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## Abbreviations and acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARU</td>
<td>Ardhi University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTECH</td>
<td>Tanzania Commission for Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>Chalmers University of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP</td>
<td>International Science Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI</td>
<td>Karolinska Institutet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTH</td>
<td>Royal Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiU</td>
<td>Linköping University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>Luleå University of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>Lund University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDH</td>
<td>Mälardalen University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUHAS</td>
<td>Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Södertörn University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLU</td>
<td>Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIDER</td>
<td>Independent ICT4D center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Stockholm University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCU</td>
<td>Tanzanian Commission of Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDSM</td>
<td>University of Dar es Salaam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>University of Gothenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMU</td>
<td>Umeå University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU</td>
<td>Uppsala University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>The Swedish Research Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 46 questions was sent out by email to 81 Principal Investigators (PI’s), coordinators and supervisors at Tanzanian institutions involved in the Swedish Bilateral Research Cooperation with Tanzania 2015-2020. A similar survey was sent out to Swedish collaborating partners earlier during 2019. The aim of both surveys was to collect experience and input from the involved Tanzanian partners to help evaluate the current program phase and provide input to the coming one. In the current survey, totally 49 out of the 81 invited PI’s, supervisors and coordinators responded (61%).

General experience of the program. A large majority of respondents (93%) have an overall positive experience of coordinating/supervising in the bilateral program. This is a considerably more positive view than that expressed by the Swedish collaborating partners, out of which 23% had a negative experience. Respondents on the Tanzanian side point to that the collaboration leads to capacity building, increased supervision and publication capacity, development of PhD and MSc programs, sharing of experiences (academic and cultural), enhanced new knowledge, skills, technology transfer and institutional and personal relationships.

Postgraduate program development and supervision. Most of the respondents have postgraduate students in their programs, and a large majority of them are involved in local PhD and MSc program development and supervision of local students. While 43% of respondents believed there are enough incentives for supervisors and PI’s to stay engaged in the program, many pointed to that the monetary compensation does not reflect the actual work-load, and that there inequalities in the compensation received by Swedish and Tanzanian supervisors. The quality of the local PhD programs is considered to be high, however some sub-programs experience problems in finding qualified candidates, or funding to support candidates. Most PhD students are traveling to Sweden as planned, but starting and graduating on time are issues for the majority of the respondents. This is due to long and time-consuming processes for recruitment and admission of PhD students, procurement, release of students field work funding, and the delayed approval of the programs by the Tanzanian Commission of Universities. A majority of respondents experience problems in spending funds in time, also connected to the above-mentioned issues. The

---

1 These differences are due to the widely different salary levels in Tanzania and Sweden, as well as the high level of indirect costs (overhead) imposed by Swedish universities. As explained by ISP at various meetings in Tanzania, the Swedish partners do not receive extra remuneration for their participation in the program. Instead, the Sida funding is used to relieve them from other duties, like teaching and administration.
sandwich model is considered to be an efficient model by a large majority of the respondents and there is a general positive view towards the double-degree arrangement that is applied.

**Communication and collaboration.** A large majority of the respondents (90%) are satisfied with communication with their partners in the subprograms, compared to 64% of the Swedish collaborating partners. An even larger share of respondents is satisfied with the research collaboration (96%). The latter is described as good and productive, with a high level of commitment and learning from each other, contributing to capacity building, joint publications, joint research grant writing, and opportunities for further collaboration. On average, respondents meet their partners physically 1-2 per year, and online more than five times per year. A large majority of the respondents (88%) state to routinely share their annual reports (narrative and financial) with their Swedish partners. However, only about half of the Swedish partners state taking part of drafts of these documents before submission to Sida.

**ISP and Sida management.** A majority of respondents are satisfied with the communication and allowance payments by ISP, as well as the communication with the Swedish Embassy. It is pointed out that the main communication channel is between the overall coordinators and the Embassy, and many are fine with this arrangement. Some respondents wish to be informed directly by the Embassy to avoid confusion and second-hand information. A large majority of the respondents rated the Sida call for partners in 2014 as good to excellent. Positive comments involve words such as open, transparent, clear and participatory. In contrast, some respondents pointed to that it created internal tensions and that it was a lengthy and demanding process.
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. In 1995, University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) became the key partner for national research capacity building. 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 2009.²

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 issued by Sida 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).³ There is one overall responsible coordinator at each Tanzanian institution and one coordinator per subprogram, called Principal Investigator (PI).

Table 1. Research Cooperation Programs with Swedish partners 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>

3 For the full list see: https://www.isp.uu.se/what-we-do/bilateral-coordination/tanzania/#programs
The majority of 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 amount allocated for Swedish partners, handled in Sweden by Swedish partners.

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 is commissioned by Sida and carried out by ISP to collect experiences and opinions from PI’s, coordinators and supervisors at Tanzanian institutions in the Bilateral Research Program with Tanzania. The aim is to collect first-hand information from involved Tanzanian partners to help evaluate the current program phase (2015-2020) and provide input to the coming one. This survey aims to complement the survey sent out to Swedish partners in the program earlier in 2019.4

**Method**

An online survey (Appendix 1) using SUNET Survey5 was sent out by email on 30 September 2019, followed by several reminders, to 81 PI’s, coordinators and supervisors at Tanzanian institutions who are involved in the 28 subprograms of the Bilateral Research Cooperation with Tanzania. The original survey deadline was extended from 14 October to 21 October to increase the number of respondents. The survey consisted of 46 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 (Appendix 1). The survey is based on the questionnaire earlier sent to Swedish coordinators and supervisors in the program. The results of the current survey will, when relevant and possible, be compared to the results of the earlier Swedish coordinator and supervisor survey.

Preliminary results of the current survey were presented by ISP at the Annual Review Meetings held 5-15 November 2019 in Tanzania.

---

5 [https://www.sunet.se/tjanster/survey/](https://www.sunet.se/tjanster/survey/)
Limitations

When conducting a survey of this kind, the negative experiences and opinion easily get most of the attention. In this report, the positive aspects are brought out clearly, while the emphasis is on the improvement needs, since that is the main aim of the survey. There are also distinct differences in how the collaboration functions 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.

Further, it should be noted that this survey is commissioned by the funding agency of the collaboration. Therefore, respondents could be hesitant to express negative experiences and opinions to a full extent.
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 81 PI’s, coordinators and supervisors invited to reply to the survey, 49 answered (61%) (Table 2). Out of the 49 respondents, 27 are Principal Investigators (PI’s) and 33 are supervisors (14 hold dual positions as both PI’s and supervisors in the program), three are overall coordinators and one is an assistant overall coordinator.

Most of respondents are affiliated to MUHAS and UDSM, followed by ARU and COSTECH (Table 2). The former also has the largest number of invited respondents. The survey, therefore, mostly mirrors the view of the respondents from these two institutions.

The respondents represent collaboration with all 13 involved Swedish universities and the Swedish Research Council.

Table 2. Respondents of the survey per institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Invited respondents</th>
<th>Respondents to the survey</th>
<th>% response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUHAS</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDSM</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARU</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTECH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous involvement in the bilateral program

The majority (61%) of the 49 responding PI’s, coordinators and supervisors have been involved in previous phases of program phases with Tanzania, while 39% of the respondents have not. This is to be compared with the fact that 77% of the Swedish coordinators and supervisors answering the earlier survey did not have any previous involvement in the Bilateral Research Cooperation.

Reasons for joining the bilateral program

A common reason stated for joining the program was that the supervision is part of respondents role/career development in academia, or that the task was assigned to them. Many also stated capacity building in their research area and mentoring of younger colleagues as a reason, as well as the opportunity for research collaboration. Some also stated that they already had Swedish connections.

---

6 Swedish partners 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 University of Agricultural Sciences, Södertörn University, Umeå University, University of Gothenburg and Uppsala University.
before the Sida call. One answered that it was because the ‘Sida call required to partner with a Swedish Institutions’.

The general experience of coordinating/supervising the program
Respondents 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). A large majority (93%) stated that they have a very positive (73%) or positive (20%) overall experience of the coordination/supervision in the program (Figure 1). Only 2% (one respondent) indicated an overall negative experience, while 4% (two respondents) had no opinion. The average experience of all respondents is 3.6, which is equivalent to an overall positive/very positive experience. This is a far more positive view than that of the Swedish supervisors and coordinators, where a larger share of respondents (23%) expressed an overall negative experience.

Comparing the experiences of the PI’s and the coordinators to those of the supervisors (to the degree separable), the PI’s and coordinators have a slightly more positive experience of the program on average (3.7) compared to the supervisor average of 3.5. On the Swedish side, the respondents had a less positive experience on average (3), where coordinators expressed a less positive experience than the supervisors (3 and 3.3).

Respondents with a positive and very positive experience of participating in the program (i.e. 93% of the respondents) describe the collaboration with words as flexible, smooth, timely, and effective. Further, some state that the bilateral program is a great model for partnership, that the cooperation has developed supervision skills, and contributed to capacity building. This is similar to the Swedish respondents, pointing to that things are going smooth, that the collaboration is successful, productive, of high academic quality, and that it contributes to capacity building. One Tanzanian respondent explains:

“This program has opened us to the World of Science, through quality published work and infrastructure we have been able to collaborate with other institutions both in the North and South”.

Compared to the Swedish side, the Tanzanian partners had very few (three) comments highlighting negative aspects. One emphasized that the program has become too bureaucratic and overcentralized at the top, the other wished for more interaction with Swedish partners, and the third pointed to that the academic competition in the program does not offer opportunity for new partnerships in Sweden while the program is ongoing.
Perceived positive effects and challenges for Tanzanian and Swedish institutions

Respondents were asked to point out the effects of the collaboration for the Swedish and the Tanzanian institutions. Regarding the benefits for the Tanzanian institutions, respondents pointed to that the collaboration leads to capacity building, increased supervision and publication capacity, development of PhD and MSc programs, sharing of experiences (academic and cultural), and institutional and personal relationships. Further, respondents believe that it enhances new knowledge, skills and technology transfer, and contributes to research infrastructure. It provides an increased opportunity to conduct high quality research training and strengthened networking.

The challenges brought up are presented under each section below, and they mainly regard internal administrative processes. These are bureaucratic procedures of procurement, long approval times for PhD programs, difficulties in attracting and recruiting PhD students and postdocs, and delayed disbursements of funds. Some respondents stressed that Tanzanian supervisors have a heavy work load combined with insufficient monetary compensation, and that there are unequal compensation conditions between Swedish and Tanzanian collaborators. Others point to that the allocated funding is not sufficient to develop a critical mass of human resources required or to carry out fieldwork activities, and that the allocation is insufficient for the subprograms that are involved in conducting clinical trials or patient follow-up.

Respondents were also asked to state the presumed benefits for the involved Swedish partners. In summary, these involve opportunities for publishing, enhanced research and supervision capacity, possibilities to conduct fieldwork, knowledge exchange, collaboration with the South, and training of Swedish students. In addition, better understanding and appreciation of the contextual differences are mentioned, and its importance for shaping the research collaboration.
The challenges brought up for Swedish collaborating partners are related to adapting to working with a different culture, and to bureaucratic procedures at some Tanzanian institutions. Travels to Tanzania and involvement in fieldwork activities are mentioned as a way to gain better understanding of the cultural and economic environment.

2. Postgraduate program development and supervision

Involvement in postgraduate program development

Out of the 49 respondents, 43 (88%) have postgraduate students in their subprograms. A large majority (84%, 34 respondents) have been involved in the development of PhD programs at their institutions, and 63% (27 respondents) have been involved in the development of MSc programs.

The involvement in local PhD program development mainly regards designating curricula and courses. One respondent has been involved in developing guidelines for postgraduate studies at the Tanzanian institution, and some have at a later stage been involved in recruitment and supervision of PhD students.

The main challenges with PhD program development are considered to be the slow and bureaucratic process of getting approval of the curricula by the Tanzanian Commission of Universities (TCU). This was also mentioned by the Swedish partners. One respondent describes the frustration:

“Our Programs (PhD and MSc) have been approved by the Senate in July 2016 and was immediately submitted to TCU. New programs had to be re-submitted for TCU review in November 2018 and approved and uploaded by TCU in May 2019. Changes in TCU leadership also changes program assessment criteria“.

Other challenges mentioned, by some, is the difficulty to develop a sustainable PhD curriculum due to poor laboratory facilities at the Tanzanian institution, in this case MUHAS, and that the same institution does not have enough courses to support local PhD studies. One respondent mentioned that a taught PhD program has been developed, but that it is difficult to get student to opt for it. Another respondent brought up the lack of funds for traveling to develop curricula together with the Swedish collaborators, an issue also mentioned by Swedish partners.

Respondents were asked to comment on the quality of the PhD program, i.e. if there are candidates that are sufficiently qualified, if there are regular seminar series, if there is adequate staff to supervise students, and regarding the publication activity and quality of graduates. Many respondents did answer positively to all of the above, which indicates high quality of the PhD programs. Some sub-programs, however, pointed out that there are not enough qualified candidates, and in some cases, there are enough candidates but not enough scholarships or funding to support them. Some sub-programs state that there is a scarcity of supervisors due to young age of staff members and that students are not publishing to the degree expected. But overall, there is a positive view of the quality of the PhD programs.

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). A majority of the respondents with postgraduate students in their programs state being very involved (70%) or involved (19%) in the supervision of local PhD students (Figure 2). Only 5% (two respondents) state not to be involved at all, and 2% (one respondent) does not have an opinion. Both of the former two are coordinators in the program.
Respondents were asked if they believed that there is a need or an interest to organize PhD supervision courses (Figure 3). A large majority (93%) answered yes and commented that there is a demand for such courses. The need for courses for newly graduated PhD’s, who will start to supervise, was especially emphasized.
Sandwich model training

Most of the 41 respondents (95%) see the sandwich model as an efficient training model, whereas 5% have no experience or opinion (Figure 4). This can be compared to that 75% of the Swedish supervisors considered the model efficient, while 9% did not.

Figure 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Based on your experience, is the sandwich model an efficient training model? Comment on the positive and negative aspects.</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41 (95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No experience</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The positive aspects of the model that were mentioned were that students are exposed to advanced facilities, experts, modern data analysis, and updated literature. This while keeping the focus on local research problems, which makes the research relevant to local communities. Some pointed out that the model is preferred by students with families, compared to full-time studies abroad, since students do not spend as much time away from home. One respondent pointed to that it enables students to conduct research of international standard, and two others pointed out the important aspect of students getting enough time to concentrate on their studies and research while in Sweden. Many also pointed out that the model helps to curb brain drain since students are not detached from the home environment. One respondent explains:

“With over 100 postgraduates graduated so far, none has sought greener pastures elsewhere other than Tanzania and they make an extended family of the research team.”

A few negative aspects with the model was, however, brought up. Two mentioned that students become less active in Tanzania compared to Sweden. One respondent explains:

“The weakness of this program is when the candidate builds a tendency of planning well for his/her PhD work only when in Sweden but relaxes the moment he/she comes back in Tanzania. It is like they fail to cope up with additional tasks at the university and fail to organize their time while in Tanzania”.

Two respondents (from sub-programs without a double degree agreement) also mentioned that fact that only the university where the sandwich students are registered gets the credit for the PhD student. One
pointed to that the model requires more resources due to the overseas travels and one would prefer shorter stays in Sweden since the student are carrying out their studies in Tanzania. On the other hand, some respondents considered the time spent with Swedish supervisors to be too limited.

**Double degrees**

Eleven out of the 43 respondents with postgraduate students in their programs have experience of carrying out or planning double degrees in their subprograms, while 32 (74%) have no experience.

The eleven respondents with experience of a double degree points to that it is a good model that provides recognition to both participating universities’ MSc and PhD training, and that it adds important quality assurance to both institutions. Considering challenges, it is pointed out that students need to meet the requirements from two institutions, which is not always possible. Further, operationalization and curricula harmonization are mentioned as challenges.

Respondents without any experience of double degree programs are in general positive towards such arrangement. One respondent points to the benefit for both Swedish and Tanzanian supervisors, in terms of the ability of the candidates to plan joint publications. Another one points out that it would be good in perspective of the above-mentioned credits that currently only go to one university depending on where students are registered. The quality aspect of students having to meet requirements from both institutions is emphasized also by respondents without any experience of double degree programs.

One respondent would like to see the arrangement of a joint degree instead of double. Since the double degree increases the amount of work of a student, and “at times students tend to use the degree from the Institution of the developed side, unlike in the joint degree”.

**Student planning**

Of the 43 respondents with postgraduate students in their programs, 44% reported that students started later than originally planned, while 56% report that students started on time (Figure 5). A common reason for delayed starts is that registration of PhD students takes place after the PhD proposal is presented and accepted by the department. Since it takes considerable time to develop a quality proposal and getting it approved, the start of the PhD training is delayed. Delays in release of funds is another common reason stated, as well as delays in ethical clearance and the recruitment of PhD students. Delays in development and accreditation of PhD and Masters programs are also mentioned as reasons for delayed start of PhD students. One respondent pointed to that PhD candidates often are employed and their release from their employer can sometimes take time.
Connected to the issue of the timely start of PhD students, is the issue of whether the students will finish on time. About half of the respondents (49%, Figure 6) believe that the students included in their subprograms in this program phase (2015-2020) will not finish on time. The reasons brought up are both related to practical arrangement and academic requirements. On the practical side, late registrations, delayed ethical clearance, late or no release of fieldwork funding in Tanzania, long and time-consuming process for procurement, and maternity leaves are causing delays. On the academic side, delays are caused by the time it takes to publish the number of articles required to graduate combined with other academic milestones along the way, such as data collection.
When it comes to visits to Sweden, most respondents state that students are traveling as originally planned (88%, Figure 7). Where there are delays, respondents point to reasons such as that students do not receive funds at the required time, or that students have not completed their intended studies in Tanzania at the time they were supposed to travel. The reasons for the latter could be lack of sufficient data from fieldwork or delay in procurement of equipment etc.

**Figure 7.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are students going to Sweden for their research visits as planned? If no, what do you believe to be the main obstacles and how do you believe these obstacles can be removed?</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the above mentioned reasons were confirmed when asking respondents if they have suffered any delays in their subprograms related to procurement issues, release of funds for students’ field work or curriculum approval by the TCU. Out of all respondents, 76% answered that they suffered delays due to procurement issues, 47% due to release of funds for students’ fieldwork, and 43% due to slow approval by the TCU.

**Incentives for PI’s and supervisors**

Respondents were asked if they found enough incentives to be in place for PI’s and supervisors to stay engaged and involved in the program. In all, 43% of the 49 respondents believe there are, while 39% do not, and 18% of the respondents have no opinion (Figure 8).
Many of the 21 respondents answering that there are enough incentives to stay engaged, also pointed to that the coordination/supervision allowance is low (non-existent) in relation to the workload. Only two respondents specifically pointed out that the incentives are fair. One stated:

“The program provides adequate budget for the PI and the supervisor in relation to supervision and own (major) research work. For example, there is budget for research fieldwork, publication and conferences, which caters adequately for such activities.”

The 19 respondents answering that there are not enough incentives for PI’s and supervisors to stay engaged mainly pointed to too low or no compensation for involvement, especially for supervision. Many describe it as voluntary work, and that they stay engaged because of their research interest and the future of the students. There are also feelings of inequality and different conditions for Swedish and Tanzanian sides involved. Two respondents express:

“For PI’s if not corrupt, it feels like charity work done basically for the Swedish government. This is heart-rending when realizing what the co-PI’s in Sweden receive, who do less work, and get far more ‘perks’. Our major perk is a workshop to write another document for Sweden. We are also told we can earn money by going to conferences and going to the field with our students. But much of the time only a few days are needed in the field with the students. If we extend that time, we end up teaching the students how to deal with the inequities... But I think it is also corruption, and it is very unfair to push supervisors and students into this. Likewise conference attendance is wonderful, especially if the supervisor also has an abstract....But if unnecessary and only being attended for monetary benefit, leads to time wasted from other duties, including teaching, and increased carbon footprint...”

“...There is no balance compared to what the Swedish institutions receive for their work and what [our institution] receives for our work. And the amount of work done on [by Tanzanian institution] side is far
greater. It is painful; and for the Swedish side it can lead to arrogance - in the condescending belief that those who are better compensated are also more competent in every area”.

There seems to be a misconception about the compensation received by Swedish supervisors and coordinators. It is therefore important to clarify that the part of the Swedish supervisor budget financing the involvement of Swedish supervisors is not a top-up of the salary of the supervisor. It is not a cash-reward received to be involved. The budgeted amount instead pays the salary of the supervisor for the time equivalent estimated to be needed to supervise the student, instead of taking salary from e.g. another research grant. In general, a large share of the 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%).

Expenditure of funds
A majority of the respondents, 65%, do experience a problem in spending funds in time while 35% are not. Issues pointed out are delays in approval and/or release of funds from the institutional accounting functions and bureaucratic procurement processes. Further, some respondents state that the expenditure of funds is based on student research/training activities and students can only start utilize funds when they start their field work. So, issues delaying students are also delaying the expenditure of funds (recruitment, registration, approval of proposal, ethical clearance etc.).

Student budgets
Relating to budgeting of the students activities, the respondents were asked if they considered it to be a good idea for students to have their own individual budget for research (imprest, consumables, laptop etc.), like in some of the corresponding Sida bilateral programs in other countries. A large majority of respondents answered yes (88%), while 12% did not support the idea. The ones answering no pointed to that the current system works well, or that students could use such loopholes to cheat. One respondent answering no pointed to that:

“Committing money for a student may make program management difficult. Because some students are active and more motivated to work, it reaches at time they need more consumables or additional fieldwork money. If the money was committed per student it would affect progress of such students. Commitment can be made for travel and stipend per student and not otherwise.”

Most respondents, however, were positive towards the idea and believe it will limit the burden of the coordinator and decrease the extent of the bureaucratic process, whilst students learn how to manage research funds and take larger responsibility. But, respondents also state that it is important to keep the supervisor involved in the budget process, to ensure that students spend funds on the intended purpose. Further, respondents comment that the budget should be adaptable to change in study plans, as well as to the fact that some PhD programs are costlier than others. There are also concerns that students will spend funds on their families, and therefore tend to submit inflated budgets.

3. Communication and collaboration
Most of the 49 respondents (90%) find the communication in the program satisfactory, while 10% do not. Most express a regular and satisfying level of email, Skype and WhatsApp exchange with Swedish partners. This can be compared to the 64% satisfaction rate of the communication among Swedish survey respondents.
The few respondents that are not satisfied with the communication point to that some Swedish collaborators do not respond to communication, and that communication regarding science is working but not for planning and review. It is also pointed out that there have been instances of ineffective communication between supervisors, where Swedish collaborators e.g. only communicate directly with students and disregards the local partner. One respondent points to the importance of careful selection of collaborating partners:

“There is a need of careful selection of partner institution and researchers for smooth running of the program. Differences in culture, perception and individual interests can affect the program if there is no prior discussion and continuous engagement between partner institutions and collaborators.”

The general satisfaction with the research collaboration is also high, with 96% of respondent being satisfied while 4% are not. Overall, there seems to be a generally good impression of the research collaboration and its results. It is described as good and productive, with a high level of commitment and learning from each other, with capacity building, joint publications, joint research grant writing, and opportunities for further collaboration.

Meetings

Most respondents meet with their Swedish counterparts physically 1-2 times per year (Figure 9). Some find that to be sufficient while others believe it is not. Very few meet more or less often than that. Online meetings are, however, much more frequent with 67% answering they meet online more than five times per year, mainly via Skype meetings but also by frequent email and WhatsApp conversations.

Figure 9.

When it comes to physical meetings, respondents were asked if they believe that the Annual Review Meetings and Annual Planning Meetings are beneficial, and how they could be improved. A large majority of the respondents (92%) find these meeting to be beneficial, while 8% believe they are not.

The Tanzanian respondents had an overall more positive view regarding these meetings than their Swedish counterparts. Respondents see it as an opportunity to meet each other and discuss research, supervision and student progress, review program activities and identify individual programs challenges
and mitigation measures. Recommendations mainly concern facilitating for Swedish supervisors to attend the meetings, e.g. by budgeting/adding travel money for participation in these meetings. One respondent that did not consider these meetings to be beneficial pointed to that “Sharing of the progress from different sub-programs does not add value to the project. It is better to spend more time on the sub-program level for discussion and general understanding of the progress”.

Sharing of annual reporting and budget planning documents
A large majority of the respondents (88%) state to routinely share their annual reports (narrative and financial) with their Swedish partners, while 12% state not to do it. Most state that reports are shared before submitted.

This view was not shared by the Swedish collaborators in the previous survey. 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
In total, 84% of the respondents answered yes to the question regarding whether they are able to balance the fact that the collaboration is defined as a joint program with emphasized Tanzanian ownership. Many stated that the collaboration is balanced with emphasized ownership, with or without challenges depending on the individual collaborations. A few comments from the 16% answering no, indicate that it is believed that the Swedish side has a hard time balancing the ownership of Tanzanian partners. Two respondents explain:

“Some collaborators, just don’t believe we have ownership. Although here personalities come into play.”

“At times, we don’t work as equal partners. The feeling is that it is the Swedish counterpart that dictates the terms. In other words, there has been aspect of micro-management.”

4. ISP and Embassy management
ISP
Most respondents are satisfied with the communication and information provided by ISP (61%), while 4% are not and 35% have no opinion (Figure 10). The two respondents answering no, state that ISP only communicates with students, and tend to rely more of the views of them without consulting the Tanzanian supervisor.
When it comes to ISP’s payment of student allowances, 74% believes this is done in a satisfactory way, while the remaining have no opinion/experience. Respondents comment that they have not received any complaints from students, and there were no suggested improvements.

**The Swedish Embassy**

When it comes to the communication between the respondents and the Swedish Embassy, 69% consider it satisfactory, 6% do not and 25% have no opinion (Figure 11). It is pointed out the main communication channel is between the overall coordinators and the Embassy, and many are fine with this arrangement. Some respondents wish to be informed directly from the Embassy about certain things, such as the planning of a new funding phase, to avoid confusion and second-hand information.
Open call procedures

Respondents were asked how they experienced the open call process for Swedish partners in 2014, in case they were involved (Figure 12), on a scale from to be improved, sufficient, good to excellent. In all, 37% of respondents rated the open call procedure as excellent, 24% as good, 8% to be improved and 2% as sufficient. The remaining 29% were not involved and had no opinion.

Positive comments involve words such as open, transparent, clear and participatory to describe the process. The ones answering ‘to be improved’ and ‘sufficient’ pointed to the call caused some internal tensions, because of competition for subprogram support and that the successful proposal selected by Sida was not the ones preferred by the Tanzanian institution. One other respondent pointed to that it was a lengthy and very demanding process on the Tanzanian side while some of the Swedish partners did not put in enough effort. A third believed that the applications should be online based.
If you were involved, how did you experience the open call process for Swedish partners for the bilateral program in 2014? Please comment on your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be improved</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>12 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>18 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved</td>
<td>14 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses.](image-url)
Conclusions and suggested improvements

In general, respondents have a very positive view of coordinating/supervising in the program, to a much larger extent than the Swedish collaborating partners. Respondents point to that the collaboration leads to capacity building, increased supervision and publication capacity, development of PhD and MSc programs, sharing of experiences (academic and cultural), enhanced new knowledge, skills, technology transfer and institutional and personal relationships.

Many of the challenges brought up are similar on both the Swedish and the Tanzanian side of the collaboration. These mainly regard internal administrative processes at and in Tanzanian institutions and systems, which in various ways are causing delays in the programs. For example, bureaucratic procedures of procurement, long approval times for PhD programs, difficulties in attracting and recruiting PhD students and postdocs, and delayed disbursements of funds. However, these challenges seem to be more frustrating for Swedish partners (most of which are new to the bilateral research cooperation), than to the Tanzanian partners. This is also reflected when Tanzanian respondents point out that challenges facing Swedish partners are the ability to adapt to work with a new culture, and to bureaucratic procedures at Tanzanian institutions.

Most of the respondents have postgraduate students in their programs, and a large majority of them are involved in PhD and MSc program development and supervision of local students. Most PhD students are traveling to Sweden as planned, but the starting and graduating on time are issues for the majority of the respondents, which is related to the above-mentioned challenges. A majority of respondents are experiencing problems of spending the allocated funds in time, also connected to the above issues. The sandwich model is considered to be an efficient model by a large majority of the respondents and there is a general positive view towards the double-degree arrangement.

When it comes to incentives for PI’s and supervisors to stay engaged in the program, many respondents point to that the coordination/supervision remuneration is non-existent. Further, there is a feeling of unequal compensation conditions between Swedish and Tanzanian supervisors. Here, there is a misunderstanding about the level and nature of compensation received by Swedish supervisors, which needs to be sorted out. Some respondents state that these experienced inequalities contributes to the feeling of an unequal partnership, and opens up for corruption.

When it comes to communication with Swedish collaborating partners, almost all respondents are satisfied. This can be compared with a 64% satisfaction rate among Swedish partners, who mentioned communication as one of the major challenges in the program. This confirms the conclusions in the Swedish survey, that there is a clash in communication culture between the two collaborating countries. The few Tanzanian respondents not satisfied with the communication pointed to that Swedish collaborators do not respond to communication, and that there have been instances of ineffective communication between supervisors, where Swedish collaborators e.g. only communicates directly with students and disregards the local PI.

A large share of respondents is also satisfied with the research collaboration in general. It is described as good and productive, with a high level of commitment and learning from each other, contributing to capacity building, joint publications, joint research grant writing, and opportunities for further
collaboration. Tanzanian respondents have no problem with balancing the fact that the collaboration is a joint program with emphasized Tanzanian ownership. Rather, it is Swedish partners that are experiencing problems with this, confirmed by answers in both surveys. Some Tanzanian respondents point to micro-management by Swedish partners and a disregard of the Tanzanian ownership of the program.

Overall, there is a satisfaction with the communication with ISP and the Swedish Embassy, as well as positive experiences of the open call process for the program in 2014.

**Suggested improvements by respondents**

Regarding postgraduate program development, research and supervision respondents suggest that the coming program phase:

- Allows students in this program phase to finish their PhD studies
- Allocates more funds for in-country and in-region MSc and PhD scholarships
- Allocates more funds for postdoc candidates
- Allocates funds for establishing networks in East and Central Africa
- Provides research funds available to all university staff not just students
- Includes short term (1-year) research projects
- Compensates PI’s and supervisors in the program through allowances/salaries or such
- Establishes/develops local PhD courses
- Encourages more local registration of students
- Continues with the sandwich program
- Considers double degree programs (where this has not been applied yet)
- Organizes supervisor training courses
- Implement individual student budgets (according to survey answers)

Regarding communication and collaboration respondents suggests that the coming program phase:

- Strengthens communication between collaborators
- Allows for more frequent visits by Swedes to Tanzania
- Expands the collaboration to include more Swedish collaborators
- Implements financial decentralization, each sub-program should manage its own funds to ease the release of funding and the implementation of project activities
- Has a more well-defined budget template and improved guidelines
- Encourages Swedish partners to share their financial reports and activity plans

Overall suggestions include:

- Increasing funding for some crosscutting programs like ICT
- Improving National Research Management Systems including IT integrated system
- Having a special call for supporting research infrastructure to R&D institutions
- Putting emphasis on establishing Centers of Excellence
- Enhance the use of Tanzanian research results by policy-makers, private companies, non-governmental organizations, community based organizations and public institutions
- Building on the success stories and strengthen/support the well-performing sub programs
- Extending the duration of responding to the open calls
- Implementing a submission system that allows fair competition i.e. use online system.
Appendix 1. Survey questions

Tanzanian PI & Supervisor Survey

This survey is commissioned by the Swedish Embassy in Tanzania and carried out by the International Science Program (ISP), Uppsala University. It aims to collect your experiences and opinions as PI's 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 46 yes/no questions, scaling questions and open-ended questions. The time to answer the questionnaire will depend on the length of your answers. 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 the 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.**

Deadline 14 October 2019!

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**
   - [ ] Principal Investigator (PI)
   - [ ] Supervisor
   - [ ] Other, please specify

Comment

3. **Affiliation**
   - [ ] ARU
   - [ ] COSTECH
   - [ ] MUHAS
   - [ ] UDSM

Comment
4. Collaborating Swedish institution(s)

- Chalmers University of Technology
- Karolinska Institutet
- Linköping University
- Lund University/LTH
- Luleå University of Technology
- Mälardalen University
- Royal Institute of Technology (KTH)
- Stockholm University/Spider
- Swedish Research Council
- Swedish University of Agricultural Science
- Södertörn University
- University of Gothenburg
- Umeå University
- Uppsala University
- Other, please specify

Comment

5. Title of the sub-program you are involved in

[Blank Line]

6. Have you been involved in previous bilateral program phases with Sweden? If yes, which period(s)?

- Yes, please specify period (year-year) below
- No

Comment

7. Why did you choose to participate in this collaboration?

[Blank Line]

8. What are your overall, general experiences as a PI/supervisor in the Swedish/Tanzanian bilateral program on the scale below? Please, comment on your answer.

- Very negative
- Negative
- Positive
- Very positive
- No opinion
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9. In your opinion, what are the main benefits with the bilateral program for your institution/department?

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

11. In your opinion, what are the main benefits with the bilateral program for your Swedish collaborating institution(s)?

12. In your opinion, what are the main challenges with the bilateral program for your Swedish collaborating institution(s)?

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-Q23) will disappear from the survey)

- Yes
- No

Comment

14. What local postgraduate programs are available in your sub-program in Tanzania?

- MSc
- PhD
- None yet

Comment

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

- Yes
- No

Comment
16. Please comment on the quality of the PhD program. Consider questions like: 1) Are there enough qualified candidates? 2) Do you have regular seminar series? 3) Adequate staff to supervise students? 4) Do the student publish in international high-quality journals? 5) Do the students continue to publish after graduating?

17. Have you been/are you involved in the development of a local MSc program at your institution? If yes, comment on the development, the quality of the MSc program (using the first three criteria in Q16), your involvement, challenges, etc.

18. How active are you in the supervision of the PhD students? Please, comment on how relevant for the program you consider your involvement here.

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

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

21. Do the PhD students start their PhD studies as originally planned? If no, what were the reasons for the delay?
22. Are students going to Sweden for their research visits 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

23. Will the PhD students finish on time? If no, what are the challenges preventing this? In your opinion, what measures could be taken to prevent or remedy such delays?

- Yes
- No

Comment

______________________________________________________________

**Budget & planning**

24. In your opinion, are there enough incitements for PIs and supervisors to stay engaged and involved? Please, motivate your answer.

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know/No opinion

Comment

25. Do you experience problems with spending the allocated funds on time and for the activities according to the plans? If yes, what are the issues?

- Yes
- No

Comment

26. In some other bilateral programs, PhD students have individual budgets for their research (imprest, consumables, laptop, etc.). Do you consider this to be a good idea in the next bilateral program phase in Tanzania?

- Yes
27. Considering that this is a joint program, but at the same time a collaboration that also emphasizes ownership, do you succeed to balance these two “opposites”?

- Yes
- No

Comment

28. Do you involve your Swedish partners in the writing of the annual plans and reports? Please, explain your answer and comment on whether or not you find their level of involvement relevant/satisfactory.

- Yes
- No

Comment

29. Do you involve your Swedish partners in the annual budget planning of the sub-program? Please, explain your answer and comment on whether or not you find their level of involvement relevant/satisfactory.

- Yes
- No

Comment

Communication & collaboration

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

- Yes
- No

Comment

31. Do you routinely share your reports (annual reports to the Embassy, financial reports etc.) directly with your Swedish partners? Please comment on your answer.
32. Are your Swedish partners involved in the selection process of PhD candidates? Please comment on your answer.
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ Not applicable
   Comment

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

34. Do you find the Annual Review Meetings and Annual Planning Meetings beneficial? Please suggest possible improvements, if any.
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   Comment

35. To your knowledge, has your project suffered delays caused by one of the following issues at your Tanzanian university/institution? Please comment.
36. How often do you and your collaborating partner meet physically? Do you find this sufficient? Please motive your answer.

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

Comment

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

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

Comment

38. Is your subprogram actively involved in communication and outreach (updating webpages, publications in mass media, social media, etc.) of the program? Please exemplify.

- Yes
- No

Comment
39. Is your subprogram involved in collaboration with other universities in Tanzania and/or the East African Region? What are/would be the benefits of such a collaboration and what are/would be the main challenges.

- Yes
- No

Comment

______________________________
ISP/Embassy management

40. Do you find the communication with ISP satisfactory? If no, how can communication be improved?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion/not relevant

Comment

______________________________

41. ISP is responsible for the payment of the student allowance while students are in Sweden. Is this done in a satisfactory way?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion/not relevant

42. Do you find the communication with and information from the Swedish Embassy satisfactory? Please comment on possible improvement needs.

- Yes
- No
- No opinion/not relevant

Comment

______________________________

43. If you were involved, how did you experience the open call process for Swedish partners for the bilateral program in 2014? Please comment on your answer.

- To be improved
- Sufficient
- Good
- Excellent
- Not involved

Comment
Other issues and thoughts

44. 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?

45. Do you consider there to be a need and or interest to organize PhD supervisor courses at your institution? Please comment on your answer.
   - Yes
   - No

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

Thank you for your contribution and participation!