or away from the program; and will the feedback loops between the reputation that the program builds and the quality of the students result in growing success or stagnation? It is too early to answer many of these questions, but the five additional MDP programs that have joined the network with no financial support from the Foundation indicates a broader demand for the MDP approach. The high absorption of graduates into the labor market, if sustained, would attract students to the program. In addition, information on class size and student diversity can offer insights into the complex question of program demand, suggesting, among other things, that the extent and nature of demand will vary immensely across programs.

There is strong student demand for the program overall, with an average of 80 applicants per program, but with wide variations across member institutions. Class sizes range from 57 to seven. About half the programs have fewer than 20 students in their most recent year's cohort; 10 have fewer than 15 students, and six have fewer than 10 students. Comparing year to year, many programs are keeping classes around the same size; others may be declining slightly if future years confirm recent trends. Programs with fewer than 10 students are likely to have challenges attracting students and faculty, achieving impact and reputational goals, realizing the full benefits of multi-disciplinarity, and covering expenses (due to high per-student costs). While it is too early to draw final conclusions, this issue warrants further investigation to determine why so many programs are struggling to gain traction. For example, are they struggling to win acceptance and market share relative to other programs? Is the model used to determine class size appropriate for this program? Insufficient start-up time may account for some, but clearly not all, of the story. The Association should discuss emerging lessons on optimal class size, in the context of relatively high unit costs and the need for most programs to generate income through tuition fees.

Student diversity. One of the eligibility requirements for Foundation funding under this initiative was "significant geographic representation". Student diversity enhances a key objective of the initiative – to train professionals who can work across cultural and geographical boundaries. At the aggregate level, the criterion has been met. As of June 2012, the regional breakdown of enrolled students was as follows: United States, 28 percent; Sub-Sahara Africa, 21 percent; Asia, 18 percent;

South America, 13 percent, and Europe, 7 percent. Out of the total enrolled students, 54 percent were females. Students also appear to be richly varied in terms of professional experience and backgrounds. At the individual program level, however, implementation of the diversity criterion is more uneven. Some universities have a student body that is more than 50 percent international while others have students recruited only from within their borders. The inability to provide sufficient scholarships for international students is noted in the evaluation survey as the main hurdle to recruiting a more diverse student body. The Association should share experiences on this issue since some programs in relatively poor resource environments have succeeded in achieving national diversity.

Graduate placement. The real test of the MDP program's long-term sustainability will be the marketability of its graduates and the extent to which their professional success can be linked to the MDP training. This will require many more observations than was possible in this evaluation where only one University (Columbia) had graduated more than one cohort. A survey of graduates conducted by the Secretariat in the fall of 2012 found that 82 percent of the students surveyed were employed within six months of graduation.[7] Most of the graduates, irrespective of country of origin, are working with agencies and institutions involved in development work. This relatively high labor absorption rate could be partly explained by the partnership model of the program, which gives students an opportunity to establish long term relationships during the field practicum. The MDP programs also appear to be equipping students with skills that they find useful in their work. The three top-ranked skills received from the MDP programs, according to the graduate survey, are research methods, project management, and cross-sectoral understanding of development issues. These results need to be confirmed after more cohorts have graduated from the program, but if these very early trends were to hold, they would augur well for the sustainability of the MDP program.

Replicability. Universities and other academic-related programs around the world are adjusting their strategic approach towards a more global, multi-disciplinary and experiential approach. This is in response to complex 21st century global challenges, high graduate unemployment, and declining budgets for academic research and traditional thematic programs. In this light, the MDP is likely to emerge as a trail blazing program, as universities seek to become more global in their outlook (represented in the MDP initiative as the global network), to incorporate experiential learning (the field practicum), and to offer courses that provide transversal skills (the multi-disciplinary core curriculum). The evaluation team identified four initiatives established in the past year that would appear to have taken a cue from the MDP program in terms of their conceptual framework, even though they have not adopted all the MDP pillars.[8]

---

[7] The MDP Alumni Employment Survey, Fall 2012, sampled 50 graduates from four universities: Columbia (26) Florida (5), TERI (14) and Tsinghua (5).

[8] These are the Global Network for Advanced Management (Yale Business School); the Master of Science in Global Health (Georgetown University); the Higher Education Solutions Network (USAID); and the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (United Nations).

CROSS-CUTTING ELEMENTS OF THE INITIATIVE

The MDP Network. The Network is highly valued by its members, especially for its impact on program development, standardization, collaboration and identity formation – those elements that cannot be easily provided by individual programs, and for which a unified cross-program approach would produce better results. The Network's annual MDP Summit was described by many respondents as a unique and highly valued benefit of Association membership. The Summits provide opportunity for the development of partnerships, sharing of learning and best practices, and for Partners' voices to be heard on strategic issues. A newly established governance structure was approved in October 2012, providing for a Global Association Board that is intended to be the mission-setting, policy-making, and strategic planning body of the Association moving forward. It will be supported by various committees and task forces and the Secretariat.

The Secretariat. The Secretariat provides vital operational and programmatic support to the initiative and its components, including the Network, the Global Classroom, and the individual programs. The Secretariat has provided the platform for keeping the Network vibrant and value adding thus far. In December 2012, when the Foundation's funding of the Secretariat came to its long-planned finish, the Secretariat staff was reduced from three people to just one. With this reduced capacity, the Secretariat will have limited ability to continue to provide its critical support to the Network, the Global Classroom, and other aspects of the initiative.

The Global Classroom. As a central component of the MDP approach, the Global Classroom is seen by partners as an important feature of the initiative, facilitating greater interaction among students and a shared learning experience around key sectoral and thematic knowledge areas of the MDP curriculum. However, the Global Classroom has not yet reached its full potential, receiving mixed reviews from MDP program directors and students surveyed for this evaluation. While all respondents value the interactive, cross-disciplinary nature of the course, they voiced frustration with the poor connectivity and time zone issues that make it difficult for students to interact or collaborate with one another. Some content and connectivity improvements have been made, but there is still greater scope for this program to fulfill its promise– and this potential can only be fully achieved through an upgrade in technology.

Sustainability. Ensuring that the initiative and its constituent parts have sufficient financial resources to be sustainable over the long run remains a critical issue. A large majority (about 70 percent) of the stakeholders surveyed and interviewed for this evaluation expressed concern about financial sustainability. Due to its highly complex nature, the MDP is relatively expensive – in one case, the fees are almost four times as high as a standard Master's program. The multi-disciplinary curriculum, the field practicum, the Global Network, the internationally diverse student body, and small cohort sizes all confront administrators and students with costs that are additional to a traditional Master's program. The sustainability of the Network is under threat, primarily because the capacity of the Secretariat has been depleted at precisely the time when its support is needed most to help establish a self-sustaining financing model.[9] Many of the individual programs,

---

[9] The Association has taken steps towards a plan for self-sustainability, establishing Association membership fees based on a formula determined by the revenue stream of the programs. It is also exploring other ways of generating revenue, such as transforming the MDP Summit into a fee-paying conference

particularly in the global South, are also facing financial sustainability problems as enrolment levels remain too low to cover costs through tuition fee income.

Future trajectory. Considering all of the above, the trajectory of the initiative in the years ahead is difficult to predict at this juncture. At one extreme is a positive scenario, where strong programs will continue to thrive, more will become fully established, the Secretariat's capacity will be rebuilt to maintain a vibrant Network, and the Global Classroom will be strengthened through new technology. At the opposite extreme is a less optimistic scenario, where the funding, organizational, and implementation challenges will sooner or later overwhelm many parts of the initiative. Depending on where the initiative lands on this wide spectrum of possibilities, it has the potential to bring about lasting and far-reaching positive change in the training of development practitioners (and through them, countries' progress toward sustainable development), but it is also possible that the investment of time and money made by the Foundation thus far could be substantially at risk. Putting probabilities on the various alternatives seems impossible now, with so little experience and data to draw on. Nevertheless, the fact that this degree of uncertainty exists is an indication to those who may be interested in the success of the initiative – whether as new funders or otherwise – that now is the time to step forward before it becomes harder to take corrective measures.

DISCUSSION

Beyond the findings detailed in the previous section, the evidence so far suggests other observations about the establishment of the initiative, the varying implementation experiences, and the Foundation's contribution to the field of international development training.

Theory of Change. Due to the comprehensive conceptual framework provided by the Commission and considerable preparatory work done by the Foundation prior to the initiative's launch, a clear and compelling theory of change underpinned the initiative from the outset. However, with the benefit of hindsight, it appears this vision may have been too optimistic given the implementation challenges that have arisen. The hope that a new Master's degree program could be fully institutionalized in 19 programs across 15 countries after only three years was ambitious, and did not take fully into account the differing circumstances and challenges of individual programs as discussed above. In addition, the hope that graduates would be able to fuel improvements in development practice and create impact in this short time span is plausible only if many key links in a long causal chain work well.

Different starting points. The experience of the initiative thus far can largely be explained by the underlying reality that the MDP programs are not all of the same ilk. Some are based at institutions in high income countries with students focused on contributing to the development of countries other than their own, while others are based at institutions in middle or low income countries where most students are preparing for positions in their own country. Some programs were able to adapt and build upon existing development programs, while others created their programs from scratch. These important differences, and how they can help explain the varying timelines and implementation challenges among programs, may have been underappreciated at the outset. The hope that the differing starting points and resource endowments could be quickly

overcome by a common approach was trumped by the reality of how long this approach would take to establish in different contexts.

An important contribution. Notwithstanding any of the above, the Foundation's support for the initiative has already had an important impact. The Foundation's funding for the Commission helped galvanize insightful thinking and wide consultation about persistent, fundamental issues that are relevant beyond the MDP program. No matter how many of the participating programs thrive in the coming years, the initiative's innovative approach to solving development challenges has helped to catalyze innovation and generate new impetus in this field. Similarly, for however long the Network can be vibrant, it will be a platform for a wide range of development actors to engage in cross-disciplinary problem-solving in real time. Furthermore, if the programs and Network flourish, the initiative might well have contributed to a paradigm shift, expanding the concept of ownership from a demand-driven aid agenda to emphasize partnerships between institutions in the global north and south working together to enhance local and regional capacity to solve complex problems. This approach will increasingly become the norm as the boundaries between "North" and "South" become blurred in a new multi-polar world.

Annex 1: The Global Association of MDP Programs

MDP Partner Institutions	Foundation Funding[10]	Program Launch
1. Columbia University, USA	2008	2009
2. BRAC Development Institute, Bangladesh	2009	2010
3. Emory University, USA	2009	2010
4. TERI University, India	2009	2010
5. Trinity College Dublin & University College Dublin (TCD/UCD), Ireland	2009	2010
6. Tsinghua University, China	2009	2010
7. Université Cheikh Anta Diop (UCAD), Senegal	2009	2010
8. University of Botswana, Botswana	2009	2010
9. University of Florida, USA	2009	2010
10. University of Ibadan, Nigeria	2009	2010
11. University of Minnesota, USA	N/A	2010
12. Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza (CATIE), Costa Rica[11]	2010	2011
13. James Cook University (JCU), Australia	2009	2011
14. Institut d'Etudes Politiques (Sciences Po), France	2010	2011
15. Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro (UFRRJ), Brazil	2010	2011
16. University of Peradeniya, Sri Lanka	2009	2011
17. University of Winnipeg, Canada	2010	2011
18. Universidad de los Andes (Uniandes), Colombia	2010	2012
19. University of Arizona, USA	N/A	2012
20. University of California – Berkeley, USA	2010	2012
21. University of Waterloo, Canada	2009	2012
22. Birla Institute of Technology Management (BIMTECH), India	N/A	2012[12]
23. University Sains Malaysia (USM), Malaysia	N/A	Expected 2013
24. Lund University, Sweden	N/A	Expected 2013
MDP Associates		
25. Royal University of Bhutan	N/A	Expected 2013
26. Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (KAZNU), Kazakhstan	N/A	Expected 2014
Former Partners		
University of Denver, USA	N/A	2010
University of California, Davis	2009	2010

---

[10] Funding from the Foundation was provided in several tranches; the date listed here indicates when the first tranche was released.

[11] CATIE simultaneously runs an MDP degree program (supported by the Foundation and launched in 2011), as well as a certificate program (supported by the Foundation and launched in 2009).

[12] BIMTECH launched its program in Fall 2010 but was not given full Partnership status until Spring 2012.

Annex 2: Members of the Commission[13]

Name	Affiliation
John DeGioia	President, Georgetown University
Helene Gayle	President & CEO, CARE
Lawrence Haddad*	Director, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex
Jim Kim	François-Xavier Bagnoud Professor of Health and Human Rights, Harvard School of Public Health
Jeffrey Koplan*	Vice President for Academic Health Affairs, Woodruff Health Sciences Center, Emory University
Freddie Kwesiga*	Coordinator African Water Facility, African Development Bank
Lee Yee-Cheong	President, ASEAN Academy of Engineering and Technology
Livingstone Luboobi	Vice-Chancellor, Makerere University
Goolam Mohamedbhai	President, International Association of Universities
John McArthur (Co-Chair)	CEO and Executive Director, Millennium Promise
Milena Novy-Marx	Program Officer, MacArthur Foundation
RK Pachauri*	Chairman, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
Paul R. Samson	Director General of Policy and Development Analysis, CIDA
Alice Pell	Director, Cornell International Institute for Food, Agriculture and Development (CIIFAD)
Jeffrey Sachs (Co-Chair)	Director, Earth Institute at Columbia University
Laurence Tubiana	Director, Institute of Sustainable Development and International Relations (IDDRI)
Ann Veneman	Executive Director, UNICEF
Virgilio Viana*	Director General, Amazonas Sustainability Foundation, Brazil
Xiao Geng*	Director, Brookings-Tsinghua Center, Tsinghua University
Ernesto Zedillo	Director, Yale Center for the Study of Globalization(former President of Mexico 1994-2000)

Regional Coordinator

---

[13] International Commission on Education for Sustainable Development Practice, established in 2007.