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Abbreviations and acronyms
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</thead>
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<td>KI</td>
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Executive summary

**Context.** The Swedish Bilateral Research Cooperation with Tanzania dates back to the 1970s. The aim is to increase production and use of scientific knowledge for inclusive economic growth and social development in Tanzania. In order to develop and strengthen institutional capacity, support is provided to four public institutions: University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM), Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences (MUHAS), Ardhi University (ARU), and the Tanzania Commission for Science and Technology (COSTECH). In the current program phase 2015-2020, the Tanzanian institutions are collaborating with 13 Swedish universities and the Swedish Research Council (VR).

**The survey.** An online survey consisting of 45 questions was sent out by email to 60 coordinators and supervisors at Swedish institutions involved in the Bilateral Research Cooperation with Tanzania 2015-2020. The aim was to collect experience and input from the involved Swedish partners to help evaluate the current program phase and provide input to the coming one. In total, 44 supervisors and coordinators (73%) responded to the survey, representing 24 out of the 28 subprograms.

**General experience of the program.** Most respondents (77%), have an overall positive experience of coordinating/supervising in the bilateral program, while the remaining share states having an overall negative experience. On average, respondents with a coordinating role seem to have a slightly less positive experience than respondents only supervising. Respondents with an overall positive experience of the program indicate that the collaboration is contributing to capacity building, is successful, productive, and of high academic quality.

**Postgraduate program development and supervision.** Most of the respondents have postgraduate students in their programs, and a majority of them are involved in PhD program development and supervision of local students. Most PhD students are coming to Sweden as planned, but the starting and graduating on time are issues for the majority of the respondents. This is due to long and time-consuming processes for recruitment, registration, procurement, the release of students’ field funding, and acquiring resident permits in Sweden. The sandwich model is considered efficient by a large majority of the respondents, while double degree programs are considered challenging, both by respondents with experience of it, and the ones without.

The Tanzanian ownership of the budget and the supervision is repeatedly brought up as a challenge, affecting both Swedish institutions and Tanzanian students. Due to lack of budget control, transparency and insight in the Tanzanian budget process and implementation on the Swedish side, many supervisors and students express frustration and feelings of not being able to move projects forward and helping students when needed. Some respondents do not consider the Swedish supervisor budget to be sufficient, and it is pointed out that it is “hard to run a Sida program without additional funding from other sources”.

**Communication and collaboration.** A majority of the respondents are satisfied with communication with their partners in the subprograms, while about 1/3 are not. The main issues with communication seem to be cultural clashes in meeting and planning culture with lack of or late response to emails and insufficient information regarding meetings, no or little involvement of the Swedish side in planning, and too narrow planning horizons. A larger share of respondents is satisfied with the research collaboration (73%), even though issues mentioned under supervision are impairing efficient research in some cases.
On average, respondents meet their partners physically 1-2 per year, and about 2/3 of the respondents have participated in Annual Review or Planning Meetings at some point during this program phase. However, the general view is that the budget on the Swedish side does not cover participation in these meetings, and therefore attendance is not always prioritized or possible. About half of the respondents are involved in the annual reporting while about 1/3 are involved in budget planning, in both cases to a limited degree. Comparing the two processes, respondents are less satisfied with the involvement in the budget planning and wish for more transparency and larger involvement in the process. Tanzanian ownership is again brought up as an issue, with a lack of decision making and initiatives from the Tanzanian side negatively affecting the progress of the collaboration.

**ISP and Sida management.** About half of the respondents are satisfied with the communication and administration by ISP. However, many also answered that they do not have an opinion since ISP is mainly in direct contact with coordinators and not with supervisors. It is requested that ISP provides more clear information and earlier updates concerning dates for meeting and guidelines for financial reports, and timelier communications regarding program developments. When it comes to the communication with Sida and the Swedish Embassy, 41% consider it satisfactory. Since ISP is the coordinating body, many do not have any direct contact with Sida/the Embassy. Still, many state having good or great contact while some comments indicate that more direct information would be welcome.
Introduction

Background and context

The Swedish Bilateral Research Cooperation with Tanzania dates back to 1977. At that time, the focus was on supporting individual research projects channeled through the Tanzanian Research Council (UTAFITI). In the mid 1990s, the Swedish focus shifted to building sustainable research capacity through institutional support. University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) became the key partner for national research capacity building in 1995. Ardhi University (ARU) and Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences (MUHAS) formed and branched off from UDSM in 2007, and were shortly thereafter included in the Swedish Bilateral Research Cooperation. To further enhance the local ownership of the research agenda, the Tanzanian Commission for Science and Technology (COSTECH) was selected as a partner institution in 2009.¹

The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) is the funding agency, represented by the Embassy of Sweden to Tanzania in Dar es Salaam. The program runs in five-year phases. The aim of the Swedish research cooperation is to increase Tanzania’s production and use of scientific knowledge for inclusive economic growth and social development. The main focus of the current 2015-2020 program phase lies on research- and institutional capacity building in Tanzania, through research training, developing and strengthening high quality PhD and MSc programs and research management. ARU, MUHAS, UDSM and COSTECH are the backbone in the capacity building process, working together with 13 Swedish partner institutions and the Swedish Research Council. The partner institutions are chosen through an open call held before the start of a new program phase.

Each of the four Tanzanian institutions has a separate Research Cooperation Program, with a number of adhering subprograms (Table 1).² There is one overall responsible coordinator at each Tanzanian institution and one coordinator per subprogram, called Principal Investigator (PI).

Table 1. Research Cooperation Program per institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tanzanian Institution</th>
<th>Research Cooperation Program 2015-2020</th>
<th>Number of Subprograms</th>
<th>Swedish Subprogram Coordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARU</td>
<td>Strengthening Capacity on Research and Innovation for Sustainable Land and Environment Management for Inclusive Development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SLU, KTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTECH</td>
<td>Building systems for high quality relevant research in Tanzania</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SU/SPIDER, VR, SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUHAS</td>
<td>Health Research Training and Innovation for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>UU, UMU, SU/SPIDER, KI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDSM</td>
<td>Towards Enhanced Sustainability of Strategic Research and Innovation Systems for Inclusive Development in Tanzania</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>GH, KTH, LiU, LU, SLU, SU, SU/Spider, UU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² For the full list see: https://www.isp.uu.se/what-we-do/bilateral-coordination/tanzania/#programs
The subprograms involve one or several Swedish partner institutions with one assigned Swedish coordinator per subprogram. The Swedish coordinating institutions are Karolinska Institutet (KI), Linköping University (LiU), Lund University (LU), Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), Stockholm University (SU)/Spider, the Swedish Research Council (VR), the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU), Södertörn University (SH), Umeå University (UMU), University of Gothenburg (UG) and Uppsala University (UU). The subprograms also engage supervisors from universities other than coordinating ones, such as Mälardalen University (MDH), Chalmers University of Technology (CUT) and Luleå University of Technology (LTU). Depending on the size and nature of the subprogram, the assigned Swedish coordinator could also have a dual role of supervising in the program.

The Tanzanian institution is fully responsible for the planning, implementation, and monitoring of the program and a major of the budget is transferred and handled in Tanzania. However, each subprogram has an allocated amount for Swedish partners, handled in Sweden by Swedish partners. This funding should cover supervisors’ salary costs, travel, students’ expenses (excluding allowances) and laboratory costs, etc.

The International Science Program (ISP) at Uppsala University has been assigned by Sida to be the overall coordinator on the Swedish side. ISP should function as the middle hand between Sida/the Swedish Embassy and the Swedish partners. ISP’s responsibilities include, amongst others, forwarding the funding received from Sida to Swedish partners, collecting and assessing the financial reports from the Swedish partners, disseminate information about updates and developments in the program, and organize meetings in Sweden. ISP is also responsible for the payment of the allowances to the Tanzanian students while they visit Sweden.

Objective
This survey was commissioned by Sida and carried out by ISP to collect experiences and opinions from coordinators and supervisors at Swedish institutions in the Bilateral Research Program with Tanzania. The aim was to collect valuable first-hand input from involved Swedish partners to help evaluate the current program phase (2015-2020) and provide input to the coming one.

Method
An online survey (Appendix 1) using SUNET Survey\(^3\) was sent out by email on 19 February 2019, followed by several reminders, to 60 coordinators and supervisors at Swedish institutions who are involved in the 28 subprograms of the Bilateral Research Cooperation with Tanzania. The original survey deadline was extended from 8 March to 26 March to increase the number of respondents. The survey consisted of 45 questions ranging from yes-no questions to scaling questions and open-ended ones. It covered postgraduate program development and supervision, budget and planning, communication and collaboration, program management, and future program development. See all questions in Appendix 1.

Preliminary results were presented at a meeting for the Swedish partners of the Bilateral Research Program held at Rosersbergs Slott, Sigtuna on 11-12 April 2019. The comments and discussions provided by coordinators, supervisors and Tanzanian sandwich students present at this meeting, have been considered in this report.

\(^3\) [https://www.sunet.se/tjanster/survey/](https://www.sunet.se/tjanster/survey/)
Limitations

ISP, as the overall coordinator of the Swedish side, only communicates directly with the Swedish coordinators and not with the supervisors involved in the subprograms (unless the coordinator is also supervising). Therefore, the chances are that not all supervisors within all subprograms obtained an invitation to reply to the survey. Still, most are believed to have been reached, and the obtained replies are considered to provide a sufficient representation of the programs.

When conducting a survey of this kind, the negative experiences and opinion easily get the majority of the attention. In this report, the positive aspects are brought out while the emphasis it put on the improvement needs, since it is the main aim of the survey. There are also distinct differences in how the collaboration functions, both between subprograms and collaborating institutions. It should therefore, be noted that the conclusions drawn will not necessarily be representative for all subprograms at all collaborating institutions.
Survey results

The survey results are divided into four sections: 1) The respondents, 2) Postgraduate program development and supervision, 3) Communication and collaboration, and 4) ISP and Sida management. Answers to the section 'Budget and planning' in the survey, are presented under section 2) and 3) in this report.

1. The respondents

Out of the 60 coordinators and supervisors invited to reply to the survey, 44 answered (73%). Out of the 44 respondents, 20 are coordinators and 36 supervisors (13 respondents are acting as both coordinators and supervisors), and one is an assistant coordinator.

Respondents represent 24 out of 28 subprograms. A majority of the respondents are collaborating with partners at UDSM (52%), followed by MUHAS (30%), ARU (14%) and COSTECH (7%). This is roughly proportionate to the number of subprograms at each institution.4

Respondents are affiliated to Chalmers University of Technology, Karolinska Institutet, Linköping University, Luleå University of Technology, Lund University, Mälardalen University, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm University, the Swedish Research Council, the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Södertörn University, Umeå University, University of Gothenburg and Uppsala University.

Previous involvement in the bilateral program

The majority (77%) of the 44 responding coordinators and supervisors have not been involved in any of the previous program phases with Tanzania, while 23% of the respondents have. A few respondents have been involved since the late 1980s and 1990s.

One explanation given for the high share of supervisors and coordinators being new to this program phase is that there is a generational shift taking place at the Swedish partner side, where retiring coordinators and supervisors are handing over their collaborations to colleagues new to the program.

Considering that 77% of respondents answered that they would like to continue the collaboration if there would be a next phase, the high share of new collaborators is not due to lack of interest from Swedish partners.

Reasons for joining the bilateral program

Despite the high share of new coordinators and supervisors in this program phase, many respondents already had established research collaboration with Tanzanian research institutions when responding to the Sida call of Swedish partners. This was the most common reason stated for joining the program, and it was considered an opportunity to continue and expand already existing collaborations. Capacity building and research development related reasons, such as either expanding research or better contributing to the field addressed, were also commonly stated reasons. Another reason was previous experience of

---

4 11 subprograms at UDSM (39%), 7 subprograms at MUHAS (25%), 7 subprograms at ARU (25%), 3 subprograms at COSTECH (11%).
Swedish Bilateral Research Cooperation in other countries. A few joined because they were assigned tasks in the program.

The general experience of coordinating/supervising the program

Coordinators and supervisors were asked to rate the overall experience of coordinating/supervising in the program on a scale from 1 (very negative), 2 (negative), 3 (positive) to 4 (very positive). Quite a few respondents, 77%, stated that they have a very positive (16) or positive (18) overall experience of the coordination/supervision (Figure 1). However, 23% (10 respondents) indicate a negative experience. The average experience of all respondents is 3.1, which is equivalent to an overall positive experience.

Comparing the experiences of the coordinators to those of the supervisors (to the degree separable), coordinators have a slightly less positive experience on average (3) view than respondents only supervising (3.3).

Respondents with an overall positive experience of the program point to that things are going smooth, that the collaboration is successful, productive, of high academic quality and that it contributes to capacity building. The negative aspects are brought up under the two sections: 2) Postgraduate program development and supervision, and 3) Communication and collaboration, respectively.

Figure 1.

Perceived positive effects for the Swedish and Tanzanian institutions

Respondents were asked to point out the positive effects resulting from the collaboration for the Swedish and the Tanzanian institutions. Respondents pointed to that in Sweden, the collaboration increases research knowledge, broadens the scope of research, widens perceptions, contributes to an exchange experience of culture and research, contributes to internationalization and diversity, contributes to staff development regarding teaching, supervision and curriculum development. Working with capacity building provides a sense of value to some respondents, and so does working with research that
contributes to the United Nation’s Sustainable Development Goals. Further, it is considered that the collaboration is eye opening to staff and students at Swedish institutions regarding challenges in conducting research in other parts of the world.

Respondents believe that the program contributes with new research perspectives to lecturing and education, on the Tanzanian side. Also, that it facilitates increased research capacity (infrastructure and personnel) and staff development. The joint research collaboration increases the number of PhD students, the number of publications, and gives opportunity for exchange and joint learning. It also provides access to quality equipment, courses, expertise and training opportunities at Swedish host institutions, according to respondents. Further, it is considered to contribute to solving local challenges through research, and to expand international networks.

The perceived negative things for the Swedish and Tanzanian institutions are covered under each section below.

2. Postgraduate program development and supervision

Involvement in postgraduate program development

Out of the 44 respondents, 32 (73%) state have postgraduate students in their subprograms. About half of these respondents (56%) have been involved in the development of PhD programs at the Tanzanian institution, while 31% have been involved in the development of MSc programs.

The involvement ranges from supervision to curriculum development, and planning and conducting PhD courses. The issues mentioned were mainly regarding that curriculum development (or travel to develop curriculum together) is not sufficiently considered in the budget, or that curriculum involvement was initially planned but never took place, slow certification processes and delays in program approval by the Tanzanian Commission of Universities (TCU). One respondent explains:

“A major goal of the collaboration was to assist in the development of curriculum for a PhD program. Initially this was undertaken with our involvement. However, the process has nearly grinded to a halt due to the slow certification process in Tanzania.”

Regarding MSc program development, the need for involvement from the Swedish side does not seem to be as large as with PhD programs. However, there were two comments about an experienced disparity between the curriculum and the actual quality of the MSc program. The program was considered to be too ambitious, and the background of the students considered being too weak.

Supervision of local students

Respondents were asked to rate their activity in the supervision of local students on a scale ranging from not involved at all (1) to very involved (4). Most respondents with postgraduate students in their programs are involved or very involved in the supervision of local PhD students (66%) (Figure 2), while 28% state that they are not involved at all. Out of the latter, two are coordinators without any supervision duties, and the remaining seven are supervisors in the program.

Many consider their involvement in local supervision as important and necessary. Some supervisors point to that they are fully responsible for the local students, while some of the ones ‘not involved’ would like to be more actively involved. In the comments, it became clear that having a large responsibility for local students combined with no budget control and little insight in what is happening on the Tanzanian side,
poses a challenge, which sometimes causes students to ‘fall in between the chairs’. Supporting and maintaining quality in PhD supervision due to the large geographical distance are other mentioned concerns. Another related challenge brought up is that decision making and initiatives are supposed to come from the Tanzanian side, but in some subprograms not much is happening:

“While much emphasis is placed on the fact that Tanzania should lead the process and students and supervision should successively be conducted by our partners, this is not necessarily the case. Students are left in between chairs.

“Basically, I have been doing most of the supervision. As well as dealing with all logistics and practical stuff too, such as helping out with applications for conferences, making sure they get to conferences, not to mention being a moral support and engaging them in social activities too.”

“In most projects of the sub-program, including the ones where I am involved as co-supervisor, the main drive has been with the Swedish supervisors.”

Figure 2.

Sandwich model training
Most of the 44 respondents (75%) see the sandwich model as an efficient training model, whereas 9% do not consider it an efficient model and 16% have no experience or opinion (Figure 3).
Respondents answering that it is an efficient model point out that it is a cost-effective, efficient model contributing to capacity building, ensures that students complete in time and with quality, allowing students to access facilities and international networks while keeping the focus on local research problems. One respondent explains:

“When the capacity for supervision and the research environment is low, sandwich model is the only possible way. I think it is very efficient and the only way to have the students complete within at least 5 years and with good quality.”

Some of the respondents in favor of the model, do however point to that the time in Sweden is limited and inflexible, and that most of the students’ work is being done in Sweden due to their heavy teaching and administrative obligations in Tanzania. One respondent points to that local PhD programs at the collaborating Tanzanian institution are not developing as quickly as they should have if all students were registered at the home university.

Three respondents answered that it is not an efficient model, one pointing to that it is outdated and would rather have the students being employed full time in Sweden to work under the same conditions as other at the department. Another is referring to problems concerning the specific sandwich program he/she is involved in but points to that there is hope for others. A third is not directing critique directly towards the sandwich model but rather the administrative hindrances around it:

“In combination with the [Swedish] Migration Agency’s bureaucracy, the sandwich model creates a lot of artificial deadlines for when the student has to be in Sweden and when the student has to be in Tanzania. Limited local ownership (on the side of the coordinators and administration, not the local supervisors) also means that students often lose time when they are in the home country because they have to jump through numerous locally invented bureaucratic hoops. I would much prefer a model where it is entirely up to the supervisor and student to determine when it is useful to be in Sweden and when it is useful to be in Tanzania. I think the main capacity building aspect should be the fact that we help train local faculty -
trying to build local administrative capacity by having them administer the programs victimizes the students and makes it harder for them to do good research and to finish on time.”

Double degrees
Six out of the 32 respondents with postgraduate students in their programs have experience of carrying out or planning double degrees in their subprograms, while 26 have no experience. Comments from respondents both with and without the experience of it mainly consider the challenges in merging requirements (e.g. a four-year PhD program in Sweden and three-year program in Tanzania), adjusting to different demands and requirements at the Swedish universities, and too limited time in Sweden for students for this to work. However, some also point to the quality raising value of it, if managed to be implemented. One respondent explains:

“The double degree arrangement could be quite beneficial to both collaborating partners - in terms of achieving high quality outcome and financial compensation from the university.”

Student planning
About half of the 32 respondents with postgraduate students in their programs reported that students started later than originally planned (Figure 4). Reasons include long and complicated recruitment processes, both regarding finding candidates with the required background and the administrative processes of recruitment and new routines. Once recruited, registration was pointed out as another barrier. The delay in receiving resident permits to Sweden was also mentioned. At the meeting in Stockholm, participants emphasized the six months delay in the start of this program phase, which naturally also delayed the starting date of the PhD students.

Connected to the issue of timely starting of PhD students, is the issue of whether the students will finish on time. A majority of the 32 respondents (59%, Figure 5) believes that the students included in their subprograms in this program phase will not finish on time. The main reasons for this delay are lack of time and substantial obligations at the Tanzanian universities, late registration, late or no release of fieldwork funding in Tanzania, and administrative process for procurement taking as long as 6-8 months (at some institutions). Another contributing factor making it hard for students to complete in time is that PhD students (in one subprogram) are expected to graduate in 3.5 years compared to 5 years in the previous program phase.

Two respondents expressed:
“We do not have the budget as main supervisors and we do not control any of the resources at the Tanzanian institution. To get the projects of the ground it takes a lot of time and energy. Much PhD time gets wasted this way.”

“That the responsibility for the program and the supervision has been put on the partner and we have not been able to control when and how the PhD students get their fieldwork funds so their data collection has been delayed by more than a year. This has made it hard for the PhD students to be effective with their time and produce any publications. This has been a constant challenge throughout the program and the PhD students have come to me as co-coordinator to seek help, advice and moral support, and many times I have not been able to do anything because the funds are stuck in the collaborating university system.”
When it comes to visits to Sweden, most respondents state that students are coming as originally planned (88%, Figure 6), but point to that waiting time for visas or residence permits are long\(^5\) and that the time students spend in Sweden is too short. For those having problems with students not arriving on time the release of funds again seems to be an issue.

**Figure 4.**

**Figure 5.**

![Figure 6.](image)

**Figure 6.**

### Funding to supervisors

Respondents were asked if they considered the financial support to supervisors of 250 kSEK/year to be adequate. In all, 45% of the 44 respondents find it sufficient, while 39% do not, and 16% of the respondents have no opinion (Figure 7).

Respondents answering that funds are not sufficient, mainly point out that funds to visit Tanzania are lacking, and that research includes much more than just funds for supervision. It is pointed out that the high overhead costs at Swedish universities do not leave much left. In general, a large share of the

\(^5\) The start of this bilateral phase coincided with the immigrant crisis in Sweden, peaking 2015 and 2016. Waiting times had improved considerably at the time of writing (May 2019).
supervision fee goes to so-called indirect costs (overhead) according to the financial model applied by all Swedish universities. In extreme case, these may amount to 65-70%, although they are considerably lower in most cases (around 50%).

Some respondents explain:

“Funding for supervision is OK but insufficient funds for planning and attending the other mandatory meetings, there is no budget allocated for the cost of travel, accommodation and salary.”

“The amount allocated for supervision in Sweden (250,000 SEK/year/student) has been unchanged for last 10 years despite increases in cost. There are no funds in Sweden for purchases of reagents needed at the collaborating institution in Tanzanian and we are currently experiencing delays in research training progress due to the time-consuming procurement processes at the Tanzanian institution.”

Respondents point to that it is a necessity to complement the Sida funding with funding from other sources, otherwise running the program does not add up. Some subprograms seem to have easier to find these other funding sources than others.

**Figure 7.**

25 In your experience, do you find the financial support from Sida to Swedish supervisors to be adequate? Please, motivate your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In your experience, do you find the financial support from Sida to Swedish supervisors to be adequate? Please, motivate your answer.</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No opinion</td>
<td>7 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure of funds**

A majority of the respondents, 75%, do not experience a problem in spending funds in time while 25% are experiencing problems. The issues are mainly related to external factors such as the activity level of the program in Tanzania, the activities of the students, delays in the start of the Sida program, delays in agreements, late receiving of funds, and that an unrealistically large share of the funding is allocated to year one. One respondent reacted to the 70% spending requirement, to be met before ISP can release funding for the next period, and suggest some alterations:
“(...) The work and bookkeeping at the universities in Sweden is following another more flexible and relaxed timing as for example working plans for teachers and booking of costs in financial system cannot be really changed from year and half year book ends dates and thus cannot be required to be changed to follow some extraordinary external funding projects reporting or other restrictions administrative internal for projects deadlines. Constant endless audits every year and all these 70 % requirements for getting parts of funds is not an optimal way. Remove 70 % requirements and allow transfer of funds for the whole project time or at least for half project time, not every year and not forcing artificial restrictions of 70 % at the same time.”

Summary of main challenges with postgraduate development and supervision
The main challenges related to the postgraduate development and supervision seem to be the Tanzanian ownership of the budget, and ownership of the supervision process, something affecting both Swedish institutions and Tanzanian students. Due to lack of budget control, transparency and insight in the Tanzanian budget process and implementation on the Swedish side, many supervisors and students express frustration and feelings of not being able to move projects forward. Supervisors state that their ‘hands are tied’ and they are not able to help out in a time of need – buying regents, air tickets, providing funds for field studies, etc. The Swedish supervisor budget is considered insufficient by some respondents, and it is pointed out that it is hard to run a Sida program without additional funding from other sources.

3. Communication and collaboration
Most of the 44 respondents (64%) find the communication in the program satisfactory, while 36% do not. Communication satisfaction also seems to decrease with increased hierarchy at the Tanzanian institutions. In general, the communication with the students is found to be functioning, whilst the lack of communication is rather with the supervisors or the Tanzanian PI’s. Issues stated are silence for long periods, lack of or late response to emails, and insufficient information.

Other communication issues are that the Swedish side is not always aware of the planning, the time schedule is too tight, and there is a feeling of seldom being consulted in time. One respondent explains:

“For coordination it has been bad, communication has been late, not complete, slow and very bureaucratic. Just today I got a call for a workshop that I did not know about for supervisors that is to be in the end of this month. No chance for Swedish supervisors to work with that kind of planning horizon. And we should have been part of the planning of the workshop.”

The general satisfaction with the research collaboration is, however, higher among respondents: 73% state to be satisfied, while 27% are not. Overall, there seems to be a generally good impression of the research collaboration part. Some positive respondents explain:

“The research collaboration with my Tanzanian partners has been very good during the 32 years. The research projects have involved much laboratory work and over the years we have had a number of technical problems which we have solved together.”

“We are really making good progress and a solid, impactful contribution to science! Hands down my favorite part of the project.”

Limiting factors brought up are similar to the ones regarding supervision, namely problems with procurement, delays in release of students’ fieldwork funding, adverse effects of the ownership of the
budget on the Tanzanian side. The centralized decision-making power at some of the collaborating Tanzanian institutions is posing problems for all parties involved (Swedish coordinators, supervisors, Tanzanian PI's and students). All decisions seemingly need to go through the top management, which is time consuming and creates delays, however not at all institutions.

Meetings
Most respondents meet with their Tanzanian counterparts physically 1-2 times per year (Figure 8), and most think that this number of physical meetings is sufficient, given the time and budget available. Six of the respondents who answered that they meet their partners two times per year or less do however, not think this is sufficient. All respondents meeting their partners more than three times per year are satisfied with the number of meetings.

The 44 respondents were also asked how often they meet virtually, and 34% responded that they meet online more than five times per year. In comments, however, it became clear that this was not only Skype meetings but also including emails and WhatsApp conversations. It was pointed out that Skype many times is disregarded as an option due to inadequate or unreliable internet connections.

Figure 8.

More than half (61%) of all 44 respondents state that they have participated in Annual Review and or Planning meetings in Tanzania, while 39% state that they have not. If only considering the coordinators, 85% have participated at some point in time.

Suggested improvements for these meetings are to include the participation in these meetings in the Swedish budget, involve Swedish partners in the preparations and thereby also improve the information and communication about the dates and the agenda of the meetings in time, and to invite Swedish partners to participate via link, if internet so allows.

One respondent expressed negative views towards these meeting and pointed to that they are “not addressing neither planning nor review”. To make them more efficient, the respondent suggested well planned meetings in each respective sub-program instead.
Involvement in annual reporting and budget planning

More than half (55%) of the respondents are involved in the writing of annual plans and reports, while the remaining 45% are not. Many of the respondents answering yes are involved to a very limited degree, contributing with input and comments while the main reporting responsibility lies with the Tanzanian partner. In general, there is a positive tone regarding the annual reporting, however some would like to be more involved and see the draft sooner that just before or after submission.

Compared to the involvement in writing annual reports, the involvement in the annual budget planning is less, with 34% of respondents being engaged. Comments also indicate less satisfaction with this issue and respondents would prefer a larger involvement and/or transparency in the process. Some are fine with their limited involvement, as it emphasizes local ownership and limits the administrative burden on the Swedish side. Some do, however, request more communication from the Tanzanian partners and wishes to be involved in the budget discussions concerning the students. It should be clearly stated, though, that in some subprogram, this seems to work perfectly well.

Respondent comments:

“I do not see the budget and my involvement is not requested, which is not satisfactory. I believe that I should review and approve my students’ budget since ultimately the department where the student is registered is responsible for the funding of the student’s research training.”

“I’m not always happy with the decisions on how to spend the money. In my opinion just too much funds are spend on administration, travels, meetings and so on instead of being spend on students.”

Related to the involvement in reporting writing and budget planning, is the routinely sharing of annual and financial reports. Out of the responding Swedish coordinators and supervisors, 48% state that they do get these documents from their Tanzanian counterparts, while 52% do not. However, some supervisors and coordinators also point to the fact that they do not request to see the annual/financial reporting.

Balancing joint program and local ownership

Despite the fact that the Tanzanian ownership of the budget and supervision is brought up repeated times as a challenge, a large majority (77%) answered yes to the question regarding if they are able to balance the fact that this collaboration is defined as a joint program but that Tanzanian ownership is emphasized. The 23% answering no stated already mentioned facts such as lack or poor communication, a request for more active initiatives from the Tanzanian side, and lack of resources on the Swedish side. One respondent explains:

“It is a matter of resources. As financial resources for the Swedish partner are limited, the time allocated to the program becomes limited, and may not really provide the impact that a joint program should.”

Another reason mentioned as to why there is an unbalance between a joint program and Tanzanian ownership is that Tanzanian PI’s and supervisors have too many obligations at the home university and the coordination/supervision, therefore, is not prioritized, which causes progress and planning to suffer. Another respondent points out that too much emphasis is put on the Tanzanian ownership part and not the fact that it is a joint program.
Summary of main challenges with communication and collaboration
The main challenge with communication and collaboration is that Swedish partners are not feeling enough involved in the processes of planning, reporting, budgeting, and meetings. More transparency is requested in this respect. Communication is the main issue due to experienced cultural clashes in meeting-, email- and planning culture. Tanzanian ownership is again brought up as an issue with a lack of decision making and initiatives from the Tanzanian side negatively affecting the collaboration. Further, it is considered that budget constraints are hampering meeting participation, which in turn affects communication and understanding.

4. ISP and Sida management

ISP

Most respondents are satisfied with the communication and information provided by ISP (52%), while 18% are not and 30% have no opinion. When singling out the answers of only the coordinators (which are the main points of contact of ISP), 60% are satisfied with ISP’s communication and information while 25% are not and 15% have no opinion.

When it comes to ISP’s administration of the program in terms of coordination, disbursements, financial follow-ups etc., 61% of all respondents are satisfied, 9% are not while 30% have no opinion. Regarding only the coordinators, 80% are satisfied, 15% are not, and 5% have no opinion.

In sum, what is requested by ISP is clearer information and earlier updates regarding dates for meeting and guidelines for financial reports. So are also clearer and timelier communications regarding developments in the program and a shorter response time.

Sida

When it comes to the communication with Sida and/or the Swedish Embassy, 41% consider it satisfactory, 27% do not and 32% have no opinion. Since ISP is the coordinating body, many do not have direct contact with Sida/the Embassy. Many state that they have good or excellent contact with Sida. Some comments do, however, indicate that more information from Sida/the Embassy would be welcomed:

“I have never communicated with Sida or the Embassy. But my partners at the Tanzanian institution got information about the approved funding long time before the Swedish universities. And there was obviously some kind of ceremony already in March/April where it was announced that there should be funding, but this was not communicated with Swedish partners.”

“I wish Sida would be more interested in talking directly to field workers, not only through ISP or the main coordinators. As for the moment, such communication is non-existent. Because of that it seems like the information reaching Sida is filtered and not always accurate, which certainly hampers Sida’s decision making process.”
Conclusions and suggested improvements

In general, respondents have a positive view of the program and its effects, and most supervisors and coordinators would like to continue if given the opportunity. There are, however, some respondents (23%) who have an overall negative experience of coordinating or supervising in the program. Coordinators seem, on average, to have a slightly less positive experience of being involved in the program than supervisors. It should be noted that there are differences between how the various collaborations function, both between subprograms and collaborating institutions. The relations between the coordinators/collaborators and the different administrative systems at the Tanzanian institutions are contributing factors to these differences. Some subprograms are functioning fine, while others are facing challenging factors hindering or slowing down the progress of the collaboration in different ways.

It is noted that the positive things with the program mainly consider the essence of the program, namely the research cooperation itself, while the negative aspects largely concern the structure and administrative processes around it.

Summing up the challenges, there are a few that are recurring and stand out, namely: the Tanzanian ownership of the supervision and of the budget, the (limited) level of Swedish involvement, the difference in communication and planning (culture), and the bureaucracy (mainly at Tanzanian institutions, but also at the Swedish Migration Agency). Survey respondents have suggested a number of improvements relating to these challenges provided below.

The Tanzanian ownership of the budget and the supervision. The Tanzanian ownership is repeatedly brought up as a challenge, affecting both Swedish institutions and Tanzanian students. Due to lack of budget control, transparency and insight in the Tanzanian budget from the Swedish side, supervisors (not in all programs) are experiencing problems to move projects forward and help students when needed. Supervisors and coordinators, therefore, express feeling that their “hands are tied”. Suggested improvements include:

- To increase the decision power given to Swedish PhD supervisors in terms of budget control.
- To increase the budget of Swedish supervisors.
- To improve the selection process of the PhD candidates and involve the Swedish partners in the selection of candidates.
- To make courses in supervision and project management mandatory.

Communication and involvement of Swedish partners. The main issues with communication seem to be cultural clashes in meeting and planning culture with lack of or late response to emails and insufficient information regarding meetings, no or little involvement of the Swedish side in planning, in budget and annual report writing, and too narrow planning horizons. Suggested improvements include:

- Increased timely involvement of Swedish partners in the writing process and budget planning, and communication of the documents to Swedish partners prior to submission.
- A higher level of accountability and transparency on the Tanzanian side and clearer outlined responsibilities for the Swedish coordinators.
- Regarding improved communication, alternative solutions to emails are brought up as a success factor in some subprograms such as WhatsApp and CANVAS. To include participation by Swedish
partners in meetings in Tanzania in the Swedish supervisor budget is another suggestion to improve the communication.

**Bureaucracy.** Many of the challenges affecting the collaboration are due to long and time consuming bureaucratic processes at some Tanzanian institutions, which is impeding progress of the students and the subprograms in general. The main processes concerned are recruitment, registration, procurement, the release of students’ fieldwork funding, and acquiring resident permits in Sweden. Respondents suggest:

- Closer collaboration with the Swedish Migration Agency to improve the administration of student visas. It should be noted that ISP and Sida are involved in a working group on Migration issues, aiming to facilitate the administration of PhD students coming to Sweden.
- Student research funds and fieldwork funding in Tanzania need to be handled better and with clearer procedures.

Finally, to get the more comprehensive picture of the situation, ISP suggests a similar survey on the Tanzanian side of the collaboration.
Appendix 1. Survey questions

Swedish Coordinator & Supervisor Survey - Tanzania Bilateral Program

This survey is commissioned by Sida and carried out by the International Science Program (ISP), Uppsala University. It aims to collect your experiences and opinions as coordinators and supervisors in the Swedish Bilateral Research Cooperation with Tanzania. The questions cover postgraduate program development and supervision, budget and planning, communication and collaboration, program management, and future program development.

The survey consists of both yes/no questions and open questions. Only answering the yes/no questions only will take approximately 15 minutes. Of course, receiving your answers to the open questions is very valuable for us. In this case, answering the survey will take longer time. Please note that you can save your input to the survey, and continue to work with it later.

Your valuable input will help evaluate this program phase and improve a potential coming one. The survey results will serve as an important complement to the mid-term evaluation and might be included in a public evaluation report. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential and anonymous.

NOTE! If you are responsible for more than one sub-program you can either fill out the survey more than once (in this case contact rebecca.andersson@isp.uu.se for an additional log-in) or reply for all programs at the same time, using the comment field if there are essential differences between programs.

Deadline 8 March!

If you have any questions don’t hesitate to contact Rebecca Andersson at ISP: rebecca.andersson@isp.uu.se.

Thank you for your contribution!

Background

1. Name

2. Role(s) in the sub-program
   □ Coordinator
   □ Supervisor
   □ Other, please specify

Comment
3. Affiliation in Sweden
☐ Karolinska Institutet
☐ Linköping University
☐ Lund University/LTH
☐ Royal Institute of Technology (KTH)
☐ Stockholm University
☐ Swedish Research Council
☐ Swedish University of Agricultural Science
☐ Södertörn University
☐ University of Gothenburg
☐ Umeå University
☐ Uppsala University
☐ Other, please specify

Comment

4. Collaborating institution(s) in Tanzania
☐ ARU
☐ COSTECH
☐ MUHAS
☐ UDSM

Comment

5. Name the sub-program(s) you are involved in (title or ISP contract number)


6. Have you been involved in previous bilateral program phases with Tanzania? If yes, which period(s)?
☐ Yes, please specify period (year-year) below
☐ No

Comment

7. Why did you choose to participate in this collaboration?
8. What are your overall, general experiences of coordinating/supervising in the Tanzanian bilateral program on the scale below? Please, comment on your answer.

- [ ] Very negative
- [ ] Negative
- [ ] Positive
- [ ] Very positive
- [ ] No opinion

Comment

9. In your opinion, what are the main benefits with the bilateral research program for your Swedish institution/department?

Comment

10. In your opinion, what are the main challenges with the bilateral research program for your Swedish institution/department?

Comment

11. In your opinion, what are the main benefits with the bilateral research program for your Tanzanian collaborating institution?

Comment

12. In your opinion, what are the main challenges with the bilateral research program for your Tanzanian collaborating institution?

Comment

---

**Postgraduate training & supervision**

13. Does your sub-program have postgraduate students? (Note! If you answer no to this question, all questions pertaining to postgraduate studies (Q14-Q24) will disappear from the survey)

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Comment

14. What local postgraduate programs are available within your sub-program at the collaborating institution in Tanzania?

- [ ] MSc
- [ ] PhD
- [ ] None yet

Comment
15. Are you/have you been involved in the development of a local PhD program at the collaborating institution in Tanzania? If yes, comment on the development, the quality of the PhD program, your involvement, challenges, etc.

○ Yes
○ No

Comment

16. Have you been/are you involved in the development of a local MSc program at the collaborating institution in Tanzania? If yes, comment on the development, the quality of the PhD program, your involvement, challenges, etc.

○ Yes
○ No

Comment

17. How active are you in the supervision of local PhD students at the collaborating institution in Tanzania? Please, comment on how relevant for the program you consider your involvement here.

○ Not involved at all ○ Somewhat ○ Involved ○ Very involved ○ No opinion involved

Comment

18. How many PhD students in your sub-program are registered and will graduate at your Swedish University?


19. How many PhD students in your sub-program are registered and will graduate in Tanzania (local PhD's)


20. Based on your experience, is the sandwich model an efficient training model? Comment on the positive and negative aspects.

○ Yes
○ No
○ Don't know/No experience

Comment
21. Do you have a double degree agreement with the collaborating Tanzanian institution? Comment on your views on double degrees and their feasibility, their challenges, etc.

○ Yes
○ No

Comment

22. Did the PhD students start their PhD studies as originally planned? If no, what were the reasons for the delay

○ Yes
○ No

Comment

23. Are students coming to Sweden as planned? If no, what do you believe to be the main obstacles and how do you believe these obstacles can be removed?

○ Yes
○ No

Comment

24. Will the PhD students finish on time? If no, what are the challenges preventing this? Suggest also what may prevent or remedy such delays.

○ Yes
○ No

Comment
Budget & planning

25. In your experience, do you find the financial support from Sida to Swedish supervisors to be adequate? Please, motivate your answer.
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don't know/No opinion
   Comment

26. Do you experience any problems with spending the funds on time? If yes, what are the issues?
   - Yes
   - No
   Comment

27. Considering that this is a joint program, but at the same time a collaboration that also emphasizes the Tanzanian partners ownership, do you succeed to balance these two “opposites”?
   - Yes
   - No
   Comment

28. Are you involved in the writing of the annual plans and reports? Do you find your involvement pertinent?
   - Yes
   - No
   Comment

29. Are you involved in the annual budget planning of the sub-program? Please, explain your answer and comment on whether or not you find your level of involvement relevant/satisfactory.
   - Yes
   - No
   Comment
Communication & collaboration

30. Do you find the communication between you and your Tanzanian partners satisfactory? If no, why not? And how could communications be improved in your opinion?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

Comment

31. Does your Tanzanian partner routinely share their reports (annual reports to the Embassy, financial reports etc.) with you?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

Comment

32. In general, are you satisfied with the research collaboration between you and your Tanzanian partners? Explain your answer. If no, please add suggestions for improvement.
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

Comment

33. Have you participated in any Annual Review Meetings or Annual Planning Meetings in Tanzania? If yes, how many times? If no, explain the reasons why? Add also suggestions for improvement.
   ○ Yes, how many times?
   ○ No, why not?

Comment
34. To your knowledge, has your project suffered delays caused by one of the following issues at your Tanzanian partner university/institution? Please comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procurement issues?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release of funds for student fieldwork?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays in the approval of PhD/MSc programs by TCU (Tanzania Commission for Universities)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment

35. How often do you and your collaborating partner meet physically? Do you find this sufficient? Please motivate your answer.

- Never met
- Less than 1 time/year
- 1-2 times/year
- 3-4 times/year
- More than 5 times/year

Comment

36. How often do you and your collaborating partner meet online? Do you find this sufficient? Please motivate your answer.

- Never met
- Less than 1 time/year
- 1-2 times/year
- 3-4 times/year
- More than 5 times/year

Comment

37. Are you actively involved in the communication and outreach plans (updating webpages, publication, social media, etc.) of the program? Please exemplify.

- Yes
- No

Comment

30
ISP/Sida management

38. Do you find the communication with and information from ISP satisfactory? If no, how can communication be improved?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ Don’t know/No opinion

Comment

39. Do you find the administration by ISP satisfactory (coordination, disbursements, financial follow up etc.)? Please comment.
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ Don’t know/No opinion

Comment

40. Do you find the communication with Sida/the Embassy satisfactory? Please comment on possible improvement needs.
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ Don’t know/No opinion

Comment

41. If you were involved, how did you experience the open call process for the bilateral program 2014? Please comment on your answer.
   ○ To be
   ○ Sufficient
   ○ Good
   ○ Excellent
   ○ Not involved

improved

Comment
42. Were you involved in developing the budget of the sub-program during the call process? Please, comment.
   o Yes
   o No
   Comment

Other issues and thoughts

43. If the cooperation would be followed by a next phase beyond the current agreement, what are your thoughts on the future development of the program?

44. If the cooperation would be followed by a next phase beyond the current agreement, would you be interested to continue the collaboration? Please, motivate your answer.
   o Yes
   o No
   o Don't know
   Comment

45. Other issues, thoughts, ideas and recommendations? Please, elaborate in the space below.

Thank you for your contribution and participation!