2020:20 Sida Decentralised Evaluation

FCG Swedish Development AB

Evaluation of Jönköping International Business School's (JIBS) collaboration with Sida partner universities in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Mozambique

Final Report

Sida

Evaluation of Jönköping International Business School's (JIBS) collaboration with Sida partner universities in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Mozambique

Final Report
October 2019

Åsa Königson
Michael Watts
Erlend Sigvaldsen
Matti Tedre

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2020:20
Sida

Authors: Åsa Königson, Michael Watts, Erlend Sigvaldsen, Matti Tedre

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2020:20

Commissioned by Sida, Research Cooperation Unit, Department for Partnership and Innovation

Date of final report: 2019-10-30

Published by Nordic Morning 2020

Art. no. Sida62320en

urn:nbn:se:sida-62320en

This publication can be downloaded from: http://www.sida.se/publications

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: http://www.sida.se

Table of contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ABS	Association of Business Schools
ABDS	Australian Business Deans Council
AAU	Addis Ababa University
CBE/AAU	College of Business and Economics of Addis Ababa University
CBE/UR	College of Business and Economics of University of Rwanda
CDI	Career Development Initiative
EARP-BEM	East Africa Research Papers in Business, Entrepreneurship, and Management
EARP-EF	East Africa Research Papers in Economics and Finance
EFMD	European Foundation for Management Development
EID	Entrepreneurship and Innovation for Development program run by JIBS
EoI	Expression of Interest
FE	Faculty of Economics at UEM
FEM	Faculty of Economics and Management at the National University of Rwanda
HE	Higher Education
ISEG	Instituto Superior de Economia e Gestão da Universidade de Lisboa (School of Economics and Management, University of Lisbon)
ISP	International Science Program (ISP) of Uppsala University
JIBS	Jönköping International Business School
JU	Jönköping University
LoI	Letter of Intent
MoE	Ministry of Education
MSc	Master of Science
NUR	National University of Rwanda – merged into University of Rwanda (UR) in 2013
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SoB	School of Business within College of Business and Economics of UR
SoE	School of Economics within College of Business and Economics of UR
SWEGPEC	Swedish Graduate Programme for Economics
ToR	Terms of Reference
UEM	Universidade Eduardo Mondlane (Eduardo Mondlane University)
UGOT	University of Gothenburg
UR	University of Rwanda
UNU-WIDER	United Nations University – World Institute for Development Economics Research
WoS	Web of Science

Executive Summary

Sida's aim is to contribute to poverty reduction and sustainable development in low-income countries. Its current strategy for research cooperation involves funding collaborative partnerships between universities in low-income countries and in Sweden to build capacity and generate policy-relevant research. The Addis Ababa University (AAU), the University of Rwanda (UR) and the Universidade Eduardo Mondlane (UEM) in Mozambique have partnered with Sida for this purpose. All three partner universities are currently collaborating with the Jönköping International Business School (JIBS) with funding from Sida. The collaborations are intended to help partner universities develop their capacity to develop and deliver PhD and MSc programs and to train academic staff to become research-active in the fields of Management and Economics.

The objective of this evaluation is to increase the understanding of if and how the collaborations between JIBS and AAU, UEM and UR contribute to the objectives and modalities outlined in Sida's policy and strategies for support to research cooperation. It is not a comparative study, and there is therefore no assessment or comparison of the results from collaborations between other Swedish universities and the same partner universities; the focus is on JIBS' collaborations with the Economics and Management departments/faculties in the three partner universities.

Overall, the Evaluation Team's findings show that JIBS' collaborations with AAU and UR **succeeded in increasing the amount of research** being produced by the partner universities. These collaborations were particularly **important in supporting PhD students and the development of in-house PhD programs**. However, most of that research is published as working papers, conference papers, and book chapters, while **the number of articles published in peer-reviewed established journals is very small.** All three partner universities' faculties claim ownership of the collaboration and university leadership agree. However, an assessment of all the evidence collected leads the Evaluation Team to conclude that **ownership of the collaborations has rested with JIBS to a significant extent**.

Findings

JIBS' collaborations with AAU have resulted in 12 PhD graduates (with degrees awarded by AAU), but progression has been slow with some 38 PhD students still yet to graduate. The collaboration with UR has resulted in four PhD graduates and a very quick progression with the JIBS-UR collaboration achieving the established objectives. The collaboration with UEM is at an early stage and the enrolment of PhD students had not started at the time of reporting. The collaborations succeeded in developing AAU's and UR's capacity to provide doctoral supervision by increasing

the number of academic staff with PhDs, but there is little evidence to show that the co-supervision of the PhD students by national supervisors improved significantly during the period. The findings showed that JIBS was not always able to make appropriate provision for AAU and UR PhD students in Economics at JIBS, but that JIBS was flexible and solved this by offering them courses at other Swedish universities.

The JIBS collaborations have produced a sizeable amount of outputs in terms of research reports. JIBS' statistics show that UR has a significantly larger number of outputs produced during a shorter period of time than AAU and considering that significantly fewer PhD students have been educated compared to AAU. The Career Development Initiative (CDI), intended to introduce partner university staff to a more research-intensive academic environment and develop research papers with support from JIBS mentors, appears to have helped UR staff substantially increase outputs and UEM staff to begin writing papers for publication. Producing individual research studies in quantity is an important aspect of creating a research culture. It establishes routines and systems for producing research and papers and encourages publishing of research by staff, career development, exposure to other researchers, deadlines for publications, and submission to and presentation at conferences. However, the research produced through the CDI has not resulted in publications in international peer-reviewed journals (which was the initial intention).

The Evaluation Team's analysis of the research outputs resulting from the JIBS-AAU and the JIBS-UR collaborations shows that the balance of publishing is heavily tilted towards a direction that does not produce the kinds of results the universities value the most i.e. (double-blind) peer reviewed articles in reputable journals. The JIBS-UR and JIBS-AAU collaborations have emphasized three modes of publishing: working papers (35), conference papers (85) and book chapters published by world-class publishers (99), of which the last two can positively contribute to career advancement at AAU and UR. However, a majority of the few journal articles published in the JIBS-UR and JIBS-AAU collaborations appeared in journals of very low or undetermined quality. The Evaluation Team has found that PhD students were not sufficiently guided and advised on how to identify predatory journals and how to choose appropriate publication outlets. This is an important finding as JIBS' own internal measure of quality supervision and research is that research is published in well-established journals. Also, a number of JIBS academic staff members stated that their main contribution is to help PhD students produce "publishable" research. However, evidence gathered by the Evaluation Team shows that the majority of the research published has not been in well-established journals but has been limited to papers in local conferences, working papers, and JIBS-edited book chapters.

Ownership by partner universities of the collaboration process has been assessed by analyzing (i) the design process of the collaborations, (ii) the partner universities' ability to change elements of the collaboration and (iii) which collaborating university has had control and management of resources. The design phase is vital and sets the stage for the implementation of the program. In the first proposal drafting phases UR and UEM had no choice but to collaborate with JIBS which influenced the design of the program. The comparative analysis of these proposals suggests that JIBS has used a standard approach to collaboration that is only changed as the partnering institutions

challenge its worth. The ownership by the partner university is reduced when the collaboration is perceived (i) as JIBS' responsibility and that (ii) JIBS is delivering the outputs. For example, when JIBS has been the institution managing all of the funds and all of the narrative and financial reporting to Sida. Another aspect is that when objectives were achieved (i.e. PhD graduates) partner universities did not challenge components of the collaboration perceived to contribute less to the institution's capacity development.

JIBS' Coordinator has managed the three collaboration agreements on behalf of JIBS and in the case of the JIBS-AAU collaboration, also on behalf of AAU. Centralizing the communication with both Sida and the partners to one person at JIBS resulted in academic staff at JIBS not communicating directly or sufficiently with their peers at the partner universities and in Sida. However, academic staff from JIBS and the partner universities acknowledge communication about academic matters on specific issues or components.

However, the partner universities are taking on a more decisive role. AAU is taking action in order to solve recent conflicts occurring regarding PhD supervision and in the most recent UR and AAU proposals, JIBS' involvement in activities to support the Economics Department in AAU and UR's School of Economics (SoE), has been reduced compared to the previous collaboration periods at the request of both universities. UEM has negotiated substantially with JIBS in order to focus on increasing support for its in-house PhD programs in the most recent re-written proposal to Sida.

Sida's involvement in the most recent JIBS-AAU proposal appears to have compelled two competitors to cooperate which, only one year into the collaboration, is causing cooperation problems between all four stakeholders (including Sida).

The CDI at UR has been transferred to UEM and AAU, but without a proper evaluation of the results or the value added to the partner universities of this initiative. Nor has JIBS carried out any cross-cutting evaluations prior to introducing new initiatives in a collaboration or with another partner university.

The proportion of funding allocated to JIBS compared to funding of other Swedish universities working in different faculties at each partner university is noticeably higher. Partner universities are questioning JIBS' proposal to hold PhD courses in Sweden, implement the CDI in Sweden and engage partner universities in a regional university network called the Entrepreneurship and Innovation for Development (EID) initiative. This has been resisted by partner universities in negotiations with JIBS from a cost-efficiency perspective.

The collaborations have involved significant collaboration primarily between JIBS and the partner university and with other universities with which JIBS collaborates. There has, however, been a limited number of co-authored research studies.

Summarized recommendations

Recommendations for Sida

- Sida should provide for formative and summative evaluations of collaborations, or components of collaborations. Consideration should be

given to requiring independent evaluations to inform collaborating and partner universities.
- Sida should work with partner universities to support and sustain the development of realistic human resource policies that allow for appropriate salaries, responsibilities, and allocation of time for research and supervision.
- Sida is recommended to ask collaborating universities and partner universities to, in the proposal, establish quality criteria for the publication of research. Sida should, furthermore, ask collaborating and partner universities to regularly report on the fulfillment of such criteria.
- Sida should request budgets and financial reporting from the collaborating and partner universities to be results-based for all main components of the proposal (PhD course work, sandwich PhD training, CDI, conferences etc.) and thus clearly linked to the results framework.

Recommendations for JIBS
- JIBS should carefully communicate any special features of the PhD programs that impact on when and where PhD students take their courses. Any limitations should be made clear when negotiating future collaborations. Budgets should take into account such limitations so that other aspects of collaborations are not subsequently undermined.
- JIBS should re-focus its publishing priorities and policies to ensure that a larger number of research outputs end up published in journals that are well recognized in the field. Furthermore, JIBS must ensure that PhD students and academic staff at partner universities are properly guided on how to identify predatory journals and how to choose appropriate publication outlets.
- JIBS should pay closer attention to the needs of partner universities and tailor its proposals to meet them more closely. To facilitate this, JIBS should involve its own academic staff in the coordination of all aspects of the collaboration: due diligence or needs analysis, proposal drafting, negotiations with partners and Sida, and monitoring of the collaboration and evaluation.

Recommendations to JIBS and partner universities
- JIBS and the partner university should agree at the outset of the collaboration on a documented and monitored supervisory process and include training of national supervisors.
- JIBS, together with partner universities are recommended to carry out a thorough due diligence and needs analysis prior to designing the proposal.
- Partner universities should ensure that realistic outputs and outcomes are established for each initiative. These should be based on thorough due diligence and needs analysis.
- Partner universities should monitor progress regarding the agreed outcomes and outputs throughout the program.
- Partner universities should evaluate institution building and capacity building components of the collaboration from an effectiveness and cost-efficiency perspective in order to understand the results and outcomes prior to proposing these to Swedish partner universities.

1 Introduction

Sida's current strategy for research cooperation[1] aims to contribute to "strengthened research of high quality and of relevance to poverty reduction and sustainable development" in low-income countries and regions. Sida's goals with the cooperation is to build research capacity in target countries to allow low-income countries to "identify important areas for research and to allocate resources to plan, implement, utilize and make available research for the development of society". The aim is that the research undertaken be of relevance to the partner countries and that it can contribute to poverty reduction and sustainable development.

In Ethiopia, Rwanda and Mozambique, this has taken the form of support to the main research universities (Sida's partner universities) which are all public universities; Addis Ababa University (AAU), the University of Rwanda (UR) and the Universidade Eduardo Mondlane (UEM), respectively. Key to the Swedish research cooperation is to train university staff to become researchers and to strengthen research management capacity and research-supporting infrastructure among others. In this effort Swedish and other universities have played a crucial role in developing PhD and MSc training, more recently contributing to curriculum development, lecturing and capacity building of the partner university staff.

Sida transfers funds directly to the partner universities as well as to the Swedish collaborating universities[2]. The agreement structures for the cooperation in Ethiopia, Mozambique and Rwanda consist of a) bilateral agreements between governments (except for the program in Ethiopia) b) specific agreements between Sida and its partners universities and c) sub-contracts either between Sida and Swedish collaborating universities or through International Science Program (ISP) of Uppsala University (ISP).

For the PhD staff training, the "sandwich model" (students registered and graduating at a Swedish university, but carrying out field work at home) has been the main method used to create a critical mass of researchers at partner universities.

---

[1] Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden. *Strategy for research cooperation and research in development cooperation 2015 – 2021*. Dec 2014

[2] Also to the Swedish collaborating universities via the International Science Program (ISP) of Uppsala University.

When a sufficient number of researchers are in place there is a shift to develop local MSc and PhD-training (students registered and graduating at their own university). In both types of training the students are provided with supervisors from both "their own" university and the Swedish collaborating universities.

A fundamental principle of these programs is that they meet the needs of the partner universities and the colleges and faculties engaged in the collaborations. This means that the details of the collaborations vary significantly even between collaborations at the same partner university. However, the three collaborations with JIBS shared certain characteristics including support for MSc programs, a greater focus on capacity building activities not leading to academic awards and more activities delivered in Sweden than collaborations with other Swedish universities. Beyond these characteristics, the three collaborations evaluated differed significantly in the numbers of students supported and the amount of funding awarded. The collaborations are briefly described below and in more detail in the Country Reports provided in Annexes 5, 6 and 7.

For the purpose of this evaluation the Evaluation Team will call the three African universities "partners" (partners to Sida) and JIBS a collaborating university. JIBS is one of several providers supporting each partner university under separate sub-contracts funded by Sida. We have, for the purpose of this evaluation, chosen to refer to the overall Sida program (encompassing many collaborative agreements aiming to strengthen national research capacity) in each country as the "program" while the JIBS support to each respective university is called "collaboration". At both AAU and UR the faculty JIBS collaborates with, primarily, is the College of Business and Economics (CBE). To distinguish the two these are referred to as CBE/AAU and CBE/UR.

1.1 SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

JIBS' collaborations have been with the CBE/AAU and CBE/UR and with the Faculty of Economics (FE) at UEM against a contract and with specific goals and objectives. These collaborations are the sole focus of this evaluation. There is therefore no assessment or comparison of the results from the collaborations between other Swedish universities and the same three partner universities.

The Terms of Reference (ToR) required the Evaluation Team to address the scientific quality, ownership and cost efficiency of the collaborations. Scientific quality here refers to human and institutional capacity and includes the numbers of PhD and MSc students enrolled and graduated and their completion rates, the review and development of in-house PhD and MSc programs as well as supporting guides,

the number and type of publications generated and conferences attended, research seminars and workshops delivered and other capacity building initiatives.

Ownership means more than the formal ownership acknowledged in the agreements between JIBS and the partner institutions. Different stakeholders have different perspectives of ownership. Studies[3] assessing ownership of donor-funded programs involve breaking the concept of ownership down into different components, including process-related aspects of ownership (participation in design, implementation and evaluation) as well as the aspect of control over decisions and resources. The Evaluation Team has therefore gathered information in order to be able to analyze the following aspects of ownership:

- The processes leading up to the collaborative partners' joint proposal to Sida.
- Partner universities' involvement in the design of the collaboration agreement, its activities and objectives.
- Partner universities' management of/control over the resources (personnel and monetary) used in the collaboration.
- Partner universities' ability to change direction/activities/systems as part of the collaboration.

The scale of the evaluation limited approaches to cost efficiency. Costs for PhD supervision are determined by Sida and funding arrangements from other donors vary significantly so comparisons of the costs of PhD supervision are redundant. It was acknowledged that the collaborations with JIBS include support that is not typical of other Sida-funded collaborations so meaningful comparisons are problematic. The Evaluation Team therefore considered cost efficiency in terms of how effective the outputs were in the context of how, why and where they were delivered.

The conclusions concerning scientific quality, ownership and cost efficiency are based on combined assessments of these aspects which are considered in the context of all three collaborations.

[3] In the study by Edgren, 2003 of ownership in Sida-funded relationships, ownership was identified as a desired outcome but an elusive concept that needs to be carefully defined in order to be used operationally. Ownership translated into measureable concepts often includes management, control, stakeholder interests, commitment of resources and an element of process (planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation).

1.2 BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE JIBS-AAU COLLABORATION

Sida's support for Ethiopia's higher education sector during the period 2011-2018 has been analyzed in a recent review by Watts, Abebe, Tsegay[4] and therefore is not presented in detail here. It comprised two funding streams:

- the 'block grant' (SEK 162 million for the period 2009-2018); and
- the JIBS collaboration with the CBE/AAU (SEK 27,4 million for the period 2011-2018).

The Government of Ethiopia has ambitious plans for its higher education (HE) sector and AAU has been designated as a national research hub by the Government, tasked to upgrade the qualifications and the research capacity of the wider Ethiopian HE sector. This is to happen through primarily the delivery of PhD programs, and AAU is to increase the number of PhD graduates. To assist the Government in the production of PhD graduates, several international donors have established programs to support Ethiopian universities. Sida's block grant is one example (for further information please see Watts et al. 2018).

The collaboration between JIBS and CBE/AAU followed a modified sandwich program model where students register for degrees awarded by AAU and are supervised by JIBS and AAU supervisors. Teaching and supervision took place at both AAU and JIBS with PhD students visiting JIBS at least once per semester, typically for periods of four to eight weeks. JIBS staff visited AAU to provide teaching and supervision of students and training for their Ethiopian counterparts. AAU academic staff also visited JIBS, and CBE/AAU arranged an international economics conference in 2017 as part of the collaboration.

CBE/AAU comprises two departments; the Economics department and the Management department.

In CBE/AAU's Economics department, AAU already had an accredited PhD program, and JIBS was to support and ensure the quality of the existing program. In Management, the collaboration started with the design and accreditation of a new PhD program. PhD students at AAU follow the Ministry of Education's rules which involve following a taught PhD program for two years after which they must pass their exams before embarking on their research. The Ethiopian Ministry of Education (MoE) prescribes that PhDs should be completed within four years. While JIBS was

[4] Watts, Abebe, Tsegay. *Higher Education and Research in Ethiopia, with emphasis on Addis Ababa University*. 2018

responsible for giving some of the courses, its main role was during the research phase with the provision of supervision.

The collaboration focused on increasing the number of Ethiopian academic staff with PhDs. While institutional strengthening of research capacity is an objective in the overall program between Sida and AAU, it was not JIBS' responsibility during the period 2011-2018. This changed with the new agreement signed in mid-2018.

1.3 BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE JIBS-UEM COLLABORATION

UEM has a 41 year history as a partner of Sida. The current phase of support (2017-2022) includes 21 sub-programs: 15 thematic sub-programs addressing research and training and six sub-programs in cross-cutting key supporting elements (e.g. gender, quality support). However, the Faculty of Economics (FE) at UEM had not benefitted from Sida funding since the 1990s. The Government of Mozambique has highlighted the importance of economic analyses in addressing national problems and the involvement of FE in a program to develop academic competence therefore became a priority. The Government funds education from primary to undergraduate levels but not post-graduate study so, as senior UEM officers explained, collaborations such as those with Sida and JIBS are particularly important.

UEM wants to shift from being a teaching-led to a research-led institution and create a critical mass to engage in research. The FE also wants to raise its academic profile through the generation of research projects and the publication of academic articles. It wants to address this through the development and delivery of its own PhD programs but this requires sufficient academic staff with the necessary qualifications and experience to teach and supervise PhD students.

JIBS and UEM/FE began a collaboration in November 2017 with the aim of:

- enrolling two students to study the JIBS PhD program in Management and Economics,
- developing a course-based PhD program in Economics and Management at UEM with JIBS staff supporting the teaching and supervision,
- developing and delivering MSc programs, and
- providing capacity building to UEM staff including:
    - English language training to enable FE staff to read and write academic papers;
    - the Career Development Initiative (CDI) whereby up to eight UEM/FE staff would be invited to Sweden each year to develop research papers with support

from JIBS mentors. The expected result from the CDI was to have scientific articles accepted for publication in international peer reviewed journals[5];
- the establishment of a regular seminar series (starting in 2019); and
- the establishment of an international conference to be hosted by UEM/FE every second year (starting in 2020).

However, there were significant problems enrolling and retaining students for the JIBS PhD program and developing the course-based PhD program at UEM. These problems are addressed in Annex 7.

At the time of reporting, CBE/UR and JIBS had submitted a proposal to Sida for the 2019 to 2024 phase of funding.

1.4 BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE JIBS-UR COLLABORATION

Research cooperation between Sida and what was then the National University of Rwanda (NUR) started in 2002 and has been implemented in three phases, with a fourth beginning 2019 (until 2024). UR's collaboration with JIBS began in phase three (2013-2019) with what was then the Faculty of Economics and Management (FEM) of NUR. In 2013 seven public independent universities, including NUR, were merged to create the University of Rwanda (UR). The creation of UR saw the establishment of the CBE/UR which then became the Rwandan partner in the cooperation with JIBS. The agreement between JIBS and Sida was signed in July 2013. An amendment to that agreement was signed in November 2014 following the formation of UR. The main change acknowledged the need for some budgetary adjustments because CBE/UR now operated at several campuses across Rwanda.

The first collaboration between UR and JIBS (2013-2019) was to strengthen the School of Business (SoB) and the School of Economics (SoE) within the CBE/UR by training its staff to PhD level, reviewing its Masters' programs and developing in-house PhD programs needed for the development of Rwandan public and private sectors.

Within the collaboration between JIBS and CBE/UR the PhDs followed a sandwich program where students study and carry out research for up to 29 months in Sweden and do their field research in Rwanda. JIBS awards the PhD degree. In addition, the collaboration has included teaching and supervision on MSc and MBA programs; reviews and revisions to local PhD and masters-level programs; development of the CDI; and workshops and seminars.

[5] UR. *Addendum to full proposal*. June 2014. UR. *Sub-program full proposal.* June 2013

At the time of reporting, CBE/UR and JIBS had submitted a proposal to Sida for the 2019 to 2024 phase of funding. This includes support for the in-house PhD program at CBE/UR, with provision for some students to spend time in Sweden, support for MSc students and post-doctoral researchers and a continuation of the CDI.

2 Rationale and purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to document and analyze the activities carried out in the collaborations between JIBS and AAU, UEM and UR. It is intended to explain what has worked well and less well in these collaborations and so inform Sida's current and future support for bi-lateral cooperation programs.

Its objective, as noted in the ToR, is to increase the understanding of if and how these collaborations have contributed to the objectives and modalities outlined in Sida's policies for strengthening research capacity in low-income countries ("Policy for Research in Swedish Development Cooperation 2010-2014 and Strategy for Sida's Support for Research Cooperation 2010 – 2014" and "Swedish Strategy for Research Cooperation and Research in Development Cooperation 2015-2021").

The evaluation assesses how the collaborations have developed and evolved, the activities carried out and the results of the collaborations between JIBS and AAU, UEM and UR. The three areas evaluated are:

- scientific quality,
- local ownership and
- cost efficiency.

Sida is the primary user of this evaluation but it will also inform Sida's partners in ongoing and future programs. As JIBS and AAU have only recently embarked on a new Sida-funded cooperation for the period 2019-2023, the JIBS-UEM cooperation began in November 2017 and JIBS and UR have applied for support for a new program covering the period 2019-2024, findings from this evaluation will inform them in their current and future cooperation projects.

Sida's support for the overall programs at UEM and UR has recently been evaluated and support for AAU is the main focus of a recent review[6], with the JIBS collaborations being addressed where necessary and appropriate. Those evaluations concluded that the programs broadly correspond with Sida's policies concerning bilateral research cooperation. Those programs are not the subject of this evaluation.

The Evaluation Team focuses on the most recently completed contract period and the time period leading up to the collaboration agreements. This means that the

[6] Watts et al., 2018.

following cooperation agreements, and the work leading up to them, have been evaluated:

- The JIBS-AAU agreement covering the period May 2011 to June 2018, and the current agreement signed in 2018.
- The JIBS- UEM agreement covering the period November 2017 to December 2022.
- The JIBS-UR agreement covering the period July 2013 to June 2019.

The evaluation questions are listed in Annex 2.

3 Methodology

3.1 OVERALL APPROACH

Case study research was used to conduct this evaluation. This was a particularly appropriate methodology as it allowed the Evaluation Team to examine each case from the different perspectives of key stakeholders. The three collaborations were designed under different circumstances and include different activities, the partner universities work under different conditions and the collaborations have been implemented during different periods of time. Each of the three JIBS collaborations – with AAU, UR and UEM – was therefore treated as an individual case. These cases are presented as Annexes 5, 6 and 7. The case study approach enabled us to identify, contextualize and explain key issues arising from the individual collaborations and across them. The data generated by the research was then analyzed within and between the cases to inform the evaluation.

The evaluation took a utilization-focused approach[7] with the aim to help Sida to formulate similar programs in the future. The evaluation also provides current partners and JIBS with recommendations for improving on-going and future collaborations.

The Evaluation Team has used both quantitative (gathering statistics, asking interviewees to rate aspects based on a scale, etc.) and qualitative data (whereby interviewees are asked to freely express their opinions, provide argumentation that is then summarized and objectively reported).

We have also analyzed JIBS' contribution to the results in order to understand the roles played by the different stakeholders in reaching results (or not). The collaboration agreements all follow a similar (but neither explicit nor documented)

[7] Utilization-focused evaluation (UFE) is based on the paradigmatic principle that evaluations should be judged by their usefulness to the intended users. In practice, this means UFE should identify and engage the intended users to ensure their use of the evaluation remains central to the research and that their intended uses guide the evaluation processes. In short, this means that UFE is intended to generate practical and feasible evidence-based findings.

theory of change. The following implicit theory of change was developed as part of a recent evaluation of UEM[8] and outlined in the Inception Report:

Table 1: Implicit theory of change

Inputs	Outputs	Outcomes	Impact
Funds for postgraduate training in Sweden	No. of PhD and MSc graduated	Increased capacity to conduct research of scientific quality and relevance Increased capacity for postgraduate training Enhanced capacity of supervisors to supervise Masters and Doctoral studies Increased research productivity Improved research communication Increased collaboration and networking internationally and nationally	Strengthen national research capacity Make the country better able to plan, produce and use research in the fight against poverty
Funds for national/in-house postgraduate training	No. of national PhD and MSc programs increased/students graduated		
Funds for research	No. of research projects No. of publications		
Funds for strengthening research management	No. of staff trained	Improved research management and coordination	

[8] Kruse, S.-E., Tvedten, I., Tedre, M. & da Costa Rosário, C.M. (2017) Evaluation of Swedish government research cooperation with Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique 2011-2016: synthesis report. Stockholm: Sida.

The case study approach used here enabled the Evaluation Team to identify, contextualize and explain how the inputs (here, the specific Sida-funded inputs from JIBS) helped and hindered this logical progression.

3.2 INSTRUMENTS FOR DATA COLLECTION

The evaluation used two main methods for collecting data and information:

- Document review, and
- In-depth interviews (individual and group interviews).

The document review allowed us to examine contemporaneous records of the development and delivery of the collaborations. The reviewed documents included:

- Sida's strategies relevant to research cooperation,
- Recent evaluations commissioned by Sida related to research cooperation programs in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Mozambique,
- Proposals/applications from the JIBS and the partner university,
- Collaboration agreements,
- Progress reports and annual reports,
- Financial reports, audited financial statements and budgets,
- JIBS' policies and regulations relevant to research and PhD supervision,
- JIBS' steering group instructions,
- Correspondence between University of Gothenburg (UGOT) and Sida,
- Publication data (type, number, authors, publication venue) of publications published as part of the Sida-funded collaborations,
- CVs of JIBS' staff involved in the program (Academic Directors, supervisors, coordinators),
- Policies and regulations relevant to research and PhD supervision for the partner universities (if provided),
- Minutes from meetings between Sida, partner universities and JIBS (as relevant), and
- Additional data provided by JIBS, AAU, UEM and UR in response to comments on the Draft Report.

The in-depth interviews were semi-structured and enabled us to examine the individual expectations and experiences of the different stakeholders. They were based on pre-determined guidelines which meant all interviewees were asked about the same key issues. However, because they were semi-structured, the interviews provided those interviewees with the opportunity to address issues of particular concern to them. It also meant the Evaluation Team was able to seek clarification and further explanation where necessary.

The sampling of persons to interview was done by each of the key stakeholders in order to ensure that persons with information relevant to the evaluation were interviewed, as far as possible. Sida representatives in Stockholm and in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Mozambique were asked to identify key stakeholders in the collaborations as were the coordinators of the collaboration at each of the four

universities. Senior officers from the four institutions – JIBS, AAU, UR and UEM – were invited to describe and discuss the development and delivery of the collaborations. They were also asked to identify participants in the collaboration, including supervisors, students and beneficiaries of the CDI. Convenience sampling was used to engage these participants resulting in interviews conducted with:

- Sida staff in Stockholm (3 persons) and Swedish Embassy staff in Ethiopia, Mozambique and Rwanda, respectively,
- The JIBS' coordinator and leadership of the cooperation programs (8 people in total),
- Supervisors at JIBS involved in the cooperation program (2 persons),
- Students and staff at each partner university (30 students and 36 staff, as detailed below).

Table 2: Students interviewed at each partner university

	AAU	UEM	UR
Total number of PhD students enrolled in the program	52	-[9]	8
Number of PhD students interviewed by the Evaluation Team	25	-	5[10]

Table 3: Staff interviewed at each partner university

	AAU	UEM	UR
Senior management at the universities	-	4	6
Program coordinators or contact persons	3	1	2
Academic staff members involved in teaching, supervision and research	7	6	7

3.3 PROCESS OF ANALYSIS AND DEVELOPING CONCLUSIONS

The basis for analysis is both the quantitative data gathered (statistics, results achieved, publications) and qualitative (opinions, experiences and views of stakeholders). Some of the qualitative data has been quantified (asking interviewees to rate aspects of ownerships for example).

[9] One student will be accepted to the JIBS PhD program subject to meeting discipline- and language-based criteria (Annex 7 refers).

[10] 3 graduates who are current staff at UR (and not counted in table 3).

The data has been collated for each partner university, firstly, assessing both actual, documented results and contribution.

A Draft Report was circulated to Sida, JIBS and the partner universities and comments received from all stakeholders. Comments were carefully considered and additional information and documentation requested in order to validate and strengthen the conclusions. In this Final Report, the Evaluation Team's findings are presented, as well as stakeholders' comments to these where appropriate and a final conclusion. Where there is disagreement between the Evaluation Team and the stakeholders' opinion and/or interpretation of the facts, this disagreement is reported and stakeholders' comments are reproduced verbatim in a footnote.

3.4 METHODOLOGICAL LIMITATIONS

This evaluation relied heavily on qualitative research methods (i.e. interviews with individual contributors to and beneficiaries of the three collaborations). The risk of such an approach is that it lacks the objectivity of more quantitative approaches. The following considerations therefore need to be taken into account when assessing the validity of the evaluation.

The support for capacity strengthening collaborations – certainly as realized through those involving JIBS – is intensive and involves relatively small numbers of potential direct beneficiaries. A more quantitative approach seeking to make numeric correlations would therefore be unviable and methodologically indefensible.

The implicit theory of change depends not only on how many individuals benefit from the collaborations, but how they benefit from them. Understanding this requires a subjective approach to the individual's engagement with the development and/or delivery of the collaboration. The potential weaknesses of this qualitative approach were addressed through a rigorous process of triangulation that involved:

- thorough checking of individual accounts to ensure their internal consistency;
- comparisons of individual accounts to ensure the consistency of interpretations; and
- comparisons of those accounts with data from other sources (primarily the document reviews) to ensure their validity.

In the cases where individual accounts do not show a consistent picture, the differences have been presented and analyzed.

By way of conclusion, while the Evaluation Team acknowledges the potential objective weaknesses of the evaluation's methodology, the Evaluation Team recognizes its value in providing subjective insights into the strengths and weaknesses of these collaborations. That is, the Evaluation Team appreciates the importance of individual accounts of how and why the collaborations both met and failed to meet their objectives.

4 Findings

Here the Evaluation Team addresses the JIBS collaborations in terms of their scientific quality, ownership and cost-efficiency, in accordance with the ToR.

4.1 SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

The following section aims to respond to the following evaluation questions:

- What are the results of the collaboration/relationship between JIBS and partner university supervisors as well as with doctoral students?
- What is the academic capacity and relevance of Swedish supervisors for the field of studies chosen by the doctoral students (how students and supervisors are selected and matched)?
- What is the scientific quality of the research produced as an outcome of the collaborations (for example, publications in international journals)?
- To what extent has JIBS contributed to strengthening the capacity at the universities/ departments with which they collaborate (human and institutional capacity) towards local PhD programs?

The section begins with an overall description of the results achieved through the JIBS-AAU and JIBS-UR collaborations until 2019.

4.1.1 Results achieved at AAU, UEM and UR

The output results achieved by mid-2019 are presented below.

Table 4: Summary of quantifiable results achieved

	AAU	UR	UEM
PhD students enrolled	52	8	-[11]
PhD students graduated	12	4[12]	
PhD program developed and accredited in	n.a.[13]	Yes	n.a.[14]

[11] One student is taking a preliminary PhD Competence Development Program and, subject to passing it and demonstrating sufficient English, will be enrolled on the JIBS PhD program.

[12] As of July 2019.

[13] AAU already had an accredited PhD program in Economics at the start of the JIBS-AAU

Economics			
PhD program developed and accredited in Management	Yes	Yes	
MSc courses delivered in Economics and Management		Yes	
Reviews of MSc program in Economics and MBA in Management carried out by JIBS	n.a.	Yes	Yes
Development of supporting guides/tools/student plans[15]	Yes	Yes	
Publications (number of individual studies)	82	161	7[16]
International conferences	2017	2015, 2016, 2017 and 2019	n.a.
Career Development Initiative	n.a.	32 CBE/UR staff participated	8 FE staff participated
Workshops on relevant topics delivered at the partner universities	n.a.	17	n.a.
Research seminars organized at the partner universities	n.a.	5 presentations by JIBS staff 6 presentations by PhDs	n.a.

The following sub-sections describe the results for each collaboration, briefly. For more details see the Country Reports.

collaboration.

[14] The UEM/FE PhD programs in Economics and Management had been developed and accredited prior to the JIBS-UEM/FE collaboration. The development of a new PhD program in collaboration with JIBS did not progress.

[15] For AAU, JIBS developed *Implementation Plans* and *Student Progress Reports*. With UR, JIBS developed the *Masters Thesis Assessment Manual*.

[16] Seven papers have been presented at international conferences. Two were co-authored by a PhD candidate from UEM and a JIBS professor. The others were sole- or co-authored by FE staff.

AAU Results

The outputs from the JIBS-AAU collaboration have been related to:

- PhD students and programs,
- Publications,
- International conferences, and
- Workshops and seminars.

All in all, 52 students have been enrolled in the AAU's PhD programs during the period; 29 in the Economics program and 23 in the Management program. 38 students have yet to graduate. The statistics available from AAU and JIBS show that all graduates have taken longer than the four years prescribed by the Ethiopian Ministry of Education for a PhD degree. On average, a PhD student in Management spent five years and seven months on her/his degree, while an economics student spent six years and four months.

JIBS has also helped introduce several guidelines and tools to the PhD process, in both CBE/AAU departments. In 2013 *Student Progress Reports* were introduced[17] in order to better monitor and manage progression and the supervisory process. This tool was formally approved for use among all PhD students in the two departments in January 2019.[18] The *Implementation Policy* establishing procedures for supervision and the general implementation of the PhD process, were probably used informally as guidelines earlier, but formally approved for use in 2019.

JIBS also attempted to train teachers in teaching techniques at JIBS' campus. The idea was to co-teach PhD courses at JIBS and then for JIBS' lecturers to co-teach at AAU. The teaching methods are very different according to JIBS who wanted to introduce more a student-centered approach to teaching at AAU. However, co-teaching appears not to have been implemented to its full potential as none of the staff at the Economics department at CBE/AAU have ever co-taught, while only one staff member from the Management department participated.

One conference was organized at AAU as part of the JIBS-AAU collaboration; in Economics and Management in December 2017, with about 50 participants, 103 presenters from 18 different countries, with 96 papers being selected. Two books were published as a result of the conference. In addition, AAU students and staff were encouraged to attend the conferences organized by UR in Rwanda as part of the JIBS-UR collaboration. At these conferences different JIBS-partners were invited (AAU, UR, Makerere University in Uganda, and the University of Dar es Salaam Business School) to encourage regional cooperation. At the most recent conference in Rwanda

[17] JIBS. *JIBS Narrative Report 2013*, 2016

[18] AAU. *Minutes Planning meeting AAU/JIBS/UGOT, 19/1-2019*. 2019.

in June, 2019, 17 PhD students from AAU and seven AAU staff had their papers accepted and the 17 students attended. While these conferences are dominated by JIBS' partner universities and may not classify as equally high profile as some of the European and American conferences, they do provide a first opportunity to step on to an international research scene.

UEM Results

The outputs from the collaboration have been limited to date and mostly concern preparation for the collaboration.

An attempt to recruit the two PhD students for the JIBS PhD sandwich program was made. However, only one PhD candidate was selected, who subsequently dropped out. One student is currently taking the PhD Competence Development Program (an intensive three month discipline-based program at MSc level) and, subject to passing it and demonstrating sufficient English language skills, will be enrolled in the JIBS PhD program. Arrangements have been made for JIBS staff to contribute to the delivery of the PhD Competence Development Program (starting in September 2019) and the in-house PhD programs (starting in early 2020).

Preparatory work was undertaken for the development of a PhD program based on existing PhD programs developed by JIBS in collaboration with AAU and UR. On reviewing the proposed program, though, the FE concluded it was too similar to the existing in-house PhD programs and decided not to progress it. However, some content from the proposed program will be incorporated into the existing programs.

An initial assessment by JIBS of the MSc programs offered by UEM/FE indicated that they did not provide graduates with the competence to be able to attend a PhD program and the program needed to address this before work to develop a PhD program could begin. This has meant significant changes to the program and budget, for which JIBS and UEM have sought the approval of Sida, which is pending. Arrangements have been made for JIBS staff to support the delivery of the MSc programs.

English language training was provided at UEM for 21 FE staff.

The call for applications to the CDI was launched in 2018 and eight faculty members travelled to Sweden to work on the development of papers under the mentorship of Swedish supervisors. The CDI generated two papers that were co-authored with a JIBS professor and submitted to journals for publication.

UR Results

The *Annual Progress Reports* for the academic years 2013/14 to 2017/18 indicate that most of the collaboration's objectives have been met. This was corroborated by officers from UR and acknowledged by Sida. The main outputs of the JIBS-UR collaboration for the 2013-19 period concern:

- PhD students and programs,
- MSc/MBA students and programs,
- Publications,
- International conferences,
- CDI, and

- Workshops and seminars.

Seven students were recruited to the JIBS PhD program in 2013/14 and an eighth in 2017. At the time of reporting, four had graduated and a fifth was aiming to defend his thesis in October 2019. The statistics available from JIBS show that all graduates have used less than five years to complete their degrees. JIBS delivered the coursework or made provision for it at other Swedish universities and provided most (and sometimes the only) supervision of student theses. Some CBE/UR staff provided academic input but this was limited by the arrangements for co-supervision (below). Others provided administrative and personal support to some students and also supported some students in the conduct of their fieldwork. CBE/UR staff were also invited to Sweden for their students' theses defenses. Progress reports on the collaboration implied that JIBS and CBE/UR staff had co-supervised students on the JIBS PhD program but other reports highlighted problems with the co-supervisory process. Evidence from CBE/UR staff and students and recent graduates from the JIBS PhD program also highlighted problems with the process.

JIBS staff collaborated with their CBE/UR colleagues to develop course-based PhD programs in Economics and in Management which will be awarded by UR. The programs have been accredited by the Higher Education Council in Rwanda. Unlike the research-based PhD program previously developed by CBE, these programs combine coursework and research and are among the first course-based PhD programs at UR to be accredited. Along with CBE/UR colleagues, JIBS staff also produced the *PhD Thesis Manual*.

JIBS staff supervised the theses of 11 MSc students in both Economics and Management. Six other students, and their supervisors, were given support during their fieldwork. JIBS staff initially provided supervision for another nine students but they failed to complete their theses in time and were transferred to CBE/UR programs and staff.

From 2013/14 to 2016/17 JIBS staff delivered 16 courses as part of the MSc programs for Economics and Management and on the MBA program. It was reported that all courses were co-taught with CBE/UR colleagues but some CBE/UR staff noted that this co-teaching had been limited to them observing the teaching by JIBS staff and some also noted that this then led to them not attending the classes. It was also reported that the planned delivery of a further three courses did not go ahead. JIBS staff organized and, with CBE/UR colleagues, conducted reviews of MSc in Economics and the MBA in Management. Along with CBE/UR colleagues, JIBS staff also produced the *Masters Thesis Assessment Manual*.

International conferences were held in Kigali in 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2019. As well as providing opportunities for Rwandan academics and scholars to present their

work, these typically attracted delegates from JIBS and from the African countries linked by the Entrepreneurship and Innovation for Development (EID) program[19]: Ethiopia, Tanzania and Uganda and Mozambique (where the FE/UEM is collaborating with JIBS) as well as JIBS' collaborating partners from other international universities. The participation in these conferences provided learning opportunities for young scholars and international exposure for their work.

The CDI was launched in 2014 and ran for four years. 32 CBE/UR staff travelled to Sweden (eight each year) to develop one or more research papers under the supervision of JIBS staff and it was reported that most papers produced through it were finalized. Most of these papers typically led to presentations at conferences, some have been published in books edited by JIBS staff and in *East Africa Research Papers in Economics and Finance* (which is hosted by JIBS). It was reported that one staff member obtained a Belgian PhD scholarship on the basis of a paper generated by the CDI.

JIBS staff delivered 17 workshops across several UR campuses between 2014/15 and 2017/18 on topics including:

- academic writing skills;
- thesis writing;
- policy brief writing;
- research proposal writing;
- research dissemination;
- co-teaching; and
- postgraduate supervision.

A monthly research seminar series was organized at UR. JIBS staff made at least five presentations and PhD students registered at JIBS made at least six presentations. PhD students at JIBS regularly attended and contributed to research seminars at JIBS.

Between 2014 and 2016, six business outreach meetings – two in Rwanda and four in Sweden – were organized with the intention of supporting Rwandan businesses. However, as the CBE team leader explained, they did not generate any benefits for CBE/UR or the collaboration.

[19] The EID program was, according to UR, originally initiated by UR/CBE in 2015. The partners to it and JIBS have subsequently signed contracts and sought funding from Sida as per a proposal for the EID to Sida. The purpose of the EID, as presented in the proposal, was to create course-based PhD programs where human resources would be shared between the EID partners. There were also components aimed at strengthening EID partners' research capacity namely: conferences, the CDI, post-doc positions, seminar series etc. Source: *Draft EID Proposal*. Sep 2016.

Conclusion

The JIBS-AAU collaboration agreement for the period 2011-2019 was not structured and there were no measurable objectives established (e.g. # of PhD students to graduate etc.). The results achieved show the PhD students progressed slowly with only 23 percent of the enrolled PhD students having graduated. There appears to have been limited activities implemented to improve teaching techniques. The participation in international conferences has increased.

The collaboration between JIBS and UEM was over-ambitious but has, so far, resulted in the development of the PhD Competence Development Program in order to be able to receive PhD candidates to the sandwich program to be offered at JIBS and to the in-house PhD programs at UEM/FE. The CDI has started already resulting in eight staff members participating and two co-authored papers. There were, however, setbacks in the recruitment of PhDs for the JIBS-based sandwich PhD program and the MSc programs needed improvement.

The documentation and conclusions of UR staff interviewed showed that most of the objectives of the collaboration for the period 2013 to 2018 have been met. 50 percent of the enrolled PhD students have graduated with the majority of the remaining students progressing well. The CDI has led to 32 UR staff being mentored by JIBS staff and a large number of research outputs being produced. Teaching and research techniques have also been improved through co-teaching, CDI and the participation in and organization of conferences.

4.1.2 Results of the collaboration between JIBS and partner universities' supervisors

JIBS' involvement in developing the PhD programs at the partner universities has involved assessing and developing PhD programs (at AAU and UR), teaching MSc courses (at UR) and introducing co-teaching and co-supervision to improve pedagogic methods at AAU and UR. PhD students from UR have also been offered PhD courses at JIBS and other universities as part of their PhD education.

AAU had its own accredited PhD program in Economics and AAU students took all their required courses at home and passed their exams prior to beginning research at JIBS. JIBS supported CBE/AAU in designing a PhD program in management which was accredited in May 2013 and the first students were admitted during the fall of 2013. At AAU, supervisors were appointed after the students had passed their course exams, which normally take place after two years of study. Thus, the AAU students are only supervised by JIBS for the dissertation and research phase of their PhD. According to AAU, students need the first two years to show aptitude for research and decide their topic, and it is only when that topic is chosen that suitable supervisors can be appointed.

UR PhD students were required to take mandatory and elective courses delivered at JIBS with the option of taking elective courses at other Swedish universities through JIBS' membership of the Swedish Graduate Programme for Economics (SWEGPEC)[20]. Elective courses for UR PhD students were chosen with the guidance of the Swedish supervisors and most students suggested they were given limited options. However, students from UR's SoB were able to choose courses at JIBS[21] while those from the UR's SoE reported being offered courses at other universities; this was because JIBS was not able to offer relevant coursework (according to UR staff) and because the courses offered at JIBS did not coincide with when the students were in Sweden (according to JIBS). This caused concerns as students at UR reported that the necessary travel and accommodation costs associated with sending them to other universities were met from the budgets that should have enabled them to attend international conferences[22]. This has been contested by JIBS. It is important for JIBS to communicate to the partner university and faculty leadership, already at the outset of the collaboration, any special features of the PhD program that may impact on when and where PhD students carry out their course work in order to avoid disappointment and rumours.

During the period of review JIBS has allocated two supervisors[23] to each PhD student (AAU and UR students) and the partner university one co-supervisor. JIBS' main supervisor must be an associate professor at least. The selection of supervisors at AAU followed an established process by which the PhD students' research concept notes were reviewed by JIBS and supervisors proposed (with CVs) to AAU's Department Graduation Committee, who then selected the JIBS and AAU supervisors.

At UR the two institutions – JIBS and CBE/UR – identified the supervisors separately. UR then appointed the UR co-supervisors. There is no evidence to suggest that they collaborated in the appointment process. The students reported having no say in the appointment of their supervisors.

According to JIBS, UR and AAU approve the research topics and JIBS faculty do not comment on the relevance of the research topic. This is, according to JIBS, in line with the partner universities' responsibilities and ownership of the collaboration. According to JIBS, all the research topics address relevant topics related to each

[20] https://ju.se/en/research/doctoral-programmes/doctoral-programmes-at-jibs/doctoral-courses.html

[21] Although some took at least one elective course at another university.

[22] JIBS noted in the response to the Draft Report on 2019-08-30 that "…these budgets have always been separated so this information is not correct." However, when asked to provide documentation to evidence of this statement, JIBS did not provide any.

[23] One main supervisor and one co-supervisor.

country and tackle very practical issues. JIBS initiated work with UR to communicate research findings to politicians and decision-makers by developing policy briefs.

The accounts given by JIBS academic staff, students and supervisors indicate typical processes whereby supervisors are identified by having substantive and/or methodological and/or theoretical interests and experience in the research proposed by students. The appointment of supervisors (or suggestion to AAU's Department Graduation Committee) is also based on the supervisors' availability. The accounts given by the students interviewed indicate that the appointment of Swedish supervisors was appropriate. However, those same accounts indicate that the appointment of national co-supervisors was more haphazard and took a long time leading to supervisors only being appointed later during the research phase. However the appointment of inappropriate national co-supervisors did not seem to influence the students' progress.

The involvement of the JIBS' supervisors and the national co-supervisors has been reported to differ significantly with fewer PhD students (from either AAU or UR) reporting that they received significant support, input or constructive criticism from the national co-supervisors (with a few exceptions reported). AAU had difficulties finding relevant supervisors and examiners for the PhDs which delayed the process. Some students stated that they almost never heard from their national co-supervisors, that they did not respond to emails or were very difficult to get hold of. The communication between the three supervisors was therefore not complicated as the PhD candidates related to the most active supervisors i.e. JIBS' supervisors.

The UR/CBE team leader emphasized that the Rwandan co-supervisors had benefitted from the co-supervision, which he described as an 'induction' and 'initial training' process. This learning process is important, but it seems to have limited the actual co-supervision that took place. The type of sandwich model used in this collaboration (with all teaching and supervision taking place in Sweden) further limited it. There was no clear evidence that all of the Rwandan co-supervisors followed the supervisory process from start to finish[24].

Also, narrative annual reporting to Sida showed that the national co-supervisors did not involve themselves in supervision but rather left the supervision to JIBS' supervisors. At AAU supervisors had few incentives to participate in supervision with too many other engagements (teaching, working outside the university etc.), a limited tradition of regular contacts with students, and lastly, an attitude of "students never listened to them anyway", but rather to the Swedish supervisor. At UR the JIBS supervisors were assigned already when the student was enrolled, while the national

[24] It could be argued that the term 'co-supervision' is misleading in this context and that 'secondary supervision' would have been more appropriate.

supervisor was selected at a later stage. This exacerbated a situation in which the Swedish co-supervisors were already engaged in supervision with the student when the national supervisor was selected. The Swedish supervisors were, from the perspective of the students and national supervisors, assumed to have greater pedagogic, technical and theoretical knowledge while the Rwandan co-supervisors might have some insight into local and regional issues.

JIBS supervisors stated that they saw their role as that of helping to ensure that the research was "publishable". They saw the role of the national supervisors as to ensure the quality of the data gathered in Ethiopia/Rwanda.

Interviews with staff and students at AAU indicated that some of the matches of the JIBS supervisor and PhD student did not work well. Because students were given both a main- and co-supervisor at JIBS, it was the co-supervisor that they worked the most with. This person could be just out of the PhD themselves, and some were reported by PhD students to have had insufficient knowledge of the Ethiopian context. Some students also mentioned that main supervisors' interests shifted, with the consequence that the students had to modify their approach (using a more qualitative method instead of quantitative) or topic.[25] JIBS explained that such modifications (to the method, and not the topic) came about as the student became aware of the limitations to the statistical data she/he had been planning to use or the need to use a case-study approach as opposed to gathering vast amounts of primary data through surveys too difficult or costly to implement.

In order to strengthen the supervisory process and improve progression at AAU JIBS helped develop documents providing procedures and tools for supervision and progression monitoring (*Student Progress Reports* and *Implementation Policy)* approved in 2019. JIBS' contribution to establishing these processes is found to be significant. It is doubtful if AAU would have done so without external input and pressure to improve progression as the academic environment seems not to have been particularly conducive to introducing routines that reduced the flexibility of staff and students.

JIBS has also provided training in supervision to UR and AAU staff[26], but there is limited evidence that the national supervisors have improved their engagement or techniques for supervision[27] despite this.

---

[25] It is important to emphasize that this is the story from the student perspective. There are no written minutes or similar to document exactly what happened. The lack of formal routines in such cases is unfortunate.

[26] Supervisors at UR were provided training in postgraduate supervision and teaching techniques through a separate Sida-funded sub-program. After a case of plagiarism was discovered, JIBS reviewed its routines and tools for detecting and addressing plagiarism issues and investigated the

Conclusion

The selection of JIBS' supervisors and national supervisors at AAU was carried out by AAU, and by JIBS and UR, for their respective supervisors. The Swedish supervisors were deferred to by both students and national supervisors, and there was less engagement of the national supervisors than JIBS' supervisors. The structure of the sandwich model used at CBE/UR may have helped improve completion rates but limited opportunities for meaningful co-supervision. This highlights the problems encountered in these and other collaborations of trying to support capacity development through co-supervision. The JIBS collaborations succeeded in developing AAU's and UR's capacity to provide doctoral supervision by increasing the number of academic staff with PhDs, but there is little evidence to show that the supervision of the PhD students by national supervisors improved significantly during the period.

The findings showed that JIBS was not always able to offer elective courses in Economics in the subjects needed by UR PhD students at JIBS within the timeframe of the collaborations. However, provision was made through JIBS membership of SWEGPEC to offer students these courses at other Swedish universities. Students and staff at AAU and UR raised concerns about this but the successful completion of PhD studies in Economics indicate that JIBS was able to provide sufficient support through this alternate arrangement.

The selection and approval of research topics was done by UR and AAU and JIBS was not involved. According to JIBS, all of the research topics address relevant topics related to each country and tackle very practical issues. However, modifications to research methods or topic were made as a consequence of JIBS-supervisors' advice. Earlier and better communication between Swedish and national supervisors may have allowed these issues to be addressed sooner.

Closer collaboration between JIBS and national supervisors is desirable because it would strengthen institutional capacity at the partner universities. However, subject to other concerns about supervision, the changes recommended by the JIBS supervisors typically strengthened the research generated by the PhD students.

Recommendations

- JIBS and the partner university should agree at the outset of the collaboration on a supervisory process that includes:

---

occurrence among PhD students from both UR and AAU. Cases were detected and as a result, JIBS carried out training on ethics and rules of how to use citations, quotes and references in academic publications at both UR and AAU.

[27] As reported by students and supervisors at JIBS.

  - Swedish and National supervisors appointed at the same time (preferably upon acceptance of the PhD candidate),
  - Clear roles and responsibilities for JIBS and national supervisors,
  - Training and monitoring of the national supervisors,
  - Communication of the supervision process and responsibilities to PhD students,
  - Documented tools to be used to guide and measure progression of the PhD graduate (examples of this are the AAU *Student Progress Reports*).
- JIBS should ensure that appropriate structures are in place for co-teaching and co-supervision with colleagues at partner universities and that responsibility for teaching coursework is transferred to the partner universities at the earliest viable opportunity. Consideration should be given to the delivery of at least some PhD coursework in-country, especially where the number of students makes this a financially viable option, to provide academic staff at partner universities with greater opportunities to benefit from co-teaching.
- JIBS should carefully communicate any special features of the PhD programs that impact on when and where PhD students take their courses. Any limitations should be made clear when negotiating future collaborations. Budgets should take into account such limitations so that other aspects of the collaborations are not subsequently undermined.
- Sida should work with partner universities to support and sustain the development of realistic human resource policies that allow for appropriate salaries, responsibilities and allocation of time to research and supervision. Consideration should be given to realizing this through training/workshops delivered by Swedish universities. Further consideration should be given to making such policies a key criterion in the assessment of overall programs and the sub-programs within them.

4.1.3 Academic capacity of JIBS' supervisors

JIBS' *Supervision Policy* establishes requirements to be a main or co-supervisor (academic qualifications, pedagogical competence and experience of supervision or co-supervision) and their respective responsibilities (follow-up and report progress, share networks, actively support the student to become a fully-fledged academic). The rules at JIBS have been that the main supervisor should dedicate 4 percent of her/his time to supervision per student and that the JIBS co-supervisor should dedicate 2 percent of her/his time. This was changed in 2017 and JIBS now allocates one main supervisor only (to dedicate 5 percent of her/his time). Timesheets were not available to verify this, but JIBS' supervisors interviewed stated that they spent more than the 4, 2 or 5 percent of her/his time on the AAU and UR PhD students' supervision.

Supervisory responsibilities in the 2011-2018 period were as follows for both AAU and UR students:

Table 5: Number of PhD students supervised in Economics by JIBS for both AAU and UR

Main supervisors	Graduated	Under supervision	Academic Rank
Per Olof Bjugren	1		Professor
Börje Johansson	1	1	Professor Emeritus
Scott Hacker	3	2	Professor
Almas Heshmati	6	4	Professor
Johan Klaesson		1	Professor
Kristofer Månsson		1	Professor
Pia Nilsson		2	Associate Professor
Paul Nystedt		1	Professor
Pär Sjölander	2	3	Professor
Andreas Stephan	1		Professor

Source: JIBS statistics

Table 6: Number of students supervised in Management by JIBS for both AAU and UR

Main supervisors	Graduated	Under supervision	Academic Rank
Leona Achtenhagen	2		Professor
Ethel Brundin	2	2	Professor
Karin Hellerstedt		3	Associate Professor
Benson Honig		1	Professor
Tomas Müllern		2	Professor
Lucia Naldi		4	Professor
Mattias Nordquist		1	Professor
Gunnar Rimmel	1		Professor
Andreas Stephan		1	Professor

Source: JIBS statistics

The persons that have held the positions as main supervisors for AAU and UR students have fulfilled the requirements in JIBS' *Supervision Policy*. The CVs of the staff involved, particularly the main supervisors, are very strong, with long publication records from variety of good international publications. All of the main supervisors but two[28] have substantial supervisory experience both as a main or co-supervisor. Their publications are frequently cited and their CVs attest to their academic qualifications, rewards received and publications. The experience in

[28] Based on a review of the CVs where two professors' CV do not indicate supervisory experience.

entrepreneurship, and specialist subjects e.g. family businesses, are particularly relevant for countries like Ethiopia and Rwanda with the majority of businesses being both small and family owned, and was mentioned as one of the reasons why UR motivated its decision to collaborate with JIBS.

JIBS' statistics show that nine professors and associate professors have been JIBS' main supervisors of PhD students in Management and ten academics have been JIBS' main supervisors of Economics students from both AAU and UR. Of the main supervisors most have supervised four PhD students or less. There is one professor who was the main supervisor of 10 PhD students at the same time between 2015 and 2017[29]. A closer look at the professor's CV also shows his interest and vast experience from research carried out in developing and emerging economies. However, with 10 PhD students, this would mean dedicating 40 percent of his full time work to supervision. This appears excessive. JIBS stated that "this would not happen today"[30], but there do not appear to be any rules established for the maximum amount of time a supervisor at JIBS should dedicate to supervision.

Interviewed PhD graduates and current students at AAU and UR believed that JIBS made important contributions to their PhD degrees. One said that "I do not know where I would have been today without them". Three aspects were mentioned as particularly important:

- Exposure to an international research culture, environment and expertise,
- The technical resources available at JIBS during visits, and
- Learning about personal research and study management i.e. delivering on time, and safeguarding the dynamics of the study process.

What is mentioned by a majority of the PhD students and graduates as the key contribution are the study periods in Sweden. This made it possible to devote full attention to the research, which was not possible in their home universities. As one AAU professor said: "There they worked from early dawn to midnight. Here I am lucky if I get them to spend an hour on their research." Access to facilities and online materials, high-quality courses, and active expert supervision were all regarded as highly positive inputs.

[29] In JIBS' response 2019-08-30 it is stated that: " The evaluation claims that one of the main supervisors at JIBS has supervised 10 PhD students for 7 years, and that this corresponds to 40% of full time. This is not correct." The Final report was corrected to show that it was only during 3 years (rather than 7 years) this occurred. JIBS response to a second draft of the report dated 2019-09-25 maintained that "The factual error is not corrected, and an indication that JIBS' response-letter comments still have not been considered." The report was corrected based on JIBS' register of PhD students, their Main and Co-supervisors and time of supervision and study.

[30] Interview with JIBS' academic staff.

JIBS' supervisors saw their role as helping the students to produce "publishable" research. When asked, supervisors (at JIBS, AAU and UR), stated that good supervision is measured by progression and by the quality of the research output i.e. where the individual research study is published. JIBS does not appear to have any other measure of the quality of supervision. By this measure, JIBS' supervision of UR students appears to be of high quality as the PhD students are completing their studies on time, but less well with regard to AAU students (although AAU students graduate with an AAU degree). However, as analyzed in the next sub-chapter, by the second measure JIBS' supervision quality is less impressive, as the majority of journals where the UR and AAU students supported through the JIBS collaboration, published their research were of low or undetermined quality.

JIBS commented on the high technical, theoretical and numerical competence of the AAU students but that the PhD students from AAU and UR lacked experience in critical thinking. The supervisor and students met often (sometimes weekly) during the study period in Sweden but technical difficulties (lack of internet for Skype) made virtual supervision difficult. Instead several visits by JIBS supervisors were arranged to Rwanda and Ethiopia.

Conclusion

The academic capacity of JIBS' supervisors is relevant and in accordance with JIBS' rules. The majority of the main supervisors had substantial supervisory experience. One professor has taken on a large number of PhD students, compared to the other supervisors. JIBS does not appear to have any rules limiting the amount of time an academic staff member can dedicate to supervision. Several of JIBS' academic staff interviewed stated that JIBS measures supervisory quality by the quality of outputs which was further clarified to mean research published in high-quality publishing outlets. However, by this measure, supervision does not appear to reach JIBS' own standards as the main publication venues for UR and AAU students supported through the JIBS collaboration have been invited book chapters in JIBS-edited books, papers in local conferences and, journal articles published in typically low-quality journals (see next chapter for a detailed analysis).

4.1.4 Quantity and quality of research

Quantity of research

The collaborations have produced a sizeable amount of individual research studies. This includes not only theses by PhD and MSc students but also working papers, conference papers, book chapters and journal articles. The following table presents the outputs in different categories.

Table 7: Research outputs produced as part of JIBS collaboration[31]

Type of output	Partner university		
	AAU	**UR**	**Total**
Working papers	n.a.	35	35
Conference papers	26	59	85
Book chapters	44	55	99
Journal articles	12[32]	12[33]	24
Total	82	161	243

At UR the CDI was introduced in 2014 and involved inviting, through a selection process, UR staff to Sweden to develop one or more research papers under JIBS' mentorship. The aim of the CDI, as explained by JIBS, was to incentivize UR's faculty to dedicate time and carry out research. Each UR staff member was given a mentor who provided guidance to the staff member when drafting her/his paper. It was, according to UR staff, intended to provide experience of working in a stronger research environment and to generate publications in international peer-reviewed journals. This was to be achieved through a process of support for the development of papers to be presented at conferences and then revised for publication. This is also a part of the new JIBS-AAU collaboration agreement starting 2019 as well as the recently started JIBS-UEM collaboration. According to JIBS' statistics, 41 individual research outputs were produced as a result of the CDI of which a majority (28) were conference papers. Of these some (4) became book chapters.

An interesting aspect is the substantial difference in the quantity of research outputs, where the JIBS-UR collaboration has resulted in a significantly larger number of outputs than the AAU collaboration. This can be attributed to the CDI where, in total, 32 CBE/UR staff travelled to Sweden and produced a total of 41 outputs, 28 of which were presented at conferences.

A common complaint from academic staff at all three partner universities – which is echoed throughout all universities – was that the pressure of other commitments limited opportunities to publish research findings. The CDI gave staff dedicated time to write for publication and also provided them with mentoring support and greater access to online libraries. Academic staff benefitting from the CDI explained that it gave them the opportunity and incentive to write for publication.

[31] Research studies from the JIBS collaboration with UEM are not considered here as the collaboration is in its early stages and so there has not been enough time for it to generate publications.

[32] Two journal articles were excluded due to relevance, see below.

[33] Two journal articles were excluded due to relevance, see below.

However, the outputs from the CDI fall short of what was intended (as established in the proposal documents for the JIBS-UR collaboration[34]. There is a clear hierarchy of academic publications (the actual quality of those publications notwithstanding) with chapters in edited books and articles in collections of working papers falling far short of publications in peer-reviewed international journals. Senior officers at UR suggested that JIBS defaulted to these easier publishing opportunities and the analysis of research outputs supports this concern: most of the 12 journal articles published through the JIBS-UR collaboration were generated by PhD students taking the option of producing a compilation thesis i.e. based on more than one journal article [35]. It should be noted that the expected outputs from the CDI as presented in the proposal for the 2019-24 collaboration between JIBS and CBE/UR has been reduced. The CDI for UEM includes publishing alternatives to articles in international peer-reviewed journals. The proposal links publications to post-doctoral candidates but is otherwise unclear who might benefit from the CDI or what they might be expected to produce.

Quality in Academic Publishing: Different Venues and Rankings

The interviewed researchers at JIBS reported a standard, traditional approach to valuing different types of academic outputs and measuring quality of research. A consensus in JIBS interviews was that journal articles are the most important conduit for research findings. Regarding other types of publishing channels, JIBS "*publication strategy for doctoral students and CDI candidates*" [36] followed a common "publish early, publish often" type publishing strategy, where pre-publication versions of a research report are first published as working papers, as conference papers, or as chapters in edited books. Some reports are developed further into journal articles[37]. This reflects a typical hierarchy of academic outputs, with technical reports and working papers at the bottom, followed by conference papers, conference papers subsequently published in proceedings, book chapters, and with journal articles as the main channel for publishing, in many cases for inclusion in multiple-paper theses. At Sida's request, this evaluation emphasized journal articles over other publishing channels[38].

---

[34] *National University of Rwanda Overall Proposal* (dated 23rd June 2013) and the *Addendum to Full Proposal.*

[35] CBE was subsequently asked to provide evidence of a formal agreement to downgrade the outputs of the CDI from articles in international journals to book chapters but failed to do so.

[36] Email from JIBS management, 20190621, verbatim quote.

[37] Email from JIBS management, 20190621.

[38] This focus has meant that the Evaluation Team has not followed JIBS' comment on the Draft Report made 2019-08-30: "In assessing the quality of the research output resulting from the AAU/UR/JIBS collaboration and the quality of JIBS supervision, the evaluation team has not considered i) the assessments and grades by the independent examination committees of the theses and ii) the quality

Quality research deserves a quality outlet, but as the question of "journal quality" is complex, many universities around the world nowadays rely on journal accreditation lists to ensure and measure quality. JIBS' own in-house approach follows that model: in JIBS' promotion criteria, which JIBS called "an indirect publication policy"[39], JIBS recommends it staff members to focus on journals listed on ABS (Association of Business Schools journal guide 2018) and ABDC (Australian Business Deans Council), or journals that are ranked high in similar rankings. Instead of only those two, this evaluation used seven different journal ranking frameworks for the main proxy for quality of JIBS' collaborative research funded by Sida with AAU and UR: NSD, BFI, JUFO, Web of Science (WoS), Scopus, ABS, and ABDC[40]. The choice of multiple frameworks instead of only ABS/ABDC was done to maximize index coverage.

While journal ranking systems do not measure the quality of single articles, they offer good indicators of journal quality and of the quality-consciousness of researchers. Academic journals are typically characterized by competitive screening and vetting of submissions, independent and international editorial boards, double-blind peer reviews, high rejection rates, and rigorous and transparent standards, among other things. In interviews and in written communication, JIBS reported that for promotion within JIBS, their main measure of quality and their quality goal is articles published in journals that rank at levels 3, 4, or 4* on the ABS list.

One role of JIBS in the current program, in the words of one of their central stakeholders and echoed by other interviews, is to guide and advise partners in order to make their research publishable in "decent" journals, where by "decent" that

of the book chapters produced in the collaboration."

[39] Email from JIBS management, 20190621, verbatim quote. "The ABS requirement is part of our internal promotion criteria (to be a Docent or Full Professor at JIBS), established and implemented in 2018.".

[40] Of the seven frameworks, ABS and ABDC are specialized in Business, Economics, and Management. The next three—NSD, BFI, and JUFO—are the Norwegian, Danish, and Finnish registries for accredited journals (Sweden does not have one). Finally, two large indexing services, WoS and Scopus, continuously check journal quality and are known to discontinue ranking of journals that cease to meet a minimum set of criteria. Each of the seven frameworks use their own metrics for accrediting or ranking their journals. ABS scores journals to five categories, from 1 for journals that meet the basic scholarly standards, to 2, 3, 4, and finally 4* for journals of distinction. ABDC divides journals to four categories: C, B, A, and A* (highest). The Norwegian register or journals uses 1 for journals that meet the basic standards, and 2 for the top 20% most prestigious journals in each field. The Finnish and Danish rankings use 1 for basic, 2 for leading, and 3 for top journals. For this evaluation the Finnish, Danish, and Norwegian rankings were all extracted from the JUFO system. WoS ranks journals into four quartiles, Q1 being the top quartile in each field, and both WoS and Scopus report a broad range of statistics about their journals. Many Swedish universities—Uppsala University and Stockholm University, for instance—refer to Scopus, WoS, and the Norwegian list (NSD).

interviewee explicitly named the 3, 4, and 4* levels on the ABS list. However, later JIBS management took the opposite view and stated that using the ABS list as a benchmark of quality is "unrealistic and even inappropriate in the given context".[41] This evaluation gives no precedence to the ABS list, and uses all the above-mentioned seven journal indexing and accreditation frameworks to evaluate quality of journals where results from this collaboration were published (ABS, ABDC, NSD, BFI, JUFO, Web of Science (WoS), and Scopus).

In the 2000s, the question of journal quality has been further complicated by Internet-based publishing and some of its less favorable by-products. The open-access publishing model emerged with few regulatory mechanisms or checks and balances, which enabled a parallel emergence of questionable businesses today referred to as "predatory publishers." Characterized by quick turnaround time from submission to publication, lack of proper peer review by experts, disregard of quality assurance processes, aggressive e-mail marketing, and a pay-to-publish business model, predatory publishers flourish where experienced supervision and guidance are absent. Predatory publishers are often paired with bogus "impact factors" to make them look more credible, and have also spawned "spamferences" that are the conference equivalent of predatory journals: mass e-mail advertisement, low to no selectivity, high fees, poor academic value, and lack of focus. Publications in predatory journals are a demerit for doctoral students and institutions involved—and they also undermine the legitimacy and credibility of open access publishing in general. For this evaluation, Beall's list of predatory journals and publishers (https://beallslist.weebly.com/) was used as a reference, as it is the largest listing of venues deemed "predatory", and while the list has its critics, its contents are well in line with authoritative lists of accredited journals.

JIBS-UR Collaboration: Quality of Outputs

Applying the publication strategy above in the JIBS-UR collaboration has resulted in a list of 125 individual research studies, according to JIBS' records[42]. Some of those research studies have yielded several outputs in terms of different reports, such as a working paper, book chapter, and journal article on the same topic. Others have resulted in a single output, such as one book chapter or one journal article. The list of JIBS-UR research outputs includes, among other things,

- 35 working papers,
- 59 conference papers,
- 55 book chapters, and

[41] JIBS' comments on the draft report 20190830, verbatim quote.

[42] File *Research output Rwanda 2015-2019.xlsx*, listing research output until June 10, 2019.

- 14 journal articles.

In interviews, JIBS staff members described their emphasis on working papers, conference papers, and book chapters by the high barriers of acceptance and long turnaround time in high-quality journals, and by the possibility to use conference papers and book chapters as stepping stones towards journal articles. In the context of career development, conference papers and book chapters award publication points to staff members at AAU and UR (but in many cases less than journal articles do[43]). In the context of PhD training, that choice has some pedagogical merit, but neither mode of publishing—(mostly) local conferences and (mostly) JIBS-edited books—is an appropriate mode for PhD training in the long run. Double-blind peer reviewed, reputable journals that are ranked by Web of Science, Scopus, NSD, and the like, are a typical choice to ensure the basic standards have been met and to lend credibility to research—but they are largely absent in the JIBS-AAU and JIBS-UR outputs.

Given the nature of working papers, conference papers, and book chapters as "an opportunity for junior scholars to get introduced into the publication process" [44], many of those outputs are likely to go largely unnoticed by the broader research community. That is due to three reasons. Firstly, the working papers were published in JIBS's own *East Africa Research Papers in Economics and Finance (EARP-EF)* and *East Africa Research Papers in Business, Entrepreneurship, and Management" (EARP-BEM)* series, which provide channels for PhD students to hone their research reporting skills, organize their thoughts, and get their ideas out in a referable format. Working papers typically get low citation figures everywhere, and the EARP-EF and EARP-BEM papers are not an exception: A sample of 28 working papers in EARP-EF and EARP-BEM working paper series, listed as results from the JIBS-UR collaboration, showed no citations to most (21) papers, and one, two, or three citations to the rest[45]. That being said, a number of the working papers have fulfilled their intended role as a stepping stones towards book chapters or journal articles even though very few met the expectations of the 2013-19 JIBS-UR collaboration.

[43] *Addis Ababa University Senate Legislation 2013* §32.3.5 and §32.3.6.

[44] Interview data and email from JIBS management 20190621, verbatim quote.

[45] Three papers have been cited once, another three have been cited twice, and one of the working papers has been cited three times. As the EARP series are not indexed in any of the seven indices used in the evaluation, Google Scholar was used instead. The sample of working papers consisted of all those papers in the Rwanda output list that were found in Google Scholar by the name reported in the output list (28 papers). Of those papers that had multiple versions, only the working paper versions were included (other versions, such as possible subsequent journal article version, were excluded).

Secondly, the conference papers were presented mostly through locally organized international conferences. JIBS helped the universities organize conferences, with the idea of providing learning opportunities for young scholars and international exposure for the same. Typically, this provides PhD students with a chance to familiarize themselves with the publication process, practice in giving a conference talk, receiving feedback from reviewers and audience, networking with other academics, and get affective support from their peers. JIBS intended them to be important learning experiences as well as outlets for significant research findings (as the papers presented are not made publicly available in conference proceedings[46]). The quality of conferences could not be established by this evaluation, as JIBS was unable to provide information about typical indicators of conference quality, such as rejection rates, number of submissions, peer review processes or standards, or lists of attendees (outside the conference program).[47] Some papers from the conferences were published in the working paper series above, and some in JIBS-edited books (see below). Perceptions of the conference quality varied from very positive to very negative, with more negative comments coming from the African attendees interviewed by the Evaluation Team, and more positive comments coming from JIBS and JIBS' affiliates[48].

Thirdly, the JIBS-edited book volumes serve an important role by giving PhD students a feeling of achievement and improved skills in research writing, but book chapters are not intended to replace double-blind peer reviewed journal articles as a means of publishing important results. In interviews, JIBS explained that book chapters have been favored due to 1) the difficulty for young scholars to get their articles accepted to high-quality journals, 2) sometimes very long turnaround times of journals, and 3) some journals' Intellectual Property Rights rules. Although the books are published with well-known publishers (Springer, CRC Press / Routledge) and led by experienced editor(s), the quality of the chapters involved cannot be established in this evaluation. Most books are by the same JIBS-based editor(s), they contain mostly chapters by UR and AAU PhD students, and, as is usual for book chapters, their selection is invitation-based instead of a blind peer review. The feedback and review procedures of the edited books were rigorous and quality-conscious, and seem to follow the same standards as academic books typically do[49]. Being relatively recent,

[46] JIBS response on 20190913 did not provide information on availability of conference proceedings.

[47] JIBS response on 20190913.

[48] JIBS provided letters with positive feedback from professors who "have been involved in the collaboration to provide their experiences from taking part in some activities arranged by partner universities (e.g., conferences as invited keynote speakers and session chairs" (JIBS response on 20190913).

[49] JIBS response on 20190913.

the volumes have gathered a negligible number of citations thus far[50], which is also relatively common to book chapters. All in all, rather than final products themselves, JIBS considers these book chapters as "early versions of [students'] dissertation chapters" that they can eventually "develop […] further to become a journal publication"[51]. For staff members at AAU/UR, book chapters count as points towards promotion, too.

While working papers, conference papers, and book chapters serve important roles as forums for developing early versions of research reports, as opportunities to learn how the publishing process works, and as career advancement opportunities, at Sida's request this evaluation focused on the gold standard of research publishing: (usually double-blind) peer reviewed journal articles. Regarding the quality of journals to publish in, seven articles in JIBS-UR collaboration met the standards of one or more accreditation or indexing system listed above (ABS, ABDC, NSD, BFI, JUFO, WoS, and Scopus). Of the 14 journal articles listed as program output,

- 2 articles whose status was "in review" remain in review or are being rewritten,
- 2 reported articles were agreed with the JIBS lead author to be excluded from the evaluation as they were not a straightforward result of JIBS-UR collaboration,
- 2 were published in predatory journals (blacklisted on Beall's list of predatory publishers), [52]
- 1 was published in a journal of undetermined quality,
- 6 were published in journals that meet the quality standards of one or more of the accreditation systems described above (one of them has been discontinued in Scopus but remains on the NSD, BFI, and JUFO lists).
- 1 article (with a JIBS staff member as the lead author) was published in a leading journal.

The table below presents the journal articles reported as outputs from the JIBS-UR collaboration, and their associated rankings using a number of alternative ranking bodies.

[50] Springer's own citation metrics report very modest citation numbers to the edited volumes at this point of time: The five books published by Springer had gathered 7, 4, 3, 2, and 1 citations (almost all chapters had zero citations). These figures may change in the future.

[51] Email from JIBS management 20190621, verbatim quote.

[52] CBE made clear that regular guidance is given to staff and students concerning predatory journals.

Table 8: JIBS-UR –collaborated journal articles and the ranking of their associated journals

Article title	Journal	Remarks	Journal rankings							
			ABS	ABDC	Norway	Finland	Denmark	WoS	Scopus CS	Scopus ranking
Exchange rate movements and foreign exchange reserves accretion	Submitted	In process								
Corporate governance, institutional quality and bank performance.	Being revised	In process								
Electronic Health Record System, a perspective to improve the value of services rendered to patients in ...	International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, ...	Publisher (WASET) is blacklisted on Beall's list of predatory publishers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Financial Viability of Rwanda Pension Scheme Fund Investments 2015	American International J. of Research in Humanities, Arts and ...	Publisher (IASIR) is blacklisted on Beall's list of predatory publishers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Innovation and Firm Performance in Developing Countries. Evidence from Firm-Level Survey	Journal of Corporate Ownership and Control	Scopus has discontinued the journal; NSD, BFI, and JUFO still have it	-	-	1	1	1		-	-
An Analysis of the Determinants of Youth Employment in Rwanda	University of Kurdistan Hewlêr Journal of Social...	Non-indexed journal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Characteristics of potential gasifier fuels in selected regions of the Lake	South African Journal of Science		-	-	1	1	1	Q3	1.12	66/185
Asymmetric nonlinear mean reversion in real effective exchange	The Journal of Economic Asymmetries		-	-	-	-	-	-	1.14	47/202
Do flexible exchange rates facilitate external adjustment? A dynamic	International Economics and Economic Policy		-	B	1	1	1	-	0.75	354/595
The importance of off-farm employment for smallholder	Journal of Economic Studies		2	B	1	1	1	-	1.47	36/202
Wavelet Multiresolution Analysis of the Liquidity Effect and Monetary	Computational Economics		1	B	1	1	1	Q3	1.12	39/109
Assessing the role of land use consolidation for consumption	Journal of Development Studies	Excluded (no JIBS-UR collaboration)	3	A	2	2	2	Q2	1.99	42/214
Spatial spillovers and households involvement in the nonfarm sector	Regional Studies	Excluded (no JIBS-UR collaboration)	3	A*	1	3	2	Q1	3.94	6/226
One Cow Per Poor family. Effects on the growth of consumption and	World Development		3	A	2	3	2	Q1	4.56	4/214

When analyzing the dissertations of the four PhD graduates from the JIBS-UR collaboration, the Evaluation Team were unable to find most of the papers on which three of the dissertations were based[53]. JIBS' rules[54] establish that a compilation

[53] In one case, two articles in an already-published compilation thesis have currently been returned back with no acceptance but with an option to revise and resubmit (with typically means extensive changes with no promise of acceptance), one was submitted, and one was still in preparation. In another case, two papers of an already-published thesis have been rejected, one is in review, and one has been published.

[54] JIBS' rules establish that:

1. A compilation thesis shall contain at least four papers

thesis (multiple-paper thesis) must consist of four publishable articles, however, none of those articles need to be actually published. Having articles of a multiple-paper thesis already published in double-blind peer-reviewed journals is, in many institutions seen as an additional quality control layer, which greatly increases confidence in the dissertation's merits. This has not been achieved for three of the PhD graduates of the JIBS-UR collaboration[55]. JIBS justifies the approach by the fact that requiring the articles to be published can cause delays in the process, and by the assumption that it would cause students to settle for lower quality outlets, publishable with less risk of rejection. Whether the numerous yet-unpublished articles from PhD graduates' compilation theses eventually get accepted for publication remains to be seen.

JIBS-AAU Collaboration: Quality of Outputs

The results JIBS reported as outcomes of the collaboration between JIBS and AAU are fewer in number than those in the JIBS-UR collaboration. Aside from PhD theses, the collaboration resulted as 44 book chapters, 26 conference papers or presentations, and 14 journal articles[56].

Regarding the quality of journals to publish in, only one of the 14 journal articles listed in the JIBS-AAU research outputs was indexed in any of the seven accreditation or indexing systems included in the evaluation[57]. In the end, of the 12 journal articles related to the JIBS-AAU collaboration;

---

2. A compilation thesis shall contain at least two-single authored papers
3. All four papers shall be publishable in blind refereed international journals accepted in the field.
4. All four papers shall have been presented at an international conference accepted in the field.
5. At least one paper should be submitted to a journal included in the department's list of target journals.
6. One of the papers can be publishable in a practitioner or teaching/pedagogic-oriented scientific journal included in the departments' list of target journals.
7. A compilation dissertation shall include a comprehensive introduction section and conclusion section which embeds the four papers (the so called "kappa").

[55] JIBS response to the second draft on 2019-09-25 to this was: "We have responded to this concern in written form in JIBS response letter in an elaborate way (sent to the evaluation team on August 30). We find it remarkable that FCG does not take our response into account. Publishable means publishable. The quality of PhD dissertations, including articles in a compilation thesis, is assessed by the independent grading committee." The Final report has been changed in several places to reflect JIBS' rule that articles should be "publishable", and this section has been changed in the same manner, to reflect that these articles have *yet to be* published. An assessment of the "publishability" of the articles is beyond the scope of the evaluation.

[56] File *Research output Ethiopia 2014-2019.xlsx*

[57] One 2008 article and one article funded by AERC, not Sida, were excluded due to being out of scope of this evaluation. The AERC-funded article mentions no Sida funding, but acknowledges AERC funding to the study itself and to several related conference trips.

- 1 "forthcoming" article was still in process,
- 5 were published in predatory journals (on Beall's list)
- 5 were published in journals of undetermined or low quality (not included in any of the accreditation or indexing system listed above)
- 1 met the quality standards of one accreditation system described above but not the others (but that article had no authors from AAU)

The table below presents the journal articles reported as JIBS-AAU collaboration, and their associated rankings using a number of alternative ranking bodies.

Table 9: JIBS-AAU–collaborated journal articles and the ranking of their associated journals

Conclusion

			Journal rankings							
Article title	*Journal*	*Remarks*	*ABS*	*ABDC*	*Norway*	*Finland*	*Denmark*	*WoS*	*Cite sc.*	*Rank in the field*
Firm-Specific Determinants of Insurance Companies'Capital Structure in Ethiopia	JNL of Eastern and Southern African Countries OSSREA (submitted)	In process								
Economic Valuation of Soil Conservation in Highlands of Hadiya Zone of Ethiopia: ...	Journal of Resources Development and Management, 37: 16-23	Publisher (IISTE) is blacklisted on Beall's list (predatory)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The Contribution of Financial Sector Development for Economic Growth in ...	Applied Economics and Finance, 3(2): 201-214	Publisher (Redfame) is blacklisted on Beall's list	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Households Saving Behavior: Knowledge, Practice and Affecting Factors in North ...	Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development Vol.6, No.9, 2015	Publisher (IISTE) is blacklisted on Beall's list (predatory)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Determinants of Household Saving in Ethiopia- The case of North Gondar Zone, Amhara Regional State	International Journal of Development and Economic Sustainability, Vol.2, No.4,pp.37-47, 2014	Publisher (EAjournals) is blacklisted on Beall's list (predatory)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Livestock marketing: Local belief and clan conflicts in focus.	African Journal of Marketing Management, 9(1), 1-7.	Publisher (Academic Journals) is blacklisted on Beall's list	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The Effect of International Remittances on poverty, Household Consumption and Investment in Urban Ethiopia ...	Ethiopian Journal of Economics, 22(2): 1-46	Non-indexed journal (listed in AJOL)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Multiple credit constraints and borrowing behavior of farm households ...	Ethiopian Journal of Economics, 27(1): 57-90.	Non-indexed journal (listed in AJOL)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Valuing Recreational Benefits of Wonchi Crater Lake, Ethiopia.	International Journal of Life Sciences and Technology, 9(1)	Non-indexed journal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economic Efficiency of Export–Oriented Cattle-Fattening Farms in East Shewa ...	Ethiopian Journal of Sciences and Sustainable Development, 2(1): 28–40.	New, non-indexed journal and the website is offline	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
An Applied Macro-econometric Model for Supply Constrained African Economy: A Rwandan Macro Model	Tanzanian Economic Review, 4(1-2): 24–55	Non-indexed journal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
An evaluation of the collaborative coursework-based PhD program in ...	Africa Journal of Management, 4(2), 177-194.	No authors from AAU; only JIBS	-	-	-		1	-	-	-
China and India's growth surge: is it a curse or blessing for Africa? The case of ...	African Development Review, 20(2), 247-272.	Excluded (published in 2008)	-	C		1	1	1	Q4	1.3	75/214
Capital flight and its determinants: the case of Ethiopia	African Development Review, 28(S1): 39–49	Supported by AERC, not Sida. Excluded by authors' request	-	C		1	1	1	Q4	1.3	75/214

The JIBS collaborations have produced a sizeable amount of outputs. JIBS' statistics show that UR has a significantly larger number of outputs produced during a shorter period of time (than AAU) and considering that significantly fewer PhD students have been educated compared to AAU. The CDI appears to have helped UR's staff substantially increase outputs.

Producing individual research studies in quantity is an important aspect of creating a research culture. It establishes routines and systems for producing research and papers as part of a staff position, exposure to other researchers, deadlines for publications, and submission to and presentation at conferences. The conference

papers and book chapters can contribute positively to individuals' career advancement. However, the actual results of the CDI (publications in peer-reviewed international journals) fell short of what was initially intended.

Together the JIBS-UR and JIBS-AAU programs have emphasized three modes of publishing: working papers (35), conference papers (85) and book chapters published by world-class publishers (99). Each serve their purposes, and JIBS has successfully provided alternative publication outlets by helping with locally organized conferences and by editing a number of books where most authors are AAU/UR staff members. All those serve to develop a research culture in universities. However, there are much fewer publications of the type the universities prioritize[58]: double-blind peer-reviewed research articles in reputable journals.

JIBS' emphasis on conference papers and book chapters as publication venues has some pedagogical merit, however, neither mode of publishing is a viable mode for PhD training in the long run. Quality journals indexed and ranked by Web of Science, Scopus, ABS, and the like, ensure that basic standards have been met and to lend credibility to research—but they are largely absent in the JIBS-AAU and JIBS-UR outputs. Whereas JIBS responded that the freedom to publish in any outlet one may find appropriate "is part of the freedom of research"[59], indexes like Web of Science and lists of accredited journals like NSD have elsewhere turned out to be very useful for creating quality consciousness, for helping researchers to identify quality outlets, and for reducing submissions to predatory journals.

The PhD students were not sufficiently guided and advised on how to identify predatory journals and how to choose appropriate publication outlets. JIBS delegates the responsibility for guiding and advising PhD students about appropriate outlets to supervisors, and the JU library provides some generic information about predatory publishers[60], which turned out to be insufficient. The fact that seven articles were published in predatory journals is alarming—yet unsurprising, as research on predatory publishing has found that young, aspiring researchers from developing countries are the most vulnerable to the lure of easy and quick route to "journal" articles[61]. No university can stop students from publishing in predatory journals if

[58] *Addis Ababa University Senate Legislation 2013* §32.3.5 and §32.3.6 states that conference papers and book chapters may carry full or half of the weight of a journal article in a reputable journal, "However, such papers will have to be assessed for their academic merit and contributions to knowledge in the particular discipline."

[59] JIBS comments to the draft report, 20190830, page 3.

[60] Email from JIBS management 20190621.

[61] Xia, J., Harmon, J. L., Connolly, K. G., Donnelly, R. M., Anderson, M. R., & Howard, H. A. (2015). *Who Publishes in "Predatory" Journals? Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(7): 1406–1417.

they like to do so using their own funds. JIBS does, however, have control over whether its funds are used to pay predatory publishers[62], and has control over which journal articles are listed as outputs of the collaboration.

Recommendations

- JIBS and partner universities should ensure that realistic outputs and outcomes are established for each initiative. Given the time and limited human resources dedicated to the CDI, to generate publications in international journals may not have been a realistic objective.
- JIBS and partner universities need to jointly monitor progress regarding the agreed outcomes and outputs throughout the program. Such monitoring would show the results regarding number of publications and where students publish articles earlier, and JIBS and partner universities could take earlier action.
- JIBS should re-focus its publishing priorities and policies to ensure that a larger number of research outputs end up published in journals that are well recognized in the field. Furthermore, JIBS must ensure that PhD students and academic staff at partner universities are properly guided on how to identify predatory journals and how to choose appropriate publication outlets.
- Sida is recommended to ask collaborating universities and partner universities to, in the proposal, establish quality criteria for the publication of research. Sida should, furthermore, ask collaborating and partner universities to regularly report on the fulfillment of such criteria.

4.1.5 JIBS contribution to strengthened institutional and human capacity

Human capacity

The lack of qualified personnel and institutional capacity to design and teach PhD courses, supervise research and carry out examinations of PhD students was addressed by JIBS and the collaborating partners in several manners:

- By training PhD students (who are also staff of the partner university) to graduate and become eligible to supervise subsequent PhD students.
- By assisting the partner universities in designing, developing and having PhD programs accredited (in the case of UR's Management program).
- By inviting teachers to JIBS to learn new teaching techniques and co-teaching courses at the partner universities.
- Training teaching staff at partner universities in postdoctoral supervision, ethics, academic writing skills, research dissemination etc.

[62] The list prices for the predatory journals where UE and AAU students have published articles funding through the collaboration were up to USD 550 per article.

Human capacity at the partner universities has increased as a result of the collaborations but not all increases can be attributed to JIBS. In particular, several academic staff at CBE/UR have obtained PhDs during the funding period through other collaborations and seven academic staff at UEM/FE are currently studying for their PhDs through the collaboration with the Instituto Superior de Economia e Gestão da Universidade de Lisboa (ISEG). These issues are addressed in the relevant annexes.

JIBS and the partner universities have strict rules regarding the qualifications of staff allowed to supervise PhDs. During the collaboration period (2011-2019) AAU's staff with academic qualifications of PhD or above has increased substantially, see tables below.

Table 10: AAU Academic Staff Profile; Economics Department, 2014 and 2018

	Academic Rank 2014	Qualified to teach/supervise PhD 2014	Academic Rank 2018	Qualified to teach/supervise PhD 2018
Professor (PhD)			1 (male)	1
Associate Professor (PhD)	2 (all male)	2	6 (all male)	6
Assistant Professor (PhD)	8 (all male)	8	12 (all male)	12
Lecturer (Msc)	15 (all female)		15 (3 female)	-
Total	26	10	34	19

Source: AAU Department of Economics

Table 11: AAU Academic Staff Profile; Management Department, 2014 and 2019

	Academic Rank 2014	Qualified to teach/supervise PhD 2014	Academic Rank 2019	Qualified to teach/supervise PhD 2019
Professor (PhD)	-	-	-	-
Associate Professor (PhD)	2 (all male)	2	4 (males)	4
Assistant Professor (PhD)	7 (all male)	7	14 (1 female)	14
Assistant Professor (MSc)	-	-	1 (male)	-
Lecturer (MSc)	22 (2 female)	-	20 (2 female)	-
Other (3 BA, 1 diploma)	-	-	4 (male)	-
Total	31	9	43	18

Source: AAU Department of Management

The JIBS-AAU collaboration has contributed to increasing the number of staff at CBE/AAU with qualifications to teach/supervise PhD students: three out of nine graduated PhDs now work in the Department of Economics, and one out of three PhD

graduates work in the Department of Management. In CBA/AAU's Management department, 42 percent of its academic staff now have a PhD and are qualified to teach and supervise PhD research, compared to 29 percent in 2014. In CBE/AAU's Economics department 56 percent of the academic staff are qualified teach and supervise PhD research, which means that this department has the highest ratio of staff with PhDs in comparison to all academic staff of all AAU's departments[63]. The Management department is still below all other five departments at AAU except for the Engineering and Technology department and the Medicine and Health department[64]. At AAU university level, the percentage of PhDs compared to all academic staff was 29 percent in 2016/17.[65]

When staff in both CBE/AAU departments were asked about whether they believe the department is stronger now, than when JIBS started the collaboration, the answer is a unanimous "Yes". The CBE/AAU Management Department is clear that JIBS has been a major contributor to its success. Still, the department relies on continued support from JIBS to run the program and the courses, but the goal is that it will be able to this without support at the end of the new collaboration program in 2023.

While staff at the CBE/AAU and the Economic department at AAU also agree that JIBS has provided an important input to strengthening their capacity, they attribute the key inputs to be exposure to different academic cultures. This has contributed to improving academic practice, through enhanced knowledge, pedagogic development, and expanded networks. However, economics staff felt that the technical and professional input from JIBS was less important. From 2015 (with the exception of one course in 2017) AAU taught all PhD courses in economics and now run all of the courses without much support from JIBS. The reasons for this claimed by AAU economics department staff in interviews and presented in earlier reports from Watts et al was that "….. JIBS cannot provide appropriate technical knowledge and that this not only impacts on teaching and supervision but reduces opportunities for other collaborative activities including the development of research proposals and publications."

UEM currently has a significant lack of staff competent and qualified to teach and supervise PhD students. As the FE team leader explained, 'a lot of effort is being undertaken to change that situation' and another five staff are likely to graduate from the Portuguese PhD program during the lifetime of the current phase of Sida funding.

[63] Watts, et al. 2018.

[64] Watts, et al. 2018.

[65] Watts, et al. 2018.

Table 12: UEM Academic Staff Profile; Faculty of Economics 2019

	Academic Rank 2019	Qualified to teach/supervise PhD 2019
Professor (PhD)	1	1
Associate Professor (PhD)	2	2
Assistant Professor (PhD)	4	4
Other staff	35	2
Total	42	9

Source: UEM FE staff list 2019.

Seven staff are reported to have experience of PhD supervision and three of them were identified as only having co-supervisory experience. This underlines the need for support from competent and qualified staff from JIBS to help deliver PhD training.

The human capacity of CBE/UR[66] has increased during the 2013-2019 period as, at the time of reporting, four of CBE/UR's academic staff members had PhDs awarded through the collaboration with JIBS. The four graduates from the JIBS-UR PhD collaboration will all be contributing to the delivery of the MSc programs in Economics and Management. It is clear that CBE/UR's capacity to deliver improved MSc programs has been enhanced by the collaboration with JIBS.

Institutional capacity

JIBS has helped introduce several guidelines and tools to support the PhD supervision process in both CBE/AAU departments, in response to the slow progression of PhD students' studies. The *Student Progress Reports* and *Implementation Policy* were measures introduced to help both students and supervisors to plan and monitor research progress. These were introduced in 2013[67] and formally approved and prescribed to be used among all PhD students in the two departments in January 2019.[68] Interviews with AAU students and supervisors indicated that either group did not unanimously embrace these new tools, which is possibly a reason for the slow uptake and formal introduction by AAU.

[66] Quantifying the increase in human capacity and attributing it to JIBS is problematic, though, because capacity building has been enabled by other Sida-funded sub-programs and other funders. Baseline data refers to NUR and subsequent comparisons with UR are difficult. For example, the original proposal (dated June 2013) refers to 66 staff at FEM whereas the current roster at CBE/UR, spread across several campuses, is almost three times that.

[67] JIBS. *Narrative Report 2013*. 2013

[68] AAU. *Minutes Planning meeting AAU/JIBS/UGOT, 19/1-2019*. 2019.

JIBS, together with CBE/UR, developed the *PhD Thesis Manual* and the *Master Thesis Assessment Manual* to clarify the learning objectives, aims and expectations of UR postgraduate theses and so guide UR students, supervisors and examiners.

JIBS' assessment of the teaching techniques of the partner universities was that these lacked a "student-centered" approach. Senior staff at CBE/UR explained that support had been needed to deliver quality MSc programs because of the limited number of staff, including PhD holders, who were familiar with new pedagogies, particularly those focusing on active learning. As they noted, the lecturers had 'mastery of *what* to teach but need support with *how* to teach.' JIBS academic staff assessed the theoretical and technical competence of the PhD students as high. However, they found the teaching to be largely lecture based and with limited allowance for students to "think critically" or question lecturers, theories or methods. JIBS therefore invited AAU and UR teaching staff[69] to JIBS to co-teach, several staff members from UR accepted this offer while only one from AAU participated. The idea was to show the partner university staff different teaching methods and to teach them how to implement these by co-teaching at both JIBS and at the partner universities. This did not succeed at AAU as JIBS reported not to have done any co-teaching at AAU and with only one of AAU's teachers co-teaching at JIBS.

16 MSc and MBA courses were delivered by JIBS staff in Rwanda and each course was reportedly co-taught by different CBE/UR lecturers to provide capacity building opportunities. The feedback from UR teaching staff to the Evaluation Team is mixed, with some staff describing that co-teaching helped them to acquire new pedagogic skills and technical knowledge, while another teacher explained that he was already familiar with the pedagogies used and stopped attending. The issue seems to be that it was seen as the responsibility of JIBS staff to deliver these courses and that there was no formal structure for the co-teaching. This necessarily limited the capacity building potential of the co-teaching. UR's Coordinator of Post Graduate Programs in the SoE explained that CBE/UR staff are now competent to deliver quality teaching and supervision for all courses and that all the lecturers now hold PhDs (including several recent PhD graduates from the JIBS program).

At UEM, the course-based PhD programs in Economics and Management, with degrees to be awarded by UEM, were based on the current Portuguese-funded PhD program and developed with support from ISEG. The in-house programs had been approved by UEM and accredited by the Mozambican National Council on Quality Assurance in Higher Education (CNAQ) prior to the collaboration with JIBS. They will include one year of coursework and two years of research. Recruitment for these programs is currently underway. The FE acknowledges that applicants are likely to be

[69] UR staff teaching MSc and MBA programs.

academically weak and they will therefore be required to undertake the PhD Competence Development Program. It is expected that 24 out of 40 candidates (12 each for Economics and for Management) will pass the PhD Competence Development Program and enroll in the UEM PhD programs. Up to eight students from each program are then expected to pass the one year PhD coursework and proceed to the two year research stage. The program will be delivered in Mozambique but students progressing to the research stage will be allowed to study in a country of their choice for up to one month pending UEM and Sida approval. It is expected that most of the teaching for the coursework will be delivered at UEM and provided by JIBS staff or, subject to funding, by staff from ISEG. It is expected that the United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU-WIDER) will provide some support for the research phase of the programs (Annex 7). The contribution of JIBS will be in the design and teaching of the courses as UEM does not have sufficient numbers of academic staff with the competence and capacity to teach PhD courses.

Additional training of UR and AAU staff was provided by JIBS on postdoctoral supervision, research proposal writing, ethics, and other topics. The ethics training was JIBS' initiative as plagiarism had been detected by JIBS in PhD research by partner university students. JIBS carried out a thorough investigation and assessed its own systems for detecting plagiarism. Findings and recommendations were shared with partner universities and JIBS initiated courses on ethics to teach staff and students about ethics but also how to manage quotations etc. in research studies. The partner universities made the decisions as to whether to apply any sanctions to the students.

The effects of JIBS' training of staff has not been obvious in the supervisory processes of national supervisors, that are still perceived by students (not all) to be in-active, difficult to get hold of and deferring to JIBS' supervisors.

Conclusion

The most visible output from the JIBS-AAU and JIBS-UR collaboration is the contribution to increased staff qualifications at both CBE/AAU and CBE/UR. Four of the 12 graduated PhDs now work in AAU's CBE faculty and in UR all PhD graduates work in the CBE. Comparisons with the completion rates of PhD students supported through other Sida-funded collaborations at AAU[70] and UR[71] indicate that the JIBS collaborations have been more effective in graduating PhD students in a timely manner. Comparisons between the AAU and UR collaborations indicate that the

[70] Watts et al, 2018.

[71] Tvedten et al, 2017.

sandwich model used in the UR collaboration significantly improved completion rates.

JIBS' contribution to partner universities' institutional capacity has been less visible. The co-development of postgraduate programs should ensure their academic rigor and national relevance. Some documented guidelines and tools have been introduced to improve the PhD and MSc supervisory processes. The co-teaching and co-supervision initiatives were partly implemented at AAU, while being more fully operationalized at UR. However, UR/CBE staff only observed classes in the co-teaching and had limited involvement in the co-supervision, which in turn limited the potential impact of changing teaching and supervisory techniques.

In some areas JIBS seems to have focused more on the quantity of outputs than their quality. The graduation of PhD students and the publication of research papers are both important to capacity development, but the approach taken limits its sustainability. JIBS subsequently commented on the contexts within which the collaborations take place[72] but it invites the question of whether quality issues could have been more properly addressed if there had been more rigorous discussions with the partner institutions at the proposal stage of the collaborations and/or if academic staff at JIBS had been more involved in planning and monitoring results. This is addressed in the following section.

4.2 OWNERSHIP

The following section aims to respond to the following evaluation questions:

- How JIBS contributes to partners' ownership at department/faculty and university leadership level.
- How has JIBS' collaboration with its partners to manage the programs been carried out?
- How JIBS, in the position as program coordinator when several partner universities are involved, (what and how) contributes to the implementation of the program.

4.2.1 Ownership of the collaboration

Ownership is assessed by breaking the concept of ownership down into different components, including process-related aspects of ownership (participation in design, implementation and evaluation) as well as the aspect of control over decisions and resources.

[72] In the written response to the draft report.

Designing the collaboration

The starting points for the research collaboration have been similar since 2013. It has involved:

1. The partner university being invited by Sida to submit a Concept Note,
2. A Concept Note is posted on the Sida webpage as part of a call for proposals to submit Letters of Intent (LoI) by the partner and collaborating universities,
3. Partner universities and collaborating (Swedish) universities submit a Letter of Intent to Sida.
4. If approved, a more detailed proposal and budget is prepared together with the collaborating Swedish university,
5. Negotiating the scope and budget with Sida, and
6. Signing the collaboration agreement.

The proposal–writing processes involved visits by partner university management and academic staff to JIBS and vice versa where a future collaboration was discussed. UR and UEM had little choice other than to cooperate with JIBS since no other Swedish universities showed interest in collaborating with them during the LoI phase. This also meant including Economics in the JIBS-UR collaboration, a choice of partner that may have been different, according to UR staff, had other Swedish universities been interested in collaborating with UR. However, UR also recognized JIBS' specific competence in Management and then especially addressing family businesses from different perspectives, and JIBS' willingness to address UR's needs for capacity building (e.g. support for PhD and MSc programs and the need to write and publish papers).

The Design of the JIBS-UR Collaborations

The proposal writing process with JIBS and, what was then, the NUR for the 2013-19 collaboration was reported to have been straightforward. The creation of UR, and of CBE, required an amendment to the agreement that included some budgetary readjustments. However, officers from UR and CBE acknowledged that JIBS and the FEM had worked well together during this early period of the collaboration.

The proposal writing process for the 2019-24 collaboration generated some problems, though. CBE initially produced two LoIs: one proposing a collaboration between the SoB and JIBS and the other between the SoE and UGOT. A combined proposal from JIBS, UGOT and UR was requested by the committee evaluating the proposals for Sida , which was recommended for funding but with substantial cuts to the budget. JIBS and UR staff, as well as Sida, reported tense discussions about the budget and concerns about the approaches of the two Swedish universities to the collaboration and the capacity of JIBS to provide appropriate support to the SoE. The partner university found that a large share of the budget was to be spent by JIBS, larger than in other collaborations with Swedish universities. Senior UR officers suggested that JIBS was trying to take control of the Swedish side of the collaboration and was trying to manipulate costs by increasing the number of courses and other capacity building activities, particularly the CDI, to be delivered in Sweden. Sida then instructed UR/CBE to separate the proposals again to resolve the problem. This effectively delegated the overall budgetary decisions to Sida.

The Design of the JIBS-AAU Collaborations

The first JIBS-AAU proposal was drafted primarily by JIBS. There was no call for concept notes from Sida, or any appraisal of the proposal that the Evaluation Team has been able to identify. The agreement was a treated as a sub-part of the Block Grant agreement that Sida had with AAU at the time. The focus was on producing PhD graduates and it lacked a logframe or similar with clear and measurable goals.

The recent proposal for the 2019-2023 JIBS-AAU collaboration was, according to AAU staff, thoroughly discussed by both universities and described it as an inclusive and "joint" process. There were discussions about the feasibility of implementation and negotiations regarding budgets, which JIBS wanted to reduce, but AAU had the final say. For the Management department, this was a straightforward continuation of the previous collaboration. One interviewee stated: "We have always had good relations with JIBS, and we depend on them for the expertise they bring to both the courses, and the theses. Would not have the same expertise available without JIBS".

Having received several proposals, Sida asked UGOT, JIBS and AAU to consider submitting at joint proposal for the collaboration with the Economics department at CBE/AAU[73], which was done, accepted and took effect in July, 2018. The proposal divides activities between UGOT and JIBS as well as splits the supervision of PhD students from AAU 50/50 between UGOT and JIBS. While some of the AAU staff interviewed say they regret that they agreed to the division between JIBS and UGOT, others defend the choice. There is currently a dispute between JIBS, UGOT and AAU regarding supervision responsibilities for the batch of six PhD students in economics to be supervised this year. The Economics department at CBE/AAU appears split, with AAU's Department Graduation Committee committed to upholding the 50/50 split of supervisors between UGOT and JIBS.[74] AAU has since taken on a more decisive role to solve this conflict and taken decisions during this second phase of the collaboration. AAU has also, in discussions with collaborating universities and Sida, asserted its mandate to assign AAU students to supervisors at different collaborating universities.

The interviewees' impression was that Sida, in effect, compelled the three universities to prepare a joint proposal. Sida contradicts this impression. However, the joint proposal has created a competitive situation between JIBS and UGOT that

[73] AAU/SIDA, *Minutes of AAU-Sida Sweden joint meeting of 29 September and 02 October of 2015*, (p.14). 2015.

[74] Recent developments as minuted in a meeting at AAU 19th of June indicate that AAU now propose to let all students go UGOT, and that the 50/50 split will be abandoned. It is not finally confirmed, however.

has escalated to unprofessional behavior from some individuals involved and an effect on the relationship between all four stakeholders. A better approach would have been for Sida to considered two separate collaboration agreements for the CBE/AAU Management and Economics departments, and invited proposals for each. The proposals should have been assessed on their own merit and rejected or accepted with Sida selecting one or two Swedish collaborating partner(s) for the Management and Economics collaborations.

The design process of the program is vital and sets the tone for the entire collaboration. As explained to the Evaluation Team, neither AAU's Economics department or UR's SoE were fully content with JIBS as a partner for both Economics and Management subjects. In the case of the JIBS-UR and JIBS-UEM collaborations, there were no other partners interested at the time of drafting the proposals[75]. Some UR staff (not UEM staff) felt that JIBS took advantage of this with a "take it or leave it" attitude, which is not conducive to a good working relationship.

The Design of the JIBS-UEM Collaboration

In the proposal writing phase for the UEM collaboration, discussion about the collaboration mostly took place between an academic from FE and JIBS' coordinator, with little, if any, communication with academic staff from JIBS. Officers from UEM's Cooperation Office explained that managing the development of the collaboration with JIBS had been more difficult than similar processes with other collaborating universities working with other faculties. Problematic issues included UEM's focus on number of PhD students to be enrolled at JIBS versus on the in-house PhD program, involving UEM staff in the CDI and the nature of the CDI, and JIBS wanting UEM to be involved in the JIBS-driven EID program[76]. UEM's focus was on building its in-house PhD programs and less on capacity building activities in Sweden that would not lead to academic qualifications (as promoted by JIBS, according to UEM staff). These differences were solved and a joint agreed proposal submitted and then resubmitted after Sida cut the budget. However, better communication may have led to a more realistic initial proposal, i.e. one that acknowledged the difficulties in recruiting as many PhD candidates as had been initially proposed and within Sida's budget expectations.

[75] For the JIBS-UR proposal 2013 and the JIBS-UEM proposal 2017.

[76] They felt that this was more concerned with capacity building at JIBS than at FE and so declined to join EID.

The UEM collaboration has also needed to change substantially already during the first year of implementation. The proposed development of PhD programs and taking on PhD students has needed to be revised and the proposal re-drafted (submitted to Sida for approval) since no PhD students have been accepted or started the sandwich PhD program to be offered by JIBS. The MSc programs were found to be inadequate to graduate candidates for PhD studies. The FE had wanted a high number of PhD students (with 16 to be trained at UEM/FE and eight enrolled at JIBS) but this begs the question of if the two parties (JIBS and UEM) had the same understanding of the situation at UEM and what might have been feasible.

Although the FE has the clear aim of becoming a research-focused institution, as noted in Annex 7, scrutiny of the JIBS-UEM proposal shows that it lacks an analysis of the specific weakness of UEM/ FE. Instead there is a long description of UEM's other departments, of Swedish overall support to the HE sector and of the Mozambican government's priorities. There is a significant absence of needs analysis for the FE which, if done prior to the proposal writing, could have helped in the design of a collaboration that did not need re-structuring as early as the first year of implementation. The conclusion, which is detailed in Annex 7, is that JIBS failed to properly conduct due diligence in explaining its enrolment requirements.

It is a matter of concern that this clear failure took place in the context of JIBS initial expectation to enroll up to eight students in Sweden and to provide support for up to 16 students in Mozambique. It is also a matter of concern that the proposal set out to develop an in-house course-based PhD program that did not progress because the proposed program duplicated too much of the existing accredited PhD programs at UEM/FE. These concerns suggest that JIBS's input was overstated and that insufficient discussion took place between the two institutions.

Common structure for the proposal

Some AAU staff interviewed questioned the feasibility of some aspects of the proposal. The most recent JIBS-UGOT-AAU proposal is very similar to the same ones for UR and UEM (with differences mainly in the development of MSc programs at UEM) and this begs the question of whether JIBS is applying the same methodology in all three, despite the partners' different needs, priorities, and different contexts. The comparative analysis of these proposals suggests that JIBS has a standard approach to collaboration – including the CDI, partnership in the EID and greater support for MSc programs than is found in other collaborations – that is only changed as the partnering institutions challenge their worth.

Fund management

In the first JIBS-AAU collaboration agreement (2011-2015), budgets were discussed jointly according to JIBS' *Narrative Reports*, but it was JIBS that prepared the budgets, reported to Sida and managed all of the funds. This meant that JIBS paid for expenses incurred by JIBS, but also by AAU in Ethiopia and Sweden (travel of AAU students and staff etc.). JIBS was also responsible for accounting for the use of funds and reporting to Sida. This was changed in the new agreement (2018-2024) where AAU shall administer and be responsible for all costs and expenditure of Ethiopian origin. The transfer of funds to AAU has not meant any additional feelings of

ownership at AAU, according to interviews with AAU faculty management and leadership, but instead additional bureaucracy and delays in obtaining funds for activities from AAU's own Finance department.[77] Both the Economics and Management departments at AAU had to some degree grown used to JIBS solving administrative issues related to the cooperation.

The agreement between Sida and UR and Sida and UEM acknowledged the financial responsibilities of UR and UEM. Funds are disbursed from Sida to each of the two partner universities. The two institutions are responsible for the funds allocated to them and for reporting on that disbursement. Senior officers at UR and CBE/UR acknowledged that control of the Sida funds disbursed directly to NUR/UR legitimated their control of it. The proposal negotiations between UEM and JIBS resulted in control by UEM of the funds allocated to the partner and a clear understanding by UEM of how the funds disbursed to JIBS were to be used.

One of the issues regarding the budgetary control mentioned at CBE/UR was that funding intended to allow UR Economics students to attend international conferences was being reallocated to send them to other Swedish universities for their elective PhD courses. No action was taken by CBE/UR, though, until the collaboration was being renegotiated and the SoE elected to collaborate with UGOT rather than JIBS. The issue here seems to be that this funding was part of the Swedish allocation and that CBE/UR therefore had no control over its use providing that the main aim (graduating PhDs) was being met[78].

Changes to the activities

The JIBS-AAU collaboration for the period 2011-2015 was not designed with specific goals in a logframe, results matrix or similar. JIBS presented plans for the ensuing year in the annual *Narrative Reports*, however, a review of these reports shows that the same concerns were repeated year after year and, broadly, the same solutions were presented. Thus, there are few, visible, real changes to the program implementation during the first period. JIBS and AAU had frequent face to face

[77] AAU's response to the Draft Report: "We know that we have to follow AAU's regulations to disburse funding, though that might take its own time. However, this does not mean that we don't feel ownership."

[78] The CBE team leader subsequently denied knowledge of this matter and suggested that if it had been brought to his attention 'we could have interfered and asked UR-Sweden Programme PCO to rectify it.' This issue was reported from multiple sources at CBE/UR and tacitly acknowledged by JIBS in its response to the draft report. The conclusion that can be drawn from this CBE team leader's comments are that either: (i) he was genuinely unaware of the matter (which then suggests significant communication problems); or (ii) the argument presented here is correct. As the team leader also questioned why CBE would seek to exert financial control over JIBS once activities had been planned and approved, the balance of evidence suggests the second option is correct, i.e. that CBE had limited ownership and control of fund management.

meetings but there were no minutes from any meetings to allow an understanding of how needs, changes and solutions were arrived at and the extent to which AAU were involved in the decision-making.

Once the proposals had been approved by Sida, CBE/UR appears to have been content to allow JIBS to implement it. The main aims (an increase in staff with PhDs and the development of the local PhD program) were being met. The only major change was the addition of an eighth student to the JIBS PhD program which was welcomed by CBE/UR. Senior staff at UR and CBE/UR reported that communications with JIBS were good. JIBS' Coordinator was the main point of communication with JIBS academic staff regularly visiting CBE/UR to implement specific activities (teach courses, supervise PhD students etc.). According to UR staff, the Coordinator was an effective manager and he oversaw the timely completion of most of the objectives. UR and Sida also acknowledged that the collaboration had a more effective completion rate than other collaborations.

Activities and outputs for the collaboration are recorded in the annual *Final Progress Reports* for the overall UR-Sida program using the appropriate RBM framework. The first clear indication that the proposed quality of the publications to be the result of the CDI would be downgraded from articles in international peer-reviewed journals was made in the 2016-17 report, which recorded publications in edited books and noted that the "number of articles published in high-ranked peer-reviewed international journals, we suggest, is not the best indicator for an improved research culture"[79]. This formal record suggests an agreement between team leaders to downgrade the quality of published outputs. However, the same report also notes the problem that a '"culture of silence" among UR faculty makes it difficult to involve faculty in defining real and existing problems for the institution"[80] which weakens the notion of fully-informed and transparent discussions on such matters.

Staff from UR and CBE/UR noted that JIBS' Coordinator often appeared to be pursuing a JIBS agenda instead of focusing on the capacity development needs of CBE/UR. This was more clearly articulated by UR management than CBE/UR staff and by staff from the SoE. The CDI and the limited ability of JIBS to make full provision for students from the SoE were cited as examples of JIBS pushing its own agenda. UR and CBE/UR staff do, however, not appear to have challenged them during the collaboration period, but questioned these during the proposal writing phase for the 2019-24 collaboration period. The SoE began discussing collaboration

[79] *University of Rwanda (UR) UR-Sweden Programme for Research, Higher Education and Institutional Advancement: Program Progress Report: Activity period July 2016 to June 2017*, p. 27.

[80] *University of Rwanda (UR) UR-Sweden Programme for Research, Higher Education and Institutional Advancement: Program Progress Report: Activity period July 2016 to June 2017*, p. 27.

with the UGOT during the lifetime of the 2013-19 collaboration. This clearly suggests that although CBE/UR, and particularly the SoE, may have been content to let JIBS implement the collaboration, it was not prepared to continue accepting what it considered to be a comparatively poor collaboration.

The JIBS-UEM collaboration is guided by an appropriate results-based management framework including outputs, outcomes and performance indicators for outcomes, baselines, data sources and methods of collecting data for each of the specific objectives. UEM's Cooperation Office is responsible for the overall Sida-UEM program and has oversight of the collaboration agreements between faculties and Swedish universities. Each of the collaborations has a coordinator responsible for day-to-day monitoring and reporting in collaboration with Swedish and other partners. Sida meets regularly with these coordinators. Senior staff at UEM and FE suggested that the monitoring and evaluation processes for the collaboration was appropriate and that "the peer review mechanisms in place help in terms of guaranteeing that high quality standards are met".

The JIBS-UEM collaboration needed to be changed substantially already from the beginning. The selection of PhD candidates using JIBS' criteria led to few PhD students being selected and difficulties in meeting the objectives. The development of an in-house PhD program, based on those developed at AAU and UR, did not progress because the proposed program replicated too much of the existing in-house PhD programs. JIBS' analysis of the MSc programs also showed that these were not adequate to develop the competence of the students sufficiently to be admitted to the PhD program. JIBS and UEM have therefore jointly re-structured the collaboration plan and budget and submitted them to Sida.

Commitment of time and resources

Both Department Heads in CBE/AAU maintain that they have invested a lot in the collaboration in terms of time by both faculty and administrative staff. JIBS, on the other hand, expressed worries about the lack of commitment from the AAU faculty[81]. There was a worry that the "production of PhDs" was the sole focus and that there was very limited engagement of AAU faculty in institution and capacity building activities. This could reduce AAU's commitment and interest in the collaboration even further. This was changed in the most recent collaboration that includes broader organizational strengthening through joint research and other activities intended to benefit the departments as units.

[81] JIBS Narrative report. 2017.

CBE/UR staff appear to have been more involved in activities within the collaboration (excluding supervision) as UR faculty were present at co-taught courses with JIBS teachers, a large number were involved in the CDI and attended the four conferences arranged in Kigali. However, feedback from UR staff to the Evaluation Team showed some dissatisfaction with the CDI, particularly concerning the downgrading of its outputs (i.e. from the intended publications in international peer-reviewed journals to publications in edited books), and this downgrading was perceived as part of JIBS' decision to excuse its overstated claims for supporting the collaboration. The CDI was introduced as a means of raising the academic profile of CBE/UR intending to generate publications in international peer-reviewed journals. However, most outputs were conference papers and a few book chapters subject to lower levels of academic scrutiny. There have been benefits in the form of enhanced capability and reputation of UR, and increased number of research studies produced, but the expected benefits have not been realized according to UR. It was also perceived as costly and UR queried why the CDI must take place in Sweden. UR has, however, not challenged JIBS on this, but seen the broader benefits of "PhD graduates" as the trade off to having the CDI.

UEM has established a large team to coordinate and monitor the progress of the collaboration and are actively involved in planning work, negotiating with JIBS and in developing different activities. The Evaluation Team got the strong impression that UEM/FE are highly active and feel a strong sense of ownership of the collaboration, challenging JIBS during the proposal and re-drafting phases.

Conclusion

Ownership by the partner universities is established at the outset of the collaboration to a large extent, and during the implementation. The proposal drafting phase is vital and sets the stage for the implementation of the program. The most recent proposal writing processes appear to have been complicated in all three collaborations: JIBS was the only option for UR and UEM to develop the CBE/UR and FE departments with Sida support and the process with UEM appears to not have been preceded by sufficient due diligence to understand UEM's needs. The negotiations regarding the most recent proposal writing process between JIBS-UGOT-AAU were made difficult by the conditions Sida established for the proposal and have had significant and detrimental effects on the relationship between all four stakeholders. In the most recent UR and AAU proposals, JIBS involvement in activities to support the Economics Department in CBE/AAU and UR's SoE, has been reduced at the request of both universities.

The ownership by the partner university is reduced when the collaboration is perceived as JIBS' responsibility. Aspects of this is when JIBS has been the institution managing all of the funds and the narrative and financial reporting to Sida. In the more recent collaboration agreements the partner universities manage funds for parts of the overall collaboration and JIBS manages other parts. This has meant and added administrative burden for AAU academics, but for UR's and UEM's management, this has meant greater control over their activities and a clearer understanding (and ability to challenge JIBS) of JIBS' activities and budget.

One important ownership aspect is that AAU has taken on a more decisive role in order to solve conflicts occurring and taking decisions during this second phase of the collaboration.

Once the proposals were approved by Sida, AAU and UR appear to have been content to allow JIBS to implement these. At UR the main aims of the collaboration were being met and reservations regarding JIBS' broader capacity building initiatives (e.g. CDI) and JIBS' lack of capacity to deliver elective courses for PhDs in Economics were not voiced due to the aims being met. This instead came up during the proposal-writing phase of the second collaboration.

UEM appears to have been more forthright in the proposal writing phase (particularly in the writing of the revised proposal). However, both UEM and UR perceived JIBS to be focused on activities in Sweden thereby claiming a substantial part of the budget, for activities that were not directly conducive to achieving the partner universities' main goal of increasing the academic qualifications of staff (e.g. CDI and EID).

Recommendations

- JIBS should pay closer attention to the needs of partner universities and tailor its proposals to meet them more closely. To facilitate this, JIBS should involve its own academic staff in the coordination of all aspects of the collaboration: due diligence or needs analysis, proposal drafting, negotiations with partners and Sida, monitoring of the collaboration and evaluation.
- JIBS together with partner universities are recommended to carry out a thorough due diligence and needs analysis prior to designing the proposal.
- Partner universities should ensure that realistic outputs and outcomes are established for each initiative. These should be based on thorough due diligence and needs analyses.
- Partner universities should monitor progress regarding the agreed outcomes and outputs throughout the program.
- Partner universities should evaluate institution building and capacity building components of the collaboration from an effectiveness and cost-efficiency perspective in order to understand the results and outcomes prior to proposing these to partner universities.

4.2.2 Management of the collaboration

JIBS' management of the three collaboration agreements has, in practice, been led by JIBS' Coordinator (who does not hold an academic position or a PhD). He has been the contact point between JIBS' academic staff and leadership, the partner

universities, and Sida. JIBS reports to the Evaluation Team that it has had more than 35 staff members participating in different activities at the three partner universities, but it is the Coordinator that has managed the information going to JIBS' steering group, relationships with partner universities, and JIBS' communication with Sida. As such he has held a privileged position holding all of the information and all the contact with important stakeholders. However, in this position of power, JIBS reports that he has disregarded JIBS' own internal rules[82], taken decisions related to the collaboration agreement without consulting his superiors and ignored instructions from superiors[83]. JIBS took action to strengthen the internal management of the three collaboration agreements during 2018, strengthening the steering group for the collaboration agreements, structuring the functions of the steering group and establishing more formal responsibilities and authority for the academic staff involved in the collaboration agreements and that of the coordinator.[84]

The team leaders and sub-program coordinators from the partner universities, and other academic staff involved in the collaborations, emphasized their communication with academic colleagues at JIBS. However, JIBS seems to have delegated the role of primary representative to the coordinator (who does not hold an academic position or a PhD) and this has led to academic staff at JIBS (e.g. Academic Directors with the overall responsibility for the collaboration) communicating insufficiently with their peers at the partner universities and at Sida, during the development of and implementation of the proposed collaborations. It is particularly worrying that this seems to have influenced discussions about key aspects of the collaboration addressed elsewhere in this report (e.g. needs analysis, expected results, the purpose of co-teaching and co-supervision, the relative value of publications, etc.). Information, focus of the activities and budget, and potential solutions may have been differently designed had academic peers been included in information sharing and planning to a larger extent.

The JIBS-AAU first collaboration phase was characterized by design weaknesses in, among other features, management and organization. The fact that JIBS alone reported to Sida removed AAU from taking joint responsibility of achieving the aims of the collaboration. The lack of a results framework, LFA or similar, is not in accordance with good management principles. This structure left JIBS responsible for, and the main contact point with, Sida. Ownership of the communication with Sida is an additional manner of controlling the message to Sida and between Sida and the partner universities. The coordinators at the two departments in AAU did

[82] Interview with JIBS' management.

[83] Interview with JIBS' academic staff.

[84] Documentation from JIBS and interviews with JIBS academic staff.

coordinate with JIBS, and discussed program issues with JIBS staff. When asked to rate JIBS' management of the collaboration, the Head of the Management department rated it 5 out of 6 (6 as excellent). The current Head of the Economics department had not been in the job long enough to give a rating, but a former head rated it as a 5.[85] The overall AAU coordinator for Sida's support, rated it as 4.

Regarding communication between JIBS and AAU, the Sida coordinator gave that a rating of 3, while the Head of the Management department at CBE/AAU gave it a top score of 6. The former head of Economics also rated it as 6. Reports have been timely and the dialogue with Sida has been ad-hoc and on a needs basis. The Embassy gave both management and communication a 4 based on experiences since mid-2016. The Embassy noted that: "The program manager has always been responsive and willing to engage in dialogue. However, the dialogue has mainly reflected the JIBS point of view, and the AAU side has not been properly addressed through the collaboration. This is assessed as a flaw of the agreement structure and collaboration design." JIBS, partners and Sida have recognized that the management of the program and communication needs to be changed substantially, both within JIBS but also between the stakeholders. This has meant establishing teams, regular and joint planning and coordination meetings and assigning responsibilities to departments at AAU, UGOT and JIBS, respectively, for the AAU collaboration. The lessons from the first JIBS-AAU collaboration period regarding management and governance of the collaboration seem headed in a new direction, in that responsibilities are made clearer, introducing formal procedures. Implementation in practice has yet to be tested.

Senior staff at UR and CBE/UR reported that communication with JIBS was good with JIBS' Coordinator as the main contact point and with JIBS' academic staff regularly visiting CBE/UR. However, staff from UR and CBE/UR noted that the Coordinator often appeared to be pursuing a JIBS agenda instead of focusing on the capacity development needs of CBE.

UEM's has been mainly coordinated with JIBS' Coordinator who was also seen to prioritize JIBS' agenda in addressing FE's needs during the proposal drafting phase and the recent work to re-structure the collaboration. This may explain at least some of the problems experienced in realizing the academic aims of the program (e.g. the recruitment of PhD students and the development of the proposed in-house PhD program).

An analysis of the reporting to Sida from each of the collaborations is largely output and activity based, but in accordance with a results frameworks that did not establish measurable outcome indicators.

[85] Email from AAU Former Head of the Economics department, 21/8-2018.

Conclusion

JIBS' management of the three collaboration agreements has, in practice, been led by JIBS' Coordinator. Centralizing the communication with both Sida and the partners resulted in academic staff at JIBS not communicating directly or sufficiently with their peers at the partner universities and an Sida. Information and potential solutions may have been designed differently had partners' academic peers been included in information sharing and planning. In the JIBS-AAU collaboration, JIBS alone, reported to Sida and thus removed AAU from taking joint-responsibility for achieving the aims of the collaboration. Lack of responsibility leads to reduced ownership and thus leaves the responsibility for achieving results with JIBS.

4.2.3 JIBS as program coordinator of several partners

JIBS has managed the three collaborations as three separate projects to a large extent but has, with the conferences organized in Kigali and Addis Ababa, created spaces for individual researchers from different collaborations to learn and network with each other. PhD students from UR and AAU have been able to interact with each other and other international and Swedish students at JIBS and other universities.

JIBS has not conducted any evaluations of aspects of the collaborations. The evaluation of the JIBS-AAU collaboration for the period 2011-2018 was being planned when Sida decided to conduct this evaluation. Issues that would have been interesting to assess are the effectiveness and actual outcome of the new and innovative initiatives (CDI, policy briefs etc.) and overall publication quality, staff research (both in terms of researchers at the partner universities as well as the type of research conducted after graduation at AAU and UR). Some of the institution building initiatives are new and ambitious in their goals, but little is known about whether the initiatives generated the expected outcomes. Objectively evaluating the outcome of e.g. the CDI would have provided the stakeholders with an understanding of its value, cost and the potential outcome. This would have provided the stakeholders with a basis for deciding whether to include the initiative in a new proposal or not.

According to the AAU and UR staff interviewed, the design of the most recent collaboration agreements were, in several respects, a continuation of the previous activities. However, JIBS has introduced new aspects to the most recent AAU collaboration (e.g. the CDI) that were tested with UR and resulted in substantially higher number of research studies and a large number of UR staff being exposed to international research and supported in drafting articles. However, there are concerns about the dissemination of these studies and the quality assurances processes relating to their publication.

This learning is now being transferred to the new agreement with AAU as well as to the collaboration with UEM. There is evidence that the CDI has created the conditions for staff and researchers at UR to carry out research, publish conference papers, and be exposed to other researchers in conferences arranged as part of the JIBS collaboration. However, UR's staff were not been fully satisfied with the CDI. The CDI was expected to expose academic staff at partner universities to a wider research culture (among other aspects the intention to publish articles in international journals). However, JIBS clearly overstated its ability to address this expectation (and

it should be noted that in subsequent iterations of the CDI the objective to publish articles in international journals has been changed and downgraded). In this context, the CDI offered to UR can be seen as JIBS' initiative, which has not resulted in research published in internationally peer-reviewed journal and it is costly as it takes place in Sweden and not in Rwanda. The transfer of this initiative to AAU and UEM is part of the new proposals but the usefulness and value added in all collaboration agreements needs to be evaluated and considered by the partner universities.

JIBS has offered researchers exposure to other researchers through its EID program where JIBS also cooperates with the Makerere University in Uganda and the University of Dar es Salaam Business School in Tanzania. This cooperation is not funded by Sida and is therefore not a subject of this evaluation. These other universities have sent delegates to the EID conferences and so provided a wider audience for the research supported through these three collaborations. They also intended to draw on this network to support the delivery of in-house postgraduate programs at UEM and UR (although thes processes have not yet started and so cannot be authoritatively commented on).

The type of publication is an important international indicator of the quality of the research being reported and therefore reflects on the institution. Articles of 'publishable' standard (even when the type of publication is not specified) are not the same as 'published' articles because they have not met the essential criterion of being blind peer-reviewed. The CDI has given staff at the partner universities important experience in writing for publication, however, it only gave them experience in writing for the type of publication in which their work was then published. Writing for a predatory journal, for example, will not provide sufficient experience to support writing for an international peer-reviewed journal (e.g. writing to a sufficiently high standard, addressing reviewers' comments, etc.). Most of JIBS' support for writing for publication therefore failed to provide the support needed for the high quality publications required of the partnering universities.

Conclusion

JIBS has managed each of the three collaborations separately. There have been five conferences organized in Kigali and Addis Ababa where research has been shared and where the partner universities' researchers have gained international exposure but limited exposure outside of JIBS' collaborating partners.

There have been no evaluations of the effectiveness of different initiatives introduced in order for stakeholders to understand if the initiatives have generated the expected outcomes. This would have been useful prior to entering into new collaboration agreements and for all stakeholders to be able to objectively assess the value of capacity and institution building initiatives.

Learning from one collaboration (i.e. the CDI) has been transferred to UEM and AAU, but without a proper assessment of the actual results and added value for the partner university of this initiative.

Recommendations

- Sida should provide for formative and summative evaluations of collaborations, or components of collaborations. Consideration should be given to requiring independent evaluations to inform collaborating and partner universities.

4.3 COST-EFFICIENCY

The following analysis assesses the JIBS collaboration budgets and expenditure and compares them to the overall program and also analyzing specific cost items against Sida's rules. The analysis is brief, dues to the lack of detailed financial data available.

JIBS' collaborations with the partner universities have been part of overall Sida programs funding different faculties as well as partner universities' own activities, infrastructure investments and staff. The case of AAU between 2011 and 2018 was different as it involved a "block grant" to AAU essentially allowing AAU to select any university to help it carry out research (see Watts et al. 2018 for an analysis of that Sida funded program). During that period JIBS had a specific agreement with Sida to support CBE/AAU.

An analysis of the funding of the collaborations JIBS has been involved in shows a noticeably high proportion of funding to JIBS compared to funding of other Swedish partners working in different faculties at each partner university. The proportion allocated to JIBS is higher than the average allocated to other Swedish partners in both UEM and UR.

Table 13: Analysis of JIBS' proportion of funding

Partner and period	Total Sida-partner university budget	Total to Swedish universities	% to Swedish partners	JIBS-partner university total budget	Total to JIBS	% to JIBS
UR 2015-2018	230 198 148	106 448 632	46%	15 188 716	8 970 000	59%
UEM 2017-2022	335 000 000	127 729 420	38%	16 000 000	11 765 000	74%
AAU 2011-2018	189 700 000	n.a.	n.a.	27 400 000	27 400 000	100%
AAU 2018-2023	196 000 000	71 800 000	37%	53 349 925	24 000 000	45%

The senior management at UR acknowledged that JIBS had a higher proportion of the funding allocated to them compared to other Swedish universities, but also noted that the collaboration with JIBS was effective as it achieved more of its objectives than other collaboration agreements.

For the UEM collaboration JIBS expects to receive up to 74 percent of the total funding. This is the highest proportion allocated to a Swedish partner across the whole Sida-funded program with UEM and is significantly more than the second highest allocation of 58.9% for the thematic program on "Biocultural Heritage in Mozambique" (59 percent allocated to the Swedish partner) and for the cross-cutting "Quality Assurance of Research and Post-Graduate Training" program (59 percent

allocated to the Swedish partner). The funding for JIBS was intended to support activities in Sweden (two PhD sandwich students and the CDI) and in Mozambique. It is not yet clear if the proposed revision to the collaboration will be approved by Sida and how this will affect the proportionate payments to JIBS and UEM.

In the original proposal submitted by AAU, JIBS and UGOT for the period 2018-2023, JIBS was to be allocated 58 percent of the total budget (SEK 31,4 million), UGOT 18 percent and AAU 22 percent[86]. This has subsequently been reduced to SEK 24 million with 45 percent of the total collaboration budget allocated to JIBS.

The budgets presented in proposals to Sida are only partially result-based. The cost of the sandwich program students, PhD and MSc training is clearly presented, however, the cost of other institution and capacity building activities (CDI, courses for faculty etc.) are not and the efficiency of these initiatives is therefore difficult to assess for both the Evaluation Team as well as the partner universities. The fact that both UR and UEM challenged JIBS about the value of the CDI and that it and the PhD courses were to be held in Sweden (thereby substantially increasing the cost and JIBS' share of the total budget) is an indication that the partner universities see these as less cost-efficient.

Analyzing the individual cost headings for each program has not been possible for AAU due to the highly aggregated financial reporting during the period 2011-2018. The financial reporting from the JIBS-UR collaboration has been more detailed and allows an analysis of different types of costs.

Table 14: Type of expenditure JIBS-UR collaboration

Expenditure JIBS-UR collaboration ('000 SEK)	2014/15	2015/16	2016/2017	2017/2018	Total
PhD Training	2 523	2 686	2 131	2 149	9 488
Research Dissemination	179	544	357	193	1 274
MSc and short courses training	1 717	1 268	1 605	452	5 043
Total expenditure	4 419	4 498	4 093	2 794	15 805

Source: JIBS financial reports to Sida.

Coordination costs as a percentage of total costs were 5 percent each year and overall during the JIBS-UR collaboration. Unfortunately, the financial reporting regarding the JIBS-AAU collaboration does not allow for an analysis of the

[86] AAU, JU, UGOT. AAU's Application for Support to Research, Training and Capacity Building at Addis Ababa University: 2018-2023. PhD Program in Management and Economics 2018 – 2023. pp. 37. June 2018

coordination costs as the reporting is not sufficiently detailed. However, during the period 2011-2018 JIBS charged an overhead of 15 percent which the auditor stated was reasonable, and in line with what the University's practices more generally. During the period JIBS reduced its overhead cost in the JIBS-AAU collaboration to 30 percent for JIBS' staff salaries. In the budgets for UR and UEM the overhead is not specified but according to JIBS, it is 12 percent.

Between the academic year 2014/15 and 2017/18 there were seven PhD students being educated within the JIBS-UR collaboration in a sandwich modality. The calculated average cost per year of the PhD training was SEK 339,000 per PhD student, which is significantly higher than the SEK 250,000 + allowances that Sida allows.

The JIBS-AAU collaboration was significantly different in that AAU's PhD students did not spend as much time in Sweden as it was a modified sandwich education. For AAU PhD students studying and being supervised by JIBS the calculated average cost was much less; between SEK 100,000 and 150,000 per student enrolled per year.

Table 15 Analysis of cost per PhD student JIBS-AAU

Analysis of PhD student costs JIBS-AAU collaboration ('000 SEK)	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Economics department							
Total Cost	229	890	1 741	2 184	1 881	2 169	2 782
Adv./Superv. Costs	0	134	661	1 190	1 167	1 332	1 440
Students enrolled	8	8	11	15	21	21	27
Students supervised		4	7	11	11	12	15
Cost per student enrolled	29	111	158	146	90	103	103
Superv. cost per student supervised		34	94	108	106	111	96
Management department							
Total Cost	159	431	1 081	2 221	2 241	3 005	2 867
Adv./Superv. Costs	0	0	33	88	328	905	1 707
Students enrolled	0	0	5	10	15	15	19
Students supervised	0	0	0	5	10	15	15
Cost per student enrolled			216	222	149	200	151
Superv. cost per student supervised				18	33	60	114

Source: JIBS statistics and data

While the costs per supervised student under the JIBS-AAU collaboration is lower, the outputs under the program are poor and progression was slow. In AAU, after nearly eight years of collaboration, there have only been 12 graduations. This could either mean that the actual cost is several times higher than the calculated SEK 100,000-150,000 as the students would have needed supervision for many more years. However, as the PhD students at AAU often have other jobs and teach, it could also mean that the actual cost is more or less correct (since the PhD students dedicated their time to other work and therefore are not supervised).

In the budget for the JIBS-UEM collaboration, the total cost of two sandwich PhD students for four years is in accordance with Sida's regulations.

The cost-effectiveness of delivering components of the collaborations in Sweden is complex but some general observations can still be made. It is clear from comparisons between the AAU and UR collaborations that delivering PhD programs in Sweden leads to more timely completions. However, as noted above, this comes at the cost of providing meaningful opportunities for wider capacity development, e.g. co-supervision or transferring the student experience of learning from one context to another.

The CDI is more straightforward. It was intended to expose academic staff to a more research-focused environment and so enable them to generate quality publications with the support of JIBS staff. This was appreciated by all of the staff that took part in the CDI but its long term benefits are not clear. If they are to encourage staff to continue writing for publication, then there was some evidence of this in that some staff reported working on their papers following the CDI. However, except for easier access to online libraries, it is not obvious why the CDI should have taken place at JIBS rather than in-country (preferably at a retreat to minimize the disruption of other work commitments)[87]. The same outputs could be achieved with the added benefit of negotiating the problem of transferring the experience of writing in Sweden to writing in-country.

The budgets and financial reporting from JIBS and partners is highly aggregated and does not allow for an understanding of the cost of achieving the various outputs established in the results frameworks for the collaborations. The Evaluation Team recommends that Sida require the use of results-based budgeting. This approach is used by Sida and its partners in development cooperation programs (programs implemented by civil society), and favored by the World Bank among other international finance institutions. Results-based budgeting allows for a clear understanding of the cost of achieving (or not) an output and outcome. An example of this is: if an outcome is established as "to produce xx number of scientific articles in internationally peer-reviewed journals", the budget would reflect the expected cost of the outcome and the subsequent financial reporting would show a) the actual cost compared to budget, b) the achievement (or not) of the goal, and c) the cost of achieving the goal. The cost efficiency could thus be assessed on an annual basis, and changes be made if and when results are achieved or not, in line with the results based management approach to managing and monitoring collaborations.

[87] It was suggested by the CBE/UR team leader that this would require eight JIBS supervisors to travel to the partner institution but appropriate support could be provided by one or two supervisors over the two weeks typically required of the CDI.

An additional feature important for Sida is that, depending on the outcomes established for other collaborations between Swedish and partner universities, it may be possible to compare the cost of e.g. graduating a PhD from a JIBS collaboration with the cost of graduating a PhD from another Swedish University collaboration.

Conclusion

The proportion of funding to JIBS compared to funding of other Swedish partners working in different faculties at each partner university is noticeably higher. It is not possible to assess why this is in detail based on the financial data provided, as it is highly aggregated or divided per cost heading (salary, travel etc.) and not per expected result. The reasons for the high proportion of funding allocated to JIBS was attributed by partner universities to (i) JIBS holding PhD courses in Sweden (according to the agreements reached with partnering universities); and (ii) the CDI taking place in Sweden. The fact that both UR and UEM challenged JIBS about the value of the CDI and holding PhD courses in Sweden is an indication that the partner universities see these as less cost-efficient. JIBS' budgets and financial reporting would benefit from being more results-based, especially regarding institution and capacity building activities whereby the cost of the initiative is compared against the expected (in the budget) and actual (in the annual financial reporting) results. The cost efficiency could thus be assessed on an annual basis, and changes made if and when results are or are not achieved, in line with the results based management approach to managing and monitoring collaborations.

The average annual cost of educating PhD students from UR has been significantly higher than that allowed by Sida, while the new budget for the JIBS-UEM collaboration establishes that Sida's rules should be applied. The cost of graduating an AAU PhD has been significantly lower but for AAU it has not been a traditional sandwich program and cannot be compared to UR or UEM sandwich programs. However, as progression has been slow among PhD students at AAU, the actual cost of a graduated PhD could be very much higher than the calculated SEK 100' to SEK 150 per year and student.

Recommendation

- Sida should request budgets and financial reporting from the collaborating and partner universities to be results-based for all main components of the proposal (PhD coursework, sandwich PhD training, CDI, conferences etc.) and thus clearly linked to the results framework. The result-based budgets should establish the budgeted amounts per outcome per year. The subsequent financial reporting on results will enable all stakeholders to better assess cost-efficiency, monitor the actual costs of achieving outcomes and make informed decisions about any modifications necessary.

5 Conclusions

The conclusions as to if and how the JIBS collaborations with AAU, UEM and UR have contributed to Sida's policies and strategies for research cooperation are presented below. The Evaluation Team also presents conclusions as to if the outputs have led to the achievement of outcomes (as per the implicit theory of change) and findings as to the level of ownership that the partner universities have experienced while collaborating with JIBS here.

5.1 CONTRIBUTION TO SIDA'S POLICY OBJECTIVES

Sida's overall objectives for the Swedish research support between 2010 and 2014 were that:

A. Partner countries and regional research actors are better able to plan, produce and use research in the fight against poverty.
B. Increased production of research relevant to the fight against poverty in developing countries
C. Increased production of Swedish research of relevance in the fight against poverty in developing countries

In its more recent strategy for research cooperation (2015-2021), Sida aims for "Strengthened research of high quality and of relevance to poverty reduction and sustainable development".

The Evaluation Team has found that the amount of research being produced at AAU and UR has increased as a result of collaboration with JIBS. The topics of the research also appear relevant to each country. The fact that the JIBS-UR collaboration has resulted in significantly more research being produced than the JIBS-AAU collaboration is an indication that the CDI has helped UR to produce more research. However, in reference to Sida's aim to generate research of a high quality, the Evaluation Team found that JIBS' publication policy has not produced the kind of results universities value the most i.e. (double-blind) peer reviewed articles in reputable journals.

Partner universities have not found the CDI to live up to the expected results or to be sufficiently cost-effective. AAU's new tools for planning research, supervision and monitoring PhD progression appears to have been needed, but AAU's ability to produce and better plan research activities is assessed as low.

Although the amount of research produced in working papers, conference papers, and book chapters has increased substantially, when measured by journal articles, as requested by Sida, the research produced in JIBS' collaborations is of varying quality.

The Evaluation Team concludes that the topics of the research produced are relevant to each of the countries and the researchers aim to address practical problems in their home countries.

The increased production of research by Swedish researchers was not part of the aim of these collaborations and has therefore not been assessed.

5.2 ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOMES

The Evaluation Team has evaluated the extent to which JIBS collaborations have achieved the outcomes established in the implicit theory of change in Chapter 3.1.

The Evaluation Team's conclusion is that the objectives of the JIBS-UR collaboration 2013-2018 have been met: the progression and graduation of PhD graduates has been good, PhD and MSc programs have been accredited and a substantial amount of research has been produced. The results of the first phase(s) of the JIBS-AAU collaboration are less positive, PhD student progression was slow and AAU staff were insufficiently involved in institution and capacity building.

All three partner universities' faculties claim ownership of the collaboration and university leadership agree. However, the evidence leads the Evaluation Team to conclude that ownership of the collaborations has rested with JIBS to a significant extent. In the first proposal drafting phases, UR and UEM had no choice but to collaborate with JIBS which limited their negotiating position. JIBS possesses the greater technical and pedagogic knowledge and skills that the partner universities need. This, and the fact that results have been achieved (at UR) has led the partner universities to accept JIBS' management of the collaboration. The fact that the JIBS' Coordinator has had a central role as the contact point between JIBS and the partner university, and between the partner university and Sida, has meant that he managed the flow of information to the different stakeholders, and was responsible for delivering not only information but, in effect, results. The fact that the most recent proposal writing processes have been more difficult with negotiations between the stakeholders is an indication of the partner universities voicing their needs and taking ownership of the next phase.

The Evaluation Team concludes that the lack of proper due diligence or analysis of UEM's needs, and proposing similar content to that of the UR and AAU collaborations without properly assessing the effectiveness of their components led to a need for significant change in the collaboration's activities as early as the outset of the collaboration. Proper due diligence and understanding of UEM's weaknesses regarding research ability needed to have been conducted during the proposal phase.

JIBS' capacity to provide PhD training in Economics has not been sufficient to allow PhD students to take elective courses at JIBS within the timeframe of the collaboration. JIBS has solved this by offering elective courses at other Swedish universities. Its capacity to supervise research in Economics is high but its partner universities have had issues with how and where the PhD training takes place. JIBS' capacity to offer PhD training and supervision for Management students was better.

An important issue is the conclusion that most of the research studies produced under the guidance of JIBS' academic staff have not found their way to high-quality peer-reviewed journals. The research outputs from the JIBS-UR and JIBS-AAU collaborations have been published mainly as working papers and conference papers, and as book chapters published by world-class publishers. Those were intended to be stepping stones towards journal publication and some of them do contribute positively to AAU/UR staff members' career advancement, but the majority of the few journal articles published in the JIBS-UR and JIBS-AAU collaborations were published in journals that were not in any of the journal indexes used in this evaluation. The two commonly accepted indicators of high-quality research are (i) where the article is published and (ii) citations of the article. That most of the research outputs JIBS claims from its collaborations are neither published in indexed journals nor ranked on journal accreditation lists or cited by other researchers is worrying. Furthermore, JIBS' own internal measures of supervision and research quality is the ranking of the journals where the research is published, and by that measure—research published in reputable journals—this collaboration has achieved little. PhD students were not sufficiently guided and advised on how to identify predatory journals and how to choose appropriate publication outlets.

The type of publication is an important international indicator of the quality of the research being reported and therefore reflects on the institution. Articles of 'publishable' standard (even when the type of publication is not specified) are not the same as 'published' articles because they have not met the essential criterion of being blind peer-reviewed. The CDI has given staff at the partner universities important experience of writing for publication, however, it only gave them experience in writing for the type of publication in which their work was published. Writing for a predatory journal, for example, will not provide sufficient experience to support writing for an international peer-reviewed journal (e.g. writing to a sufficiently high standard, addressing reviewers' comments, etc.). Most of JIBS' support for writing for publication therefore failed to provide the support needed for the high quality publication required of the partner universities.

However, the Evaluation Team can conclude that JIBS has contributed to increasing the research capacity of UR and AAU, with all of the PhD graduates from the JIBS-UR collaboration working in the CBE/UR and four of the 12 PhD graduates from the JIBS-AAU collaboration working in the CBE/AAU.

The institutional and capacity development elements of JIBS' collaborations have been questioned by the partner universities, mainly from a cost-efficiency point of view, namely the CDI and the teaching of PhD courses in Sweden. JIBS has consistently taken a larger share of the total collaboration budget compared to other Swedish universities collaborating with the same partner universities. The financial data does not allow for an analysis leading to a conclusion regarding cost-efficiency. However, it can be said that that JIBS' budgeting and financial reporting has not been fully results-based and that a cost-efficiency analysis of each component is not possible.

JIBS has been innovative in introducing new initiatives to improve research capacity, teaching methods, student monitoring practices etc. but has not evaluated the effect of these initiatives. This is a weakness that may have contributed to the

difficulty of the proposal drafting processes, where an objective assessment of the results achieved e.g. for CDI would have provided evidence for or against its inclusion in a new Sida-proposal.

6 Recommendations

6.1 RECOMMENDATIONS TO SIDA

- Sida should provide for formative and summative evaluations of collaborations, or components of collaborations. Consideration should be given to requiring independent evaluations to inform collaborating and partner universities.
- Sida should work with partner universities to support and sustain the development of realistic human resource policies that allow for appropriate salaries, responsibilities and allocation of time to research and supervision. Consideration should be given to realizing this through training/workshops delivered by Swedish universities. Further consideration should be given to making such policies a key criterion in the assessment of overall programs and the sub-programs within them.
- It is recommended that Sida ask collaborating universities and partner universities to, in the proposal, establish quality criteria for the publication of research. Sida should, furthermore, ask collaborating and partner universities to regularly report on the fulfillment of such criteria.
- Sida should request budgets and financial reporting from the collaborating and partner universities to be results-based for all main components of the proposal (PhD course work, sandwich PhD training, CDI, conferences etc.) and thus clearly linked to the results framework. The result-based budgets should establish the budgeted amounts per outcome and per year. The subsequent financial reporting on results will enable all stakeholders to better assess cost-efficiency, monitor actual costs of achieving outcomes and make informed decisions about any modifications necessary.

6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS TO JIBS

- JIBS should carefully communicate any special features of the PhD programs that impact on when and where PhD students take their courses. Any limitations should be made clear when negotiating future collaborations. Budgets should take into account such limitations so that other aspects of collaborations are not subsequently undermined.
- JIBS should ensure that appropriate structures are in place for co-teaching and co-supervision with colleagues at partneri universities and that responsibility for teaching coursework is transferred to the partner universities at the earliest viable opportunity. Consideration should be given to the delivery of at least some PhD coursework in-country, especially where the number of students make this a financially viable option, to provide academic staff at partner universities with greater opportunities to benefit from co-teaching.

- JIBS should re-focus its publishing priorities and policies to ensure that a larger number of research outputs end up published in journals that are well recognized in the field. Furthermore, JIBS must ensure that PhD students and academic staff at partner universities are properly guided on how to identify predatory journals and how to choose appropriate publication outlets.
- JIBS should pay closer attention to the needs of partner universities and tailor its proposals to meet them. To facilitate this, JIBS should involve its own academic staff in the coordination of all aspects of the collaboration: due diligence or needs analysis, proposal drafting, negotiations with partners and Sida, and monitoring of the collaboration and evaluation.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS TO JIBS AND PARTNER UNIVERSITIES

- JIBS and the partner university should agree at the outset of the collaboration on a supervisory process to include:
    - Swedish and National supervisors appointed at the same time (preferably upon acceptance of the PhD candidate),
    - Clear roles and responsibilities for JIBS and national supervisors,
    - Training and monitoring of the national supervisors,
    - Communication of the supervision process and responsibilities to PhD students,
    - Documented tools to be used to guide and measure progression of the PhD graduate (examples of this are the AAU *Student Progress Reports*).
- It is recommended that JIBS and partner universities carry out a joint, thorough due diligence and needs analysis prior to designing the proposal.
- Partner universities should ensure that realistic outputs and outcomes are established for each initiative. These should be based on thorough due diligence and needs analysis.
- Partner universities should monitor progress regarding the agreed outcomes and outputs throughout the program. Such monitoring would show the results of the number of publications and where students publish their articles earlier, and in doing so enable JIBS and partner universities to take action earlier.
- Partner universities should evaluate the institution building and capacity building components of the collaboration from an effectiveness and cost-efficiency perspective in order to understand the results and outcomes prior to proposing these to partner universities.

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of Jönköping International Business School's (JIBS) collaboration with Sida partner universities in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Mozambique

Date: 2019-03-04

1. Evaluation background and object

Sweden has a long history of supporting low income countries to develop their capacity to independently carry out and manage research. The training of researchers at national public universities in these countries has often been done in partnership with Swedish universities. The collaboration between universities and researchers is highly valued both by Sida and partners as a way to build sustainable research capacity and create long-term partnerships beyond the Sida cooperation.

In Sida's cooperation with Addis Ababa University in Ethiopia it was decided in 2018 that the collaboration with its long-term (2011-) Swedish partner Jönköping International Business School (JIBS) at Jönköping University should be evaluated. Since JIBS also are collaborating with other universities in the region such as the University of Rwanda and Universidade Eduardo Mondelane in Mozambique, Sida saw this as an opportunity to also include these collaborations in the evaluation to obtain a broader picture of how a Swedish university partners contributes to develop institutional research capacity in low income countries.

Sida has through years of experience developed a model for the support. The "model" is grounded in a system approach and although referred to as a "model" it is neither static nor rigid, but rather adaptive to context and evolves with time, along with the supported countries and institutions as their capacity increases

.The system approach considers both national and institutional research and innovation systems. This evaluation will focus on institutional research capacity. The support to develop institutional research capacity include various elements but is roughly divided into four areas 1) research training, 2) research policy, 3) research management and 4) research supporting infrastructure. These are to be seen as integrated and reinforcing each other.

Research training

Research training is key to build institutional research capacity. The researchers are at the core of research universities generating new knowledge through research, sharing their knowledge as lectures to students increasing the quality of HE in general and in collaboration with different actors in society.

When there is a limited number of researchers at a partner university and the structures that regulate research activities are weak, the cooperation most often starts by providing PhD training to university lectures in selected areas to create a critical

mass of researchers. The logic of this approach is that the researching lecturers later will contribute not only to teaching and to carry out research, but also to develop structures at their university for managing research. When a country lacks its own PhD training, the lecturers are registered to study and graduate at Swedish university. To reinforce the approach above and prevent knowledge flight the lecturers are not removed from their positions during the training. They commute between the two countries, taking courses, lab work in Sweden/other country and carry out field work in their own in an area that is relevant to the country's effort to find solutions to circumstances that prevent poor groups to be lifted out of poverty. The students have supervisors from the Swedish partners university and, if available, lectures from their home university. This model is called "the sandwich model".

When capacity increases and there is a critical mass of researchers in one area, the cooperation successively moves away from using the sandwich model to train researchers and instead local PhD programmes are developed. The training is then open to anyone in the country who has the qualifications to apply. They are registered and graduate at their own university and follow national regulations. There is , however, quality requirements for the type of training that can be supported. A general reference is that the training at a national university in a partner country should be of similar quality to those offered in Sweden. But, there are also more specific guidelines that Sida uses for quality requirements. To this end double degree programmes are encouraged.

High academic quality is key to Sida to maintain and sustain the increasing research capacity. Low income countries are already disadvantaged in the global knowledge production and in order for their researchers and research institutions to become visible and competitive enough to attract funds and international collaboration high quality must be ensured.

Swedish university collaboration with Sida's partner countries

Important for the above "model" is the collaboration with Swedish universities. When the sandwich model, with graduation at a Swedish university, is the modality being used for research training, the quality is guaranteed through the Swedish national regulations and accreditation of universities. In this context, the students generally co-publish with their supervisors from both universities in international journals which is another indicator of quality. Further, they present papers at international conferences and have the opportunity to build networks being exposed to other research environments than the one at their home university.

When, the support moves on to local PhD programmes the quality is maintained by national regulations and accreditation if there are such in place. Since such regulations are not always in place or cannot be upheld through regular quality assessments, high quality is expected to be ensured by partnership with Swedish universities that collaborate in developing curricula, supervisor training, co-supervision and co-publications. Presentations of papers at conferences, a number of extended visits to Swedish universities to experience a different research environment and opportunities to expand their scientific networks is also offered in the local PhD training programmes. The extent and active participation may vary from country to

country and even from department to department, but the objective is that the training at the end should be entirely managed by the partners' universities.

JIBS and partner universities
Jönköping University (JU) is a non-profit foundation and one of few non-public institutions of higher learning in Sweden. JIBS is one of four colleges at the university. These are managed as joint stock companies fully owned by the Jönköping University Foundation. JIBS offers PhD training through four programmes in Business Administration, Economics, Informatics and Statistics.

JIBS/JU in collaboration with University of Rwanda
Sida has been supporting research cooperation with Rwanda since 2001. The cooperation aims to develop research capacity at National University of Rwanda. In 2013, after a successful reform process which had aimed at merging seven public universities (NUR included) into one, University of Rwanda was established, and the cooperation was transferred to this new university.

The partnership started between JIBS and NUR Faculty of Economics and Management (NUR-FEM) started in July 2013 with a five-year collaborative programme "Economics and Management". The aim of the programme was to develop 2 PhD programmes and train 6 PhD students and NUR and 7 PhD students at JIBS using the sandwich modality. They would further develop 2 MSc programmes and implement other research capacity building activities. Total budget for the agreement period that ends in June 2019 is 39,522,000 SEK.

The College of Business and Economics (CBE)/School of Business/ School of Economics at University of Rwanda (UR) have applied to Sida for a new cooperation period July 2019 – June 2024 in partnership with Jönköping International Business School (JIBS), Jönköping University (JU), Jönköping, Sweden, Department of Economics at Gothenburg University, School of Business and Economics at Umeå University and Karlstad Business School at Karlstad University. The name of the programme is *Sustainable socio-economic transformation of Rwanda through relevant economics and management research of high quality* and the amount applied for is 34,465,250 SEK. The programme has been recommended for support by the embassy, but the process is not yet concluded.

JIBS/JU in collaboration with Universidade Eduardo Mondlane
Universidade Eduardo Mondlane has been a long-standing partner to Sida. In 2018 the cooperation celebrated its 40th anniversary. JIBS is a more recent partner to UEM. It started in July 2017 in collaboration with the Faculty of Economics to develop an in-house PhD programme, train PhD and MSc-students. The total amount for the cooperation period in 16,000,000 SEK.

JIBS/JU in collaboration with Addis Ababa University
Sida's cooperation with AAU started in 1979. In 2009 it was agreed that AAU would receive a block grant from Sida to increase the number of lecturers with a PhD degree in order to improve the quality of HE in Ethiopia, in practice a massive expansion of the graduate program at AAU. A couple of years later the collaboration with Addis

Ababa University and Jönköping University was initiated with the aim of developing sustainable PhD programmes at AAU.

JIBS and College of Business and Economics (CBE) have been partners since 2011. The collaboration has focused on developing PhD programmes in Economics and Business Management. This agreement was extended to June 2018 and the total amount for JIBS' collaboration was 27,397,068 SEK MSEK, while the block grant provided to AAU for the entire cooperation period 2009-2018 was 162,335,348 SEK

In 2018 Sida decided to continue the cooperation with AAU for yet another five-year period. *Support to research training and capacity building at Addis Ababa University 2018-2023,* with a maximum agreed amount of 196 000 000 SEK. One of five thematic research areas were granted to the programme. The programme "Capacity Building and Knowledge Creation Through Research-Led Teaching Collaboration "was submitted by CBE in partnership with JIBS/JU and University of Gothenburg (UGOT). The total amount for the period July 2018 – June 2023 is 53,349,926 SEK.

The scope of the evaluation and the intervention logic or theory of change of the project/programme shall be further elaborated by the evaluator in the inception report.

2. Evaluation purpose: Intended use and intended users

The objective of the evaluation is to increase the understanding of if and how the partnership between Jönköping University/Jönköping International Business School and Universidade Eduardo Mondlane in Mozambique, University of Rwanda in Rwanda and Addis Ababa University in Ethiopia contributes to the objectives and modalities outlined in the previous "Policy for Research in Swedish Development Cooperation 20110-2014 and Strategy for Sida's Support for Research Cooperation 2010 – 2014" and the "Swedish Strategy for Research Cooperation and Research in Development Cooperation". The evaluation is especially relevant for the first objective in both strategies *to strengthen and develop research of relevance to the fight against poverty in developing countries. Partner countries and regional research actors are better able to plan, produce and use research in the fight against poverty (2010-2014) and* "*Focusing on capacity-building for research, primarily in low-income countries and Regions*. *Support to research and analysis help build domestic capacity, which is a sustainable way of strengthening responsibility for, and ownership of, a country's own development 2015-2021*."

It is also expected that the evaluation at a more general level will contribute to Sida's approach to partnership in research cooperation.

During the inception phase, the evaluator and the users will agree on who will be responsible for keeping the various stakeholders informed about the evaluation.

3. Evaluation scope

The evaluation shall consist of an in-depth assessment of the nature and results of the collaboration between Jönköping University/ Jönköping International Business School at Universidade Eduardo Mondlane, University of Rwanda and Addis Ababa University. Three main areas are targeted a) scientific quality, b) local ownership and c) cost efficiency. More specifically the evaluation shall focus on:

Scientific quality:

- To what extent JIBS has contributed to strengthen the capacity at the universities/departments with which they collaborate (human and institutional capacity) towards local PhD programs?
- What are the results of the collaboration/relationship between JIBS and partner university supervisors as well as with doctoral students? Such results may include the nature and quality of relationships, if they have been extended to collaboration outside the Sida cooperation, if they have resulted in co-publications, improved completion rates, affected the number of years for completion etc.
- Academic capacity and relevance of Swedish supervisors for the field of studies chosen by the doctoral students (how students and supervisors are selected and matched),
- The scientific quality of the research produced as an outcome of the collaborations (for example, publications in international journals)

Ownership:

- How JIBS contribute to partners' ownership - at department/faculty levels as well as university leadership level - of the different areas of collaboration. Partner universities' ownership is key for the long-term sustainability of achieved results to build institutional research capacity.
- Management of the program. How has JIBS' collaboration with its partners to manage the programs been carried out? (development of program documents, planning, reporting, communication, participating in meetings such as the annual planning and review meetings etc.)
- How JIBS's, in the position as programme coordinator when several partner universities are involved, (what and how) contributes to the implementation of the programme.

Cost efficiency:

- The cost efficiency of JIBS's contribution to the partner universities related to the objectives and areas outlined above. This area may involve a comparative approach (with other Swedish universities contributions within the same broader programs).

4.Evaluation approach, methods and analysis

A literature review that will include relevant strategic documents both at Sida and Sida's partner universities in Rwanda, Mozambique and Ethiopia. The reviews will also cover available documents at embassies consisting of external evaluations as well as programme documents and Sida's/embassies' internal assessments memos as well as any other relevant documents such as agreements and MoU's.

Interviews will be carried out with students, supervisors, coordinators, administrators and university leadership at all universities/departments involved in the cooperation.

Field visits will be required to carry out interviews at the three partner universities located in the three countries, as well as with Sida staff at the Swedish embassies. Meetings in Sweden include interviews with JIBS staff at Jönköping University,

involved in the collaboration with Sida partner universities, as well as interviews with staff at Sida HQ.

A comparative approach will be inevitable since there are many partners involved in the evaluation. It is also necessary from the point of view of cost efficiency.

The consultant shall provide a more detailed approach to the methodology outlined above but may also propose additional methods.

5. Organisation of evaluation management

This evaluation is commissioned by Sida's Research Cooperation Unit. The intended users are Sida, Swedish Embassies in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Mozambique, University of Rwanda, Addis Ababa Unviersity, Universidade Eduardo Mondlande and Jönköping University/JIBS. The commissioner will evaluate tenders, approve the inception report and the final report of the evaluation.

6.Evaluation quality and ethics

The evaluators shall adhere to the terminology in OECD/DAC Glossary of Key terms in Evaluation and Result-Based management when relevant. The evaluators shall specify how quality assurance will be handled by them during the evaluation process.

The evaluator shall ensure that any of any of its employees, agents and subcontractors, as well as any informant to the evaluation, whose personal data are transferred to Sida, promptly receive and take note of the information provided in Sida's Privacy Policy: https://www.sida.se/English/About-us/about-the-website/privacy-notice/. The evaluator shall promptly inform any of its informants that their names and organisational affiliation will be included and published in the final report of the evaluation, which will be made available in Sida's publication database and in Open Aid, a web-based information service about Swedish international development cooperation.

7.Time schedule and deliverables

It is expected that a time and work plan is further detailed in the inception report to be submitted to Sida no later than 21 April 2019. The outline of the inception report may be discussed through a face-to-face meeting or video/skype meeting. The evaluation shall tentatively be carried out 22 April to 30 May 2019, when a draft evaluation report should be submitted to Sida and after comments and discussions be finalized and submitted to Sida by 7 July 2019.

The inception report will form the basis for the continued evaluation process and shall be approved by Sida before the evaluation proceeds to implementation. The timing of field visits needs to be settled by the evaluator in dialogue with the main stakeholders during the inception phase. The inception report should be written in English and cover evaluability issues and interpretations of evaluation questions, present methods for data collection and analysis as well as the full evaluation design. A specific time and work plan for the remainder of the evaluation should be presented which also cater for the need to create space for reflection and learning between the intended users of the evaluation i.e. Sida, JIBS, UR, AAU and UEM.

The final report shall be written in English and be professionally proof read. The final report should have clear structure and follow the report format in the Sida

template for decentralized evaluations. The methodology used shall be described and explained, and all limitations shall be made explicit and the consequences of these limitations discussed. Recommendations should be specific and directed to relevant stakeholders.

For invoicing purposes, the evaluator needs to include the invoice reference "ZZ541001S", type of allocation "sakanslag" and send it to:
Sida/Forsk
Att.Inger Lundgren
ZZ-541001S
FE152
838 80 FRÖSÖN

The table below lists key deliverables for the evaluation process. Deadlines for final inception report and final report must be kept in the tender, but alternative deadlines for other deliverables may be suggested by the consultant and negotiated during the inception phase.

Deliverables	Participants	Deadlines
1. Start-up meeting at Sida HQ in Stockholm/or virtually	Evaluators, Sida and concerned embassies	8 April 2019
2. Inception report and submission		8-21 April
3. Data collection, analysis and report writing	Evaluators	22 April – 16 June
4. Draft evaluation report		16 June
5. Comments from intended users to evaluators		17-30 June
6. Final evaluation report		1-15 July
7. Debriefing at Sida HQ/or virtually	Evaluators, Sida and concerned embassies	TBD

The inception report will form the basis for the continued evaluation process and shall be approved by Sida before the evaluation proceeds to implementation. The inception report should be written in English and cover evaluability issues and interpretations of evaluation questions, present the evaluation approach/methodology, methods for data collection and analysis as well as the full evaluation design. A clear distinction between the evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection shall be made. A specific time and work plan, including number of hours/working days for each team member, for the remainder of the evaluation should

be presented. The time plan shall allow space for reflection and learning between the intended users of the evaluation.

The final report shall be written in English and be professionally proof read. The final report should have clear structure and follow the report format in the Sida Decentralised Evaluation Report Template for decentralised evaluations (Annex A). The executive summary should be maximum 3 pages. The evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection used shall be clearly described and explained in detail and a clear distinction between the two shall be made. All limitations to the methodology and methods shall be made explicit and the consequences of these limitations discussed. Findings shall flow logically from the data, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. Conclusions should be substantiated by findings and analysis. Recommendations and lessons learned should flow logically from conclusions. Recommendations should be specific, directed to relevant stakeholders and categorised as a short-term, medium-term and long-term. The name of the consulting company.

8.Evaluation Team Qualification

In addition to the qualifications already stated in the framework agreement for evaluation services, the evaluation team shall include the following competencies The tender must contain information regarding the qualifications and competence of the team members proposed for the evaluation team. The tenderer must propose a team leader with at least Level 1 qualifications and:

- at least a Master's degree
- theoretical and practical evaluation skills (including methods, facilitation, reporting and communication)
- experience as team leader for complex evaluations (i.e. of large programmes with many stakeholders)
- experience from assessing scientific quality, supervision of doctoral students and research management
- experience/expertise from scientific research and research capacity building in low-income countries.

The team must have staff with at least Level 1 qualifications and:

- at least two members with a Master's degree in business administration and economics
- all team members must have at least a master's degree
- experience of assessing scientific quality, supervision of doctoral students and research management
- experience of research in low income countries
- knowledge of Swedish development cooperation
- knowledge of (bilateral) research cooperation
- very good knowledge in spoken and written English least level 2, according to Sida Language Level Definition.
- One team member must have Swedish least level 2, according to Sida Language Level Definition.

It is desirable that the evaluation team includes the following competencies:

- a team leader with PhD degree
- two team members with PhD in economics and business administration

- experience from research collaboration in the African context.
- One team member should preferably have Portuguese according to Sida Language Level Definition.

A CV for each team member shall be included in the call-off response. It should contain a full description of relevant qualifications and professional work experience.

It is important that the competencies of the individual team members are complimentary. It is highly recommended that local consultants are included in the team if appropriate.

The evaluators must be independent from the evaluation object and evaluated activities, and have no stake in the outcome of the evaluation.

9.Resources

The maximum budget amount available for the evaluation is 1.2 million SEK.

The contact persons at Sida is Inger Lundgren, Research Advisor, Unit for Research Cooperation Department for Partnerships and Innovation. The contact person should be consulted if any problems arise during the evaluation process.

Relevant Sida documentation and contact details to intended users of the evaluation will be provided by Inger Lundgren, Sida/Embassies

The consultant will be required to arrange the logistics for preparing the field visits. Contact persons at the respective Embassies and JU/JIBS:

- Ethiopia: Dr. Alexander Sellerholm, Addis Ababa; alexander.sellerholm@gov.se;
- Mozambique : Dr. Claire Lyngå, Maputo; claire.lynga@gov.se ;
- Rwanda: Dr. Emilia Molnar, Kigali; emilia.molnar@gov.se;
- JIBS: Prof. Ethel Brundin, Jönköping *ethel.brundin@ju.se;*
- JIBS: Mr. Lars Hartvigsson, Jönköping; Lars.Hartvigson@ju.se

11. Annexes

Annex A: Decentralised evaluation report template

Annex 2 – Evaluation Questions

Evaluation Questions	Data analysis	Indicators	Sources of information
1. Scientific quality:			
1.1 To what extent JIBS has contributed to strengthen the capacity at the universities/ departments with which they collaborate (human and institutional capacity) towards local PhD programmes?	Results will be assessed against general as well as national criteria for accreditation that need to be fulfilled in order to offer a PhD programme that relate to human capacity (see indicators). Institutional capacity will be assessed by seeking to identify the existence of procedures and systems for the development, implementation and quality control of PhD programmes. In order to assess causality, JIBS' input into the process of developing human and institutional capacity will be assessed. This will involve: 1. identification of JIBS' input (sharing tools, procedures or helping to develop procedures to improve the	# of staff competent to teach PhD programmes (reviewing CVs) # of staff with experience of supervision of PhD students # PhD accredited programmes Existence and quality of quality control systems for PhD programmes at the partner university Inputs shared and/or developed with JIBS to improve the institutional capacity for PhD programs at the partner universities. Rating by stakeholders as to the relevance and usefulness of the inputs to develop a) institutional capacity do deliver PhD programs and b) PhD programs.	University statistics (staff data on academic achievements, supervision experience, PhD and teaching competence) and PhD programmes (accredited/developed/being accredited) In-depth interviews with: • University academic staff (professors, supervisors) • Programme coordinators • JIBS programme coordinator • JIBS academic staff • Doctoral students University policies/ regulations/description of systems for quality control Documented verification of use of policies/regulations/description of

	institutional capacity for PhD) 2. asking the stakeholder to assess the quality of the input (relevance, usefulness/feasibility of the input)		systems for quality control
1.2 What are the results of the collaboration/ relationship between JIBS and partner university supervisors as well as with doctoral students?	Comparison of actual quantifiable results (# of PhD graduates etc.) against quantifiable goals established in the collaboration agreements or proposals to Sida. In order to assess causality, JIBS' input into the process of developing human and institutional capacity will be assessed. This will involve 1. identification of JIBS' input to develop PhD programs. 2. asking the stakeholder to assess the quality of the input (relevance, usefulness/feasibility of the input) Collation of qualitative data from interviewees on expected and unexpected results of the collaboration on • PhDs research • staff competence • PhD research topics • programme planning and development	# of cases when PhD students and or university academic staff collaborated outside the Sida cooperation, # of trainings/workshops/conferences planned and implemented # of research projects related to Management and Economics # of papers/ publications/ research projects co-published with researchers outside the university, Trends in completion rates, Trends in number of years for completion etc. Inputs shared and/or developed with JIBS to create PhD programs at the partner universities. Rating by stakeholders as to the relevance and usefulness of the inputs to develop PhD programs.	Peer reviewed publications Papers presented in international conferences University statistics (Enrolled, Completed, Ongoing) Courses (Number of courses, No of participants) JIBS & partner university data on supervision (number of supervisors, supervisor hours/student)

	We will also analyse objective measurements to include: • date of doctoral graduation (to provide a timeframe); • number of primary and secondary supervisors in: (a) Sweden; and (b) partner universities;		
1.3 Academic capacity and relevance of Swedish supervisors for the field of studies chosen by the doctoral students (how students and supervisors are selected and matched),	Process-maps of the supervision processes (tasks, times allocations) and supervision oversight from topic selection through to publication Estimates of actual supervisor time used for different tasks; turnaround time for feedback from supervisors Compliance with university regulations on supervision, time allocation, tasks and duties, and agreement over supervisors' and students' roles Students' and supervisors' perceptions of topic selection process, supervisor pool, supervision process, and modes co-operation (plans and actuality	PhD students' rate of satisfaction with the supervisory process (both with the main supervisors and co-supervisors) Main and co-supervisors rate of satisfaction with the supervisory process # working hours and funding budgeted for supervision # of PhD students per supervisor (to assess workload) Measures taken to guarantee supervisor expertise and high quality supervision process, including identification of problems and bottlenecks Channels available for working out problems and disagreements.	In-depth interviews with PhD students, main and co-supervisors, faculty leadership, and programme coordinators Contracts, agreements, memoranda of understanding, background papers, and other documentation that demonstrates mutual agreement or consensus, as well as careful planning of the supervision process
1.4 The scientific quality of the research produced as an outcome of the collaborations (for example, publications in international journals)	We will compile a complete list of indexed and non-indexed publications, citations to them, joint works, venue ranking (quartiles, rankings, impact factors), and other relevant bibliometric	# of publications in indexed publications, sole/co-authored books, chapters in edited books (ranked by publisher), articles in national/institutional journals, monographs, and conference papers.	International citation indices (Scopus, WoS, or EBSCO; the latter includes publications in Portuguese) Programme's own records on publications and research outcomes (e.g.,

	details. We will ask stakeholders to describe what aspects of research quality they have pursued, reflect with them how well they have reached their quality goals, and what mechanisms they have set up for facilitating quality, as well as monitoring, measuring, and constantly improving it. We will compare stakeholders' views and analyse those results in terms of the RQ+ framework quality dimensions. Stakeholders' perceptions of what constitutes high scientific quality and fruitful academic collaboration, and how those have been pursued Analysis of measures taken to avoid predatory publishers and choose high quality journals and venues Analysis of partner universities' monitoring of quality and activities	Journal quartile or impact factor reports for joint publications, as well as their status on the Norwegian register of journals (used instead of WoS/Scopus by a number of Swedish universities) Consensus over quality, processes, publishing venues, modes of collaboration,	Revista Científica da UEM) Interviews with programme coordinators, supervisors, and other stakeholders
2. Ownership:			
2.1 How JIBS contribute to partners' ownership - at department/faculty levels as well as university leadership level - of the different areas of collaboration.	The Evaluation Team will ask department/faculty level and university leadership level at each of the collaborating partners' to define ownership. The definitions will be	Rating by JIBS and partner universities of JIBS' and partner universities': • involvement in the design of the collaboration agreement, activities, objectives.	Desk review of programme documentation, decision documents Interviews with programme coordinators, supervisors, and other stakeholders

	presented and evidence gathered to verify the extent to which each collaboration is rated high or low regarding ownership.	• management of the budget and funds in the collaboration agreement. • ability to change direction/activities/systems as part of the collaboration agreement. • commitment of time and resources to the activities within each collaboration agreement	
2.2 Management of the programme. How has JIBS' collaboration with its partners to manage the programmes been carried out?	The Evaluation Team will ask each of the collaborating partners (JIBS and each partner university) to assess the formal programme management aspects (planning, reporting, timely delivery of outputs) as well as communication between the parties. The results of successful/less successful programme management often impacts on the ownership aspect.	Rating of JIBS' management of the parts of the programme cycle (planning, reporting, meetings) by partner universities Rating of JIBS' communication during the cooperation agreement by partner universities Rating of partner universities' participation and involvement in the programme cycle by JIBS	Desk review of formal programme management outputs Interviews with programme coordinators and other stakeholders
2.3 How JIBS, in the position as programme coordinator when several partner universities are involved, (what and how) contributes to the implementation of the programme.	We have interpreted this aspect as how JIBS learns from the other programmes and feeds that into programme development. We would therefore analyse: • what formal and informal evaluations have been conducted and how, • if and how learning from one cooperation agreement informs other subsequent or ongoing programmes	Availability of evaluations, mid-term reviews or similar Evidence of initiatives introduced as a result of learning	Desk review of evaluations Interviews with programme coordinators and other stakeholders

	• how that learning is transferred across programmes and to partners.		
3. Cost efficiency:			
3.1 The cost efficiency of JIBS's contribution to the partner universities related to the objectives and areas outlined above. This area may involve a comparative approach (with other Swedish universities contributions within the same broader programmes).	Basic financial analysis of main cost items/headings, per partnership. Analyse main cost drivers. Cost comparisons, if possible on a "per unit of output" basis. This presumes that reliable data makes it feasible to do fair assessments. Qualitative analysis of interview responses and feedback regarding financial processes of the partnerships.	Level of costs per produced output (i.e. average annual costs for training of one PhD Student) Budget utilisation and "burn rate" – indicates ability to do realistic costing Financial ratios (i.e. share of salaries, allowances, support costs, etc.)	Financial data from partnerships: • Original detailed budget (Sida) • Revised budget • Annual audited accounts and expenditure reports • Other financial reporting • Received/expended (end 2018) In-depth interviews with JIBS staff Collect comparable financial data from International Science Programme Uppsala University. In-depth interviews with faculty management, and partner university financial staff. Publicly available financial information from other donor programmes within PhD and research. Financial data from other university collaboration programmes in Sida.

Annex 3 - List of persons interviewed

AAU staff and students interviewed

Name	Position	Organisation	Date of interview
Alemu, Atlaw	Assistant professor, also Former Head of Economics Dep. (2017-18), and PhD graduate 1st batch	AAU	6 June 2019
Adhena Abreha, Fyery *	PhD Student, Mgt AAU,3rd Batch	AAU	23 May 2019
Abebe Gemeda, Damena	PhD Student, Mgt AAU, 4th Batch	AAU	5 June
Abera Gudissa, Zerihun *	PhD Student, Mgt AAU, 5th Batch	AAU	23 May 2019
Afework Tessema, Demeke *	PhD Student, Mgt AAU, 5th Batch	AAU	23 May 2019
Bane Boka, Jonse	PhD Student, Econ AAU, 5th Batch	AAU	7 June 2019
Birhane Abebe, Meseret	PhD Student, Econ AAU, 6th Batch	AAU	5 June 2019
Debas Awoke, Andualem	PhD Student, Mgt AAU, 4th Batch	AAU	5 June
Desalegn Enaro, Yonatan	PhD Student, Econ AAU, 5th Batch	AAU	7 June 2019
Elias, Hailu	Assistant professor, also Former Head of Economics Dep.(2016-17), and PhD graduate 1st batch	AAU	6 June 2019
Eshete , Zerayehu	Head of Economics Dep.	AAU	3 June & 5 June, 2019
Gebreegziabher, Selamawit	PhD Student, Econ AAU, 5th Batch	AAU	7 June 2019
Geletu Woldeyohanis, Yilma	PhD Student, Mgt AAU, 4th Batch	AAU	5 June
Girma Aragaw, Zerihun *	PhD Student, Mgt AAU, 5th Batch	AAU	23 May 2019
Gutema Keno, Gutu	PhD Student, Econ AAU, 5th Batch	AAU	7 June 2019
Jegesse, Ethiopia	Assistant Professor, Mgt,	AAU	6 June 2019
Jembere Amare, Toli *	PhD Student, Mgt AAU,3rd Batch	AAU	23 May 2019
Kassa, Workneh	Head of Management Dep.	AAU	5 June 2019
Lachisa Tato, Gidisa	PhD Student, Econ AAU, 6th Batch	AAU	5 June 2019
Legesse Tessema,	PhD Student, Econ AAU, 5th Batch	AAU	7 June 2019
Lemma, Brook	Overall coordinator for SIDA programmes	AAU	3 & 4 June 2019
Mesele, Marian	Coordinator of graduate program in Economics Department	AAU	5 June, 2019
Negussie Simie, Marshal *	PhD Student, Econ AAU, 4th Batch	AAU	23 May 2019

Name	Position	Organisation	Date of interview
Olani Akuma, Gemeda	PhD Student, Econ AAU, 6th Batch	AAU	5 June 2019
Seid, Mohammed	Assistant Professor, Mgt, AAU	AAU	6 June 2019
Shitaye Anley, Yaschilal	PhD Student Mgt. AAU, 2nd Batch	AAU	6 June 2019
Tadesse Delle, Meba	PhD Student, Mgt AAU,3rd Batch	AAU	5 June
Terfa Eticha, Gemechis	PhD Student, Mgt AAU, 4th Batch	AAU	5 June
Tesfaye Abebe, Tigist *	PhD Student, Mgt AAU, 5th Batch	AAU	23 May 2019
Teshome Bayissa, Jebessa	PhD Student Mgt. AAU, 2nd Batch	AAU	6 June 2019
Tufa Adinew, Moges	PhD Student, Econ AAU, 6th Batch	AAU	5 June 2019
Werkilul Asfaw, Ermias	PhD Student Mgt. AAU, 2nd Batch	AAU	6 June 2019
Yirdaw Yigezu, Hailegebrie	PhD Student, Econ AAU, 6th Batch	AAU	5 June 2019

JIBS staff interviewed

Name	Position	Organisation	Date of interview
Achtenshagen, Leona	Professor Business Administration dept. Supervisor	JIBS	28 May 2019
Blombäck, Anna	Assiciate Dean of Education	JIBS	29 May 2019
Brundin, Ethel	formerly Associate Dean of Research and deputy Team Leader	JIBS	June 13 2019
Brunninge, Olof	Associate Professor, Academic Director of International Development Collaboration	JIBS	May 27 2019
Hartvigsson, Lars	Coordinator	JIBS	May 27 2019
Pettersson, Lasse	Associate in Faculty	JIBS	Juen 12 2019
Pittino, Daniel	Associate Dean of Research	JIBS	June 13 2019
Moodysson, Jerker	Managing Director	JIBS	May 29 2019
Månsson, Kristofer	Professor Economics supervisor	JIBS	May 28 2019
Nilsson, Pia	Associate Professor Economics. Academic Director of International Development Collaboration	JIBS	May 28 2019
Sjölander, Pär	Professor Economics. Academic Director of International Development Collaboration	JIBS	May 28 2019

Sida staff interviewed

Name	Position	Organisation	Date of interview
Kjellström, Claes		Sida Unit for Research	June 12 2019

		Cooperation	
Lundgren, Inger	Senior Research Advisor	Sida Unit for Research Cooperation	June 13 2019
Lyngå, Claire	First Secretary/Research Cooperation	Swedish Embassy	June 10 2019
Molnar, Emilia	Senior Programme Manager, Research and Higher Education	Swedish Embassy Kigali	June 24 2019
Oltorp, AnnaMaria	Director Regional Team Asia	Sida	June 13 2019
Sellerholm, Alexander	Program manager	Swedish Embassy Addis Ababa	June 3 and June 12 2019

UEM staff interviewed

Name	Position	Organisation	Date of interview
Chenene, Manuel	Sida Program Coordinator	UEM	June 11 2019
Guilherme, Manuel Junior	Director of the Cooperation Office	UEM	June 10 2019
Lichucha, Fernando	Coordinator of the sub-programme	UEM	June 10 2019
Lucas, Carlos	Former Director of the Cooperation Office	UEM	June 12 2019
Manjate, Vasco	Programme Officer	UEM	June 11 2019

UR staff interviewed

Name	Position	Organisation	Date of interview
Barayandema, Jonas	Dean of the School of Business	UR	June 20 2019
Bosco, Shema Jean	PhD graduate (Business)	UR	June 25 2019
Ijumba, Nelson	DVC, Academic Affairs and Research	UR	June 17 2019
Kamugisha, Samuel	PhD student (Business)	UR	June 19 2019
Muhoza, Dieudonne Ndaruhuye	Dean of the School of Economics	UR	June 20 2019
Murigande, Charles	DVC, Institutional Advancement	UR	June 18 2019
Musekura, Celestin	Lecturer and PhD co-supervisor, School of Business	UR	June 20 2019
Ndikumana, Raymond	Program Coordinator,	UR	June 19 2019

	UR-Sweden Programme for Research, Higher Education and Institutional Advancement		
Nyamulinda, Bideri	Director of Research, Acting Director for Postgraduate Studies	UR	June 17 2019
Rao, Rama	Team Leader UR-Sweden, CBE-JIBS Economics and Management sub-programme	UR	Not interviewed but provided substantial written information during the process of the evaluation
Ruhara, Charles	MSc Economics programme coordinator	UR	June 18 2019
Rukundo, Johnson	Deputy Team Leader and PhD graduate (Economics)	UR	June 18 & 21 2019
Umulisa, Yvonne	Assistant Lecturer and PhD student (Economics)	UR	23 May 2019

Annex 4 - List of references

Author	Publication name	Date
Ministry of Foreign Affairs Sweden	*Swedish Strategy for research cooperation and research in development cooperation 2015 – 2021.*	Dec 2014
Government Offices of Sweden	*Policy For Research in Swedish Development Cooperation 2010 – 2014 and Strategy For Sida´s Support for Research Cooperation 2010 – 2014*	2010
Kruse, Tvedten, Tedre, and da Costa Rosário	*Evaluation of Swedish government research cooperation with Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique 2011-2016: synthesis report.*	2017
Watts, Abebe, Tsegay.	*Higher Education and Research in Ethiopia, with emphasis on Addis Ababa University.*	2018
Tvedten, Byabagambi, Lindström and Tedre	*Evaluation of the Sida supported research capacity and higher education development program in Rwanda, 2013–2017*	2018

Annex 5 - Country report: the JIBS-AAU collaboration

by Erlend Sigvaldsen

Design of the collaboration agreements

The 2011 – 2015 Collaboration Period

The initial contact that took place in 2010 and 2011 is not well documented, but the information that is available in documentation from meetings, plans and agreements indicate a process that AAU and JIBS were both involved in. There was no call for concept notes from Sida, or any appraisal of the proposal that the Evaluation Team has been able to identify. The agreement was treated as complementary to the Block Grant agreement that SIDA had with AAU at the time.

At AAU level, there is little doubt that there was ownership of the objectives of the collaboration as it was to help AAU produce more PhDs. AAU was under immense pressure from the Government to do precisely that. Thus, the first agreement is also focused on the production of PhDs – and does not mention objectives like scientific or research quality. Activities reflect this, with JIBS providing support to courses, and to supervision. Scientific quality was part of Sida's general guidelines for bilateral research cooperation, and thus part of the overall Swedish strategy.

There is no result framework or indicators by which to measure the progress of the program. The funds were to be used for a "partnership on PhD education between Jonkoping University and Addis Ababa University".

The 2015 – 2018 Collaboration Period

The initial contract period for both the block grant and the JIBS/AU agreements ended in 2015, and Sida asked for "new block grant proposals", which were discussed at the Annual Meeting between Sida and AAU during the fall of 2015. The resulting decision by Sida in the same annual meeting[88] was to ask JIBS, the University of

[88] AAU/SIDA, "Minutes of AAU-Sida Sweden joint meeting of 29 September and 02 October of 2015", (p.14)

Gothenburg (UGOT), and AAU to consider submitting a joint proposal. Between 2016 and June 2018, while awaiting a new agreement to be signed, Sida agreed to continue funding the JIBS/AAU collaboration through a series of amendments of the original contract. The amendments were mostly for one year (there were five of them), and some were signed after the year had started. In 2017 this resulted in activities being stopped for half a year, and re-activated. The general impact was uncertainty regarding long-term plans or activities.

At this time there was considerable uncertainty as to what should happen with the Economics program. AAU's leadership had signaled to Sida that it wanted to prioritize technical subjects, and was less interested in Economics. The relevance and effectiveness of the whole economics program with JIBS was questioned, and the Ethiopian government clearly instructed AAU to prioritize natural sciences and technology. The minutes from the meeting at the embassy on 10 March 2016 between Sida and AAU showed that the intention was that the cooperation on Management and Economics would be phased out between 2017 and 2021. However, slow progress has left a large number of doctoral candidates in the middle of their studies, and these students could not be abandoned.

JIBS, UGOT and AAU started developing a joint project proposal in 2015/16, including both Management and Economics, and this was accepted by Sida despite the earlier intention to phase these programs out. AAU staff members interviewed have vague recollections of the events, but say that there was considerable resistance internally towards ceasing working with JIBS completely, in particular from the Management department within CBE.

The New Agreement for 2018 - 2013

The process of drafting the proposal (to eventually come into effect in July 2018) was described by AAU staff as follows:

- The proposal and application were mostly written in Sweden – but jointly discussed. One staff member says that "Not completely comfortable with the result, but the whole problem is an Ethiopian problem, we do not know what we want." The interviewee agreed with the theoretical idea but saw problems in implementation – expecting this to be more difficult than the document envisaged.
- Another staff member says that they started from the existing cooperation methodology and that proposal writing was an inclusive process. There were arguments regarding budgets - which JIBS wanted to reduce - but JIBS listened to AAU arguments. For instance, funds for addressing plagiarism were included on AAU's initiative.
- In Management, the process was described as a "joint" process, with discussions between JIBS and AAU starting as a response to Sida's wish for new proposals. For the Management department, this was a straightforward continuation of the already ongoing cooperation. One interviewee stated: "We have always had good relations with JIBS, and we depend on them for the expertise they bring to both the courses, and the thesis. Would not have the same expertise available without JIBS".

The new agreement between JIBS, UGOT and AAU took effect 1st of July 2018. It has a very different program framework than the first, and is fully in line with Sida's

current rules and procedures. There is an elaborate results framework and budget that is based on standard rates, and the budget is significantly more detailed than the former one. The program document[89] is detailed and includes a well written plan for the collaboration. The targets for the five years are to have:

A. up to 42 PhD students graduating from the AAU PhD program in management and economics,
B. up to 36 PhD students admitted into the PhD program in management and economics in addition to the 47 PhD students already admitted in the previous collaboration (2011-2018),
C. one international conference in management and economics arranged annually,
D. 16 scientific articles publishable in international peer-reviewed journals produced by eight AAU faculty in the post-doc program,
E. four faculty members each year from each discipline participate in the Career Development Initiative (CDI) and produce articles presented at international conferences,
F. ongoing policy briefs for relevant policymakers,
G. joint research projects and joint publications between the departments of Economics and Management at AAU and JIBS/UGOT faculty and PhD students produced, and
H. Regular Research seminar series introduced at the departments of Management and Economics, respectively, supported by JIBS and UGOT.

Results achieved

The following section analyses the extent to which JIBS has contributed to strengthening the capacity of AAU to manage and deliver PhD programs, how related the academic capacity of Swedish supervisors is to AAU PhD students' research, and the quality of research produced.

JIBS contribution to strengthening AAU's Capacity to manage and deliver PhD education

AAU's rules and regulations for the delivery of PhD programs are established in the *Senate Legislation*.[90] The implementation and follow-up of the rules at department level is delegated to the Department Graduation Committee (DGC) that approves topics for dissertation, supervisors and academic issues in general. There are no detailed supervision guidelines or similar procedures for the implementation of the

[89] AAU. *AAU's Application for Support to Research, Training and Capacity Building at Addis Ababa University: 2018-2023. PhD Program in Management and Economics 2018 – 2023*. June 2019.

[90] AAU. *Addis Ababa University Revised Senate Legislation* (Final Draft). April 2013.

studies in the *Senate Legislation*. Quality control of the PhD process in the *Senate Legislation* includes general rules for admission and selection of candidates, requirements for PhD students to pass exams prior to beginning research, the supervisors' role in ensuring the quality of PhD dissertations, and how examination is completed.

Two key inputs from JIBS to strengthen AAU's capacity to manage and deliver PhD programs has been to help develop the *Implementation Policy* and *Student Progress Reports.* The *Implementation Policy* establishes procedures for supervision, and for the general implementation of the PhD process. The *Student Progress Reports* record the annual progression of PhD students, are signed by supervisors, and include an evaluation form filled in by the Doctoral Advisory Committee. Every student shall deliver a *Student Progress Report* before 1st of May in any given year. The introduction of more formal procedures for monitoring supervisors and students has, according to AAU staff and management, improved the institutional capacity of the departments. JIBS has played a significant role in the process of introducing them, and adapting them to international standards.

AAU stakeholders rate the relevance and usefulness of JIBS' inputs as high, in particular the demonstration of international academic standards in PhD education, and the introduction of formal rules and procedures guiding the PhD process. The Management department mentioned JIBS' input regarding the accreditation process and the academic interactions specifically. Staff at AAU also emphasize the more unspecified impact that contact with JIBS had regarding how they "go about their job". Those having visited JIBS are particularly pleased with the "knowledge transfer" that was gained when invited to co-teach PhD courses at JIBS and then do the same with JIBS lecturers at AAU[91].

The slow progression of PhD research has been a concern for JIBS throughout the period, as evidenced in JIBS' *Annual Narrative Reports*. As a result, JIBS and AAU introduced the requirement that PhD students needed to either pass exams and/or draft and submit articles or pieces of work, before visiting JIBS. This was an attempt to both encourage and force students to adhere to established milestones, at the same time as ensuring that students visiting JIBS had sufficient understanding of the relevant academic topics. These requirements were eventually formalized, but the process from the first discussion about progress indicators in 2012, to the introduction of formal *Student Progress Reports* in 2018, took almost six years. Some of the interviews with AAU supervisors and students indicated that neither group really

[91] According to JIBS, co-teaching is an essential element of capacity building, preparing the AAU colleague to teach the courses on his/her own. However, co-teaching appears not to have been implemented to its full potential. None of the staff at the Economics department at CBE have ever co-taught, while only 1 staff from the Management department has participated.

wanted to be monitored. According to interviews with JIBS' staff, the concern and solution was proposed by them and AAU needed to accept and internalize the rationale and the implementation of such procedures, and do it in their own time. According to JIBS, this has improved progression, but is yet to be visible in the statistics (see below).

JIBS' involvement in helping AAU develop a PhD program in Management[92] included reviewing and commenting on the first draft of the program document in September 2012. After that it was sent for external review to other universities, and approved by the relevant committees in AAU and in accordance with AAU's rules and legislation in May 2013. While JIBS provided inputs and quality assurance, the review and approval process was managed by AAU.

Staff and Qualifications

The most visible output from JIBS' contribution to increased staff qualifications at CBE, is that three out of nine graduated PhDs now work in the Department of Economics, and one out of three graduates work in Department of Management.[93] Other direct input to staff qualifications include joint supervision seminars and co-teaching collaboration. From the Economics department, there have been 19 supervision visits to Sweden, and 13 from Management during the period 2012-2018. Only one staff member from Management ever went to Sweden to co-teach. These visits were important for the staff that participated, but the potential was underutilized, particularly in co-teaching.

The Management Department is clear that JIBS has been a major contributor to its success, and senior staff in the department expressed satisfaction with staff competence and the quality of courses being run. Still, the department relies on continued support from JIBS to run the program and the courses, but the goal is that the department will manage this independently at the end of the new collaboration program in 2023.

The key inputs have come through exposure to different academic cultures. This contributed to improving academic practice through enhanced knowledge, pedagogic development, and expanding networks. However, Economics staff felt that the technical and professional input from JIBS was less important. They run all of the courses themselves and do not need much support from JIBS in doing so now.[94] When staff in both departments were asked about whether they believe the

[92] AAU already had an accredited PhD program in Economics.

[93] According to the latest staff lists from AAU.

[94] See also discussion Watts et al. 2018.

department is stronger now, than when JIBS started the collaboration, the answer is unanimously "yes".

With regard to staff qualifications in teaching and supervising PhDs, the AAU *Senate Legislations* establishes that "a supervisor of the PhD student shall have a rank of an Associate Professor or above".[95] However, "in case of staff shortage, the DGC may propose that assistant professor holding PhD degree with merit supervise a PhD student". The staff profiles of the two departments have developed as follows:

[95] AAU *Senate Legislation*, Article 120, sub-article 2.

Table A Academic Staff Profile; Economics Department, 2014 and 2018

	Academic Rank 2014	Qualified to teach/supervise PhD 2014	Academic Rank 2018	Qualified to teach/supervise PhD 2018
Professor (PhD)	1 (male)		1 (male)	1
Associate Professor (PhD)	2 (all male)	2	6 (all male)	6
Assistant Professor (PhD)	8 (all male)	8	12 (all male)	12
Lecturer (Msc)	15 (3 female)		15 (3 female)	-
Total	**26**	**10**	**34**	**19**

Source: AAU Department of Economics

There are only three female academic staff in the whole department, and none of them are active in the PhD program at present. The Economics department has a higher portion of academic staff with PhDs (56 percent) than AAU at university level, where the percentage of PhD was 29 percent in 2016/17.[96] Since 2014[97], academic staff increased from 26 to 34, with eight more staff qualified to teach and supervise PhDs.

The trend towards increased academic qualifications is evident also in the Management department, which has 43 staff now, compared to 31 in 2014. Staff qualified to work with PhD candidates have doubled.

Table B Academic Staff Profile; Management Department, 2014 - May 2019

	Academic Rank 2014	Qualified to teach/supervise PhD 2014	Academic Rank 2019	Qualified to teach/supervise PhD 2019
Professor (PhD)	-	-	-	-
Associate Professor (PhD)	2 (all male)	2	4 (male)	4
Assistant Professor (PhD)	7 (all male)	7	14 (1 female)	14
Assistant Professor	-	-	1 (male)	-

[96] (Watts, Abebe, & Tsegay, April 2018)

(MSc)				
Lecturer (MSc)	22 (2 female)	-	20 (2 female)	-
Other (3 BA, 1 diploma)	-	-	4 (male)	-
Total	**31**	**9**	**43**	**18**

Source: AAU Department of Management

In the Management department, 42 percent of the academic staff now have PhDs. The department has a few female academics (only three) but one of them is an assistant professor. She is co-supervising one of the current female PhD students, and the supervision process, as she described it, was exemplary. The main JIBS supervisor is also a woman, and both the student and herself described a process with weekly skype talks and regular communication. All expressed confidence, trust and loyalty to each other and the PhD student's progression. It is perhaps a reminder of the importance of women role models and of the urgent need to get more women into the program as both supervisors and students.

The gender balance is heavily biased towards men, both among staff and as students. Out of the 51 students enrolled in the program, only five are women (three in Management and two in Economics). AAU has an elaborate, gender-neutral selection process to choose the best PhD candidates. There may be issues of skewed procedures involved, but the problem with gender balance starts much earlier, already at the secondary school stage. In 2014, the number of female students in the cohort admitted to the University was 25 percent in undergraduate programs, 17 percent in graduate MA/MSc programs, and only 4.7 percent in PhD programs.[98] The JIBS' supported programs score better than this, with almost 10 percent of the PhD candidates being women. Still there is room for improvement, and while the AAU *Gender Policy* shows AAU's intention to improve, it is unclear how successful its implementation is. It is recommended that both the Management and the Economics Departments increase the number of women among both staff and students. AAU might want to assess introducing mild positive discrimination (women are chosen if they score equal to men in the uptake).

The academic merits of staff in terms of publications has not been possible to collect, as CVs and other University based records are incomplete. This was discussed at the latest planning meeting between AAU and JIBS[99], as "it is difficult to get hold of publication data for AAU faculty." The two Heads of Department would try to compile a more complete database of CVs, but this is yet to be finalized.

[98] AAU. *AAU Gender Policy.* 2015.

[99] AAU. *Minutes: Planning meeting AAU/JIBS/UGOT*. January 2019.

Enrolment and Graduation

All in all, 52 students have been enrolled in the program; 29 in the Economics program and 23 in the Management program, see the table below. 38 students are still active in the program.

Table C Students enrolled and graduated in the JIBS/AAU program, 2011 – 2019 (end of year).

Economics	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	June 2019	Accumulated total
1st batch	4	4	3	3	3	1				
2nd batch	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3		
3rd batch			4	4	4	4	4	4	2	
4th batch				4	4	4	4	4	4	
5th batch					6	6	6	6	6	
6th batch							8	8	8	
Dropouts			1							1
Graduations						2	2	1	4	9
Total Enrolled	**8**	**8**	**11**	**15**	**21**	**21**	**27**	**26**	**24**	**29**
Management										
1st batch			5	5	5	5	5	5	2	
2nd batch				5	5	5	5	5	5	
3rd batch					5	5	5	4	4	
4th batch							4	4	4	
5th batch								4	4	
Dropout								1		1
Graduations									3	3
Total Enrolled	**0**	**0**	**5**	**10**	**15**	**15**	**19**	**22**	**22**	**22**
Total graduations										**12**

Source: JIBS/AAU Annual Narrative Reports 2011-2018, JIBS and AAU statistics

All of the graduates are male and, of the current students, five are women (three in Management - representing 10.5 percent, and two in Economics – representing 10 percent).

The statistics available from AAU and JIBS show that all graduates used more time than the four years prescribed by Ministry of Education for a PhD degree. On average, a PhD student in Management spent five years and seven months on his/her degree, while an economics student spent six years and four months.

The data gathered in interviews with JIBS, AAU and Sida and from the reporting showed slow progress regarding PhDs progressing in their research and courses. There are various reasons for the delays:

- JIBS began work only five months after the program was approved.
- In 2012 two faculties were reorganized to become part of the CBE, which meant AAU staff were reorganized.
- The lack of capacity at AAU Faculty/Department level for supervision of PhD students.

- The lack of internal regulations at AAU for how to handle the slow progression of the PhD students.
- PhD students worked to support themselves financially and as a result were not able to dedicate sufficient time to research necessary to progress.
- The lack of formal progression plans and monitoring of progression.
- Problems with internet connections and limited access to databases, computer software and research journals at AAU.
- Some (not all) PhD students indicated that there was a lack of supervision by AAU supervisors, as some did not take an interest in the process. Generally, there was no consensus among students interviewed that bad supervision is the main reason for their delays. Some are very happy with their supervisors, most are reasonably happy, and some are very unhappy. This holds for supervisors at both JIBS and at AAU.
- Low expectations at AAU on progression[100].

PhD graduates and current students interviewed believed that JIBS made an important contribution to their PhD degree. One said that "I do not know where I would have been today without them". Three aspects were mentioned as particularly important:

- Exposure to an international research culture, environment and expertise,
- The technical and personnel resources available at JIBS during visits, and
- Learning about personal research and study management i.e. delivering on time, and safeguarding the dynamics of the study process.

PhD students and graduates rate the study periods at JIBS in Sweden as the most important contribution towards their degrees. This made it possible for them to devote their full attention to the research, which was not possible in Addis Ababa. As one AAU professors said: "There they worked from early dawn to midnight. Here I am lucky if I get them to spend an hour on their research." The access to facilities and online materials, high-quality courses, and active expert supervision were all regarded as highly positive inputs. When asked to suggest improvement in the current cooperation, every student interviewed said they wanted more time in Sweden – in addition to stipends or other monetary support.

Research Outputs

[100] Some of the stakeholders interviewed at AAU reflected that "Everybody knows it is not possible to finish a PhD in four years at AAU." This reflects that in an environment where few deadlines are met, the progression issues that bothered JIBS and Sida were not considered as serious by internal staff.

Publications

The Evaluation Team has not been able to identify any targets established against which to measure research quality in either the Economics or the Management department in CBE. The University desires that academic staff members publish at least 0.8 articles per year; staff members are required to publish in order to be promoted; and PhD students are, increasingly, required to publish as a condition of graduation. AAU has recently introduced a publication incentive that increases in line with the quality of the journal. Publishing in a first grade journal may pay staff as much as Birr 25,000 (equivalent to USD 850).

Both AAU and JIBS state that the publication of research is the main measure of the quality research. The results JIBS reported as outcomes of the collaboration between JIBS and AAU are few. Aside from PhD theses, the collaboration resulted in 44 book chapters, 26 conference papers or presentations, and 14 journal articles[101]. JIBS describes the conference papers and book chapters in their own JIBS-edited Springer and CRC Press volumes as a stepping stone towards PhD theses and journal articles—an idea that has some merit in PhD training.

Some staff members are vocal in their support for growing a culture of publishing research that has a wider audience. However, interviews consistently pointed to the fact that individuals spearheaded these efforts, rather than being part of a university-wide effort. Some respondents indicated that because many of the teachers do not have a research background, they did not encourage students to look outside of the data and the material already assigned to them.

JIBS and AAU will, in the new collaboration agreement, try to address these challenges by introducing new initiatives:

- The CDI, where the AAU faculty works together with JIBS and UGOT faculties to produce research papers and to jointly present at international conferences, publish in books and in international peer-reviewed journals. Furthermore, the program will support the organization and implementation of regular research seminar series at both departments (in economics and management).
- Post-doc stipends targeting young researchers that have acceptable progress in their studies. They can apply to a committee of senior researchers from AAU, JIBS and UGOT for a one-year post doc stipend.
- The establishment of a database with unique primary data accessible for AAU, JIBS and UGOT faculty to increase the opportunities to make the unique contributions asked for by publishers and to improve the competitiveness amongst

[101] File *Research output Ethiopia 2014-2019.xlsx*

the partner institutions to publish in international peer-reviewed journals and books.

These are all initiatives that aim to address a pressing problem, which might improve the scientific output over time. It is a complex issue, however, involving culture, attitudes, incentives and a context that have tended to reward quantity over quality.[102]

Conferences

One conference has been organized at AAU as part of the JIBS-AAU collaboration; in Economics in December 2017. Altogether 103 presenters were invited from 18 different countries and 96 papers were chosen according to the conference program document[103]. Two books were published as a result of the conference.

In addition AAU students and staff were encouraged to attend a series of conferences held since 2015 in Rwanda where different JIBS-partners were invited (AAU, UR, Makerere University- Uganda and the University of Dar es Salaam Business School – Tanzania) to encourage regional cooperation. At the fourth Rwandan conference in June, 2019, 17 PhD students from AAU and seven AAU staff had their papers accepted and the 17 students attended. While these conferences are dominated by JIBS' partner universities and may not classify as equally high-profiled as some of the European and American conferences, they do provide a first opportunity to step on to an international research scene. There is unfortunately no information available regarding how many continue to other international research venues. Students interviewed said this has been an important contribution to increasing their international exposure.

Supervision

When collaboration started in 2011/12, the formal document explaining the supervision process was the *Senate Legislation*. This defines the overall procedures, and delegates the appointment of supervisors – or advisors as it is termed in the legislation – to the DGC. "The appointment will be made when the student finishes course work and begins work on qualifying exam and dissertation writing."[104] The Senate Legislation states that a supervisor should provide advice both on general academic matters, and on the organization and supervision of the student's research

[102] See for instance Watts et al. 2018

[103] AAU. *Preliminary Programme, Addis Ababa International Conference on Business and Economics, December 6-8, 2017*. 2017

[104] AAU. *AAU Senate Legislation*, para. 77.6

and writing and preparation for qualifying exams. On monitoring, the legislation says that "Chairs/Heads shall obtain from academic advisors, progress reports and action plans regarding process of academic advising twice in each semester."(para 77.7.2)

Neither the Department of Economics nor that of Management had detailed written guidelines describing the process of supervising of PhDs when AAU began working with JIBS. Indeed, Management did not even offer a PhD degree in 2011. This was perhaps an important reason for a somewhat haphazard supervision process during the early years, with – for instance – very limited formal reporting on student progress. An operational, formal framework for supervision was missing.

The most visible difference in the supervision process now, from what it was in 2011/12, is that a) the process is now documented in detail in the *Implementation Policy*, and b) the *Student Progress Report* system is not only talked about, but practiced. There is a greater degree of formality. In brief, the process now is as follows[105]:

- Supervision starts after the PhD candidate has taken the prescribed courses and passed the Comprehensive Exam (after 2 years)[106].
- Choosing a topic: PhD applicants/students present a concept note that is assessed by the DGC in consultation with JIBS.
- Matching and choosing supervisors: The DGC assigns both local and Swedish supervisors (having received a proposal for supervisors from JIBS based on the topics).
- Supervision process: The appointed supervisors work as a team with the main supervisor "having the final say". JIBS and local supervisor provide continuous communication on the progress of each student to the department of Management.

This is similar to what the process was perceived to be when JIBS started the collaboration. The lack of formal documentation led to irregular implementation, however.

Students had different experiences with the collaborative supervision:

- The quality varied, as did the collaboration between Swedish and Ethiopian supervisors. In some cases, there was active collaboration; in others, there was no alignment at all. Co-supervision with international academics led students to

[105] AAU. *Implementation policy (Draft). AAU PhD program in management.* 2019

[106] With the exception of PhD candidates in Management who present their topic already when applying for the PhD program.

approach the international supervisors for support, and Ethiopian supervisors seem to have been happy to let them.[107]

- There are differing views also about the supervision process, and some expected more support than they received. Others complained about having to wait too long for a response from their supervisors (primarily the Ethiopian supervisors). Very few complained about the actual competence and the knowledge of the senior supervisors.[108] There is a distinct difference between more recent batches of students and previously admitted PhD students, as the former appear more satisfied with the whole supervision process.

Local supervisors offered additional observations:

- In Economics, several issues developed in 2015/16, as Ethiopian supervisors felt there was very little academic benefit to be had from JIBS. This also impacted the supervision cooperation, which seems to have been almost negligible during those years.[109]
- Students did not always appreciate that a PhD student must do the most important work her-/himself. At PhD level supervisors do not take decisions for students and a PhD student is expected to develop her/his own research and research competence. Two former students that had graduated and were now supervisors themselves said the process was more formal now, which they both appreciated.
- A senior co-supervisor in Management strongly maintained that delays are primarily due to culture and attitudes. "When students go to Sweden, they are so much more productive. Here in Addis there are so many demands on them. Instead of publishing and studying, they work. In Sweden they are very focused, and work around the clock. Here, you are lucky if they spend an hour with you."

Systemic imperfections in the structure of the supervision system are primarily found in its implementation, not in the design – if one accepts the two phased, two-year dissertation process. The key problem appears to be lack of clearly written guidelines for the supervision process, with a fixed set of routines to adhere to, that can be referred to when things do not go as planned. There were no effective measures to ensure a high-quality supervision process that included actions as well as

[107] See Watts et al. 2018 on supervision practices at AAU.

[108] The main exception to this is the 8 students in batch 6 that felt UGOT had more competent supervisors than JIBS.

[109] The narrative report from 2015:"In the rescheduled supervision seminar held in late June 2015, that included the presentation of the 3rd batch's research proposal, and progress reports from batch 1 and batch 2, no AAU supervisors participated.

identification of problems. Further, there were no formal channels available to solve problems or disagreements. It appears that this was left to each individual supervisor to solve – of which some appear responsive, while others probably were not.

JIBS appears to have not fully understood the situational context that Ethiopian students worked under, nor did they appreciate fully the AAU context. Supervision practices ended up more unsystematic than they should have, with effectiveness determined more by individuals, than a solid structure. This however, is not the sole responsibility of JIBS.

While good intentions with respect to formalization of supervision processes were expressed in narrative reports and planning documents, they were not formalized until the *Implementation Polices* were approved in 2019. JIBS' contribution to establishing these procedures was significant. It is doubtful if AAU would have done so without external input and pressure to improve progression. The overall academic environment seems not to have been particularly conducive to the introduction of routines that reduce the flexibility of staff and students. A more relevant critique is that JIBS could perhaps have pressed AAU more - and earlier - on this issue.

Potentially flawed supervision cannot bear all the blame for the delays. The reasons are likely internal as well as external to AAU. As one of the AAU professors rhetorically asked: "Is it the student or the supervisor?" His example was of two students from the same batch with the same Swedish supervisor. One had graduated "almost" on time, the other was very close to dropping out of the program.

The new program describes a supervision process where lessons learned from previous programs have been taken into account; it emphasizes a) strictly scheduled study progression, b) better arrangements for supervision cooperation, and c) more incentives for students to manage progression. This is now all documented in written and approved department policies. The next years will show whether this really will improve progression and quality.

Ownership

Involvement in the design of the collaboration agreement, activities, objectives

The initial contact in 2010 and 2011 is not well documented, but what exists indicate a process that AAU and JIBS were both involved in. The Management department intended to start a PhD course and needed external help to do so. They were committed to that result. The situation in Economics is more unclear, but interviews indicate that the extra resources the JIBS agreement would provide to the Department, were welcomed.

At AAU level, there was clear ownership of a program that would help the university produce more PhDs. AAU was under substantial pressure from the Government to do precisely that. AAU leadership at all levels clearly felt they owned the objectives of the agreement (to produce PhDs), while the process of designing the program was unclear (JIBS stated that they agreed on the content together with AAU but that JIBS then wrote the proposal to Sida[110]).

The second agreement is better documented, but development of the program was a lengthy process (three years from the concept note in 2015 to taking effect in June 2018). The long transition period, with several short-term contracts without specific goals, was unfortunate, as it created a lack of strategic planning and discussion about goals, methods etc. There was a feeling of "stop-go", and some staff said they just forgot about the whole thing and continued with what they had been doing. Other stakeholders played an active role, including Sida and the Embassy. In the annual meeting in 2015 between Sida and AAU, Sida encouraged JIBS and UGOT to apply for support together, in a joint agreement. The proposal and application were mostly written in Sweden – but discussed jointly, according to AAU staff. Staff at the Management department said they were deeply involved in the design of the program.

In Economics, the current dispute between JIBS, UGOT and AAU regarding supervision responsibilities for student Batch 6 haunts any recollection of ownership of the design process. While some of the staff say they regret that they agreed to the division of responsibilities between JIBS and UGOT, others defend the choice. The Economics department appears split, with the DGC committed to upholding the 50/50 split of supervisors between UGOT and JIBS.[111]

The JIBS/UGOT dispute and its many connotations are difficult to place in a traditional "ownership" mapping. Sida emphasized a joint proposal, which all partners tried to make it work afterwards. The *Minutes* from the annual Sida/AAU meeting in 2015 show that Sida proposes this "divided" option, or that only one of them could continue the cooperation. AAU appears to have left it to UGOT and JIBS to find a reasonable solution. Did JIBS or UGOT push AAU towards accepting a split responsibility, in a way that reduced their own commitment to the end result? Perhaps, but it is difficult to find evidence for undue pressure over and above what is normal in negotiations.

Management of the budget and funds in the collaboration agreement

[110] Interview with JIBS staff. May 27, 2019.

[111] Recent developments as minuted in a meeting at AAU 19th of June indicate that AAU now propose to let the students go to UGOT, and that the 50/50 split will be abandoned. It is not confirmed, however.

In the first collaboration agreement (2011-2015), budgets were discussed jointly according to JIBS' *Narrative Reports*, but it was JIBS that prepared the budgets and managed all of the funds. This meant that JIBS paid for expenses incurred by JIBS, but also by AAU in Ethiopia and Sweden (travel of AAU students and staff etc.). JIBS was also responsible for accounting for the use of funds and reporting to Sida. AAU's input to the budgeting and fund management appears from the financial reporting to have been very limited, and the responsibility for the use of funds rested with JIBS. While plans and budgets for the next year were discussed with AAU, they cannot be said to have had ownership of the use of financial resources.

This has changed in the new agreement where AAU shall administer and be responsible for all costs and expenditure of Ethiopian origin, like travel and allowances for AAU staff and students going to Sweden. JIBS and UGOT manage their respective budgets for costs and expenditure related to activities at UGOT and JIBS. ISP at Uppsala is contracted to act as the "Coordinating Entity", with the task of administering funds of the Swedish partners.[112]

The transfer of funds to AAU has not meant any additional feelings of ownership at AAU according to interviews with AAU faculty management and leadership, but instead additional bureaucracy and delays in obtaining funds for travel etc. Both the Economics and Management departments had, to some degree, grown used to JIBS managing administrative issues related to the collaboration. JIBS staff fronted the program towards the Embassy and Sida, and in some cases tried to solve problems directly with Sida without involving AAU. Interviewees at AAU stated that "It was very convenient for us."

Few academics are fond of administration, but no project and program can do without it. It is a necessary precondition for institution building that an organization can administrate funds. It might harm both efficiency and effectiveness in the short run, but without internal skills to handle academic cooperation with foreign universities, funded by a donor, there is limited sustainability in the long term.

JIBS' management of the funds in the first phase of project was convenient for AAU, but it reduced their ability to impact the use of resources. AAU staff interviewed did not see this as particularly detrimental to the effectiveness or efficiency of the collaboration, even if the university did not own the resources in the same way as AAU did with the "block grant".

Ability to change direction/activities/systems as part of the collaboration agreement

[112] Sida. "*Terms of Reference Swedish Program Coordination Entity AAU*", Bilaga 2 to agreement ISP/Sida; 2018.

The first agreement was short (2011-2015) and with very few guidelines as to how things should be done. The main changes over the period 2011 – 2018 involved adapting the budgets and the plans to address the slow progression of PhD students. As far as available documentation shows, Sida agreed to everything that JIBS proposed.

JIBS presented plans for the ensuing year in the annual *Narrative Reports*, and there are a number of suggestions like improved co-teaching, co-supervision and more formal follow-up. A review of all *Narrative Reports*, however, shows that these tend to repeat the concerns from the previous year e.g. the same problems with progression and, broadly, the same suggestions being forwarded. Thus, there are few visible real changes to the program implementation during the first period, despite prescriptions for how to do it "better".

There were no annual planning documents that both partners subscribed to as part of the first collaboration agreement. JIBS wrote the *Narrative Reports* with varying degrees of inputs from AAU. JIBS states that they had frequent face to face meetings to discuss challenges and successes. There is insufficient information available to understand if the changes suggested by JIBS in the *Narrative Reports* had been discussed and agreed with the two other departments.

JIBS have commented on AAU's personnel policy whereby AAU staff at faculty and department leadership level changed frequently. Since 2012 there have been six different heads of the Economics department. The frequent turnover of department leadership may have reduced the ownership by individuals at AAU, made continuity an issue for JIBS[113] and JIBS' role as the manager of the program even more important. [114]

Commitment of time and resources to the activities within each collaboration agreement

Due to limitations in record keeping at AAU, there is no quantitative data available on how much time AAU staff spent on the program. The involvement has included 47 visits by AAU staff to JIBS and the time co-supervisors spent supervising the 52 PhD students. In addition to the supervision and academic discussions, for AAU staff there have been administrative tasks and follow up with coordinators, managers, and with Sida and the embassy.

[113] As commented on by JIBS in several interviews that the change in AAU staff and leadership meant lack of involvement by some individuals.

[114] AAU comments: "Changes in the departmental chairmanship ends every three years per to AAU senate regulation. Even before three years a chair can resign if there is a sabbatical or administrative leave. So no link at all with the stated project."

Both Department Heads in CBE maintain that they have invested a lot of time in the collaboration; staff get nothing extra for working with the project. The project is implemented as per Ethiopian rules with travel according to Ethiopian regulations. It is, according to AAU, well integrated in AAU's normal operation. With regard to efficiency, there are advantages and disadvantages with using AAU administrative routines, but with regard to ownership, it is positive.

JIBS expresses worries about the lack of commitment from AAU's faculty in the 2017 *Narrative Report*: "There is a risk that collaborations of this kind become more of gap filling than true institutional capacity building if the AAU faculty does not involve in the delivery of the partnership. This is especially true if the partnership solely focuses on the production of PhDs. To involve and engage AAU faculty in research, will not only assist their academic careers, but step by step increase their involvement in the whole program." If AAU's faculty fails to become engaged it risks becoming a program focused on individuals, with AAU reaping fewer collective benefits. This could reduce the university's commitment and interest in the program even further. Of course, at this time a new program was already proposed that included broader organizational strengthening through joint research and other activities intended to benefit the departments as units.

Management and JIBS coordination of the Program

The first phase of the collaboration was characterized by design weaknesses in, among other features, management and organization. The fact that JIBS alone reported to Sida, meant that AAU was one step removed from the responsibility of achieving the aims of the collaboration. The lack of a result framework, LFA or similar, cannot be said to be in accordance with good management principles. The collaboration between AAU and JIBS was discussed in the annual meetings with Sida under the broader Block Grant agreement, but only as one of many sub-items.

This structure left JIBS responsible for, responding to and as main contact point for Sida. The ownership of the Sida-contact is an additional manner of controlling the message to Sida. The coordinators at the two departments in AAU did coordinate with JIBS, and discussed program issues with JIBS staff. There are unfortunately no minutes from any of those meetings during the 2011 – 2018 period, so it is difficult to know the extent of AAU's impact on program decisions. (This has changed in the new program, and meetings of the coordinators are now minuted.)

A finding from this and previous evaluations is that JIBS had a better and more constructive relationship with the Management department than with the Economics department. The main difference appears to be that JIBS and the Management department jointly cooperated in designing the PhD program in Management, while the one in Economics was already established. When asked to rate JIBS' management of the collaboration, the Head of the Management department rated it 5 out of 6 (6 as excellent). The current Head of the Economics department had not been in the job long enough to give a rating, but a former Head of Department rated it as a 5. The overall AAU coordinator for Sida's support, rated it as a 4.

Regarding communication between JIBS and AAU, the Sida coordinator at AAU gave that a rating of 3, while the Head of the Management department at CBE/AAU gave it a top score of 6. The former head of Economics also rated it as 6. While only

indicative, it illustrates that different staff at AAU has had different experiences with the collaboration.

The Embassy gave both management and communication a "4" based on experiences since mid-2016. Reports have been timely, but since result frameworks had not been agreed, it was difficult to evaluate the results as compared to planned results. As noted by the Embassy, the dialogue with AAU had been ad-hoc and on a needs basis. The dialogue has, from time to time, also been challenging due to the turnover of staff at the Embassy and transfer of the research cooperation from Sida/Stockholm to the Embassy. This might have been made easier by a formal review structure. The Embassy further notes that: "The program manager has always been responsive and willing to engage in dialogue. However, the dialogue has mainly reflected the JIBS point of view, and the AAU side has not been properly addressed through the collaboration. This is assessed as a flaw of the agreement structure and collaboration design."

This seems to be recognized by all stakeholders, and the new collaboration includes established teams, joint planning and coordination meetings and responsibilities assigned to departments at AAU, UGOT and JIBS respectively. The lessons from the first program period regarding management and governance of the program seem to have been heeded in the new program, in that responsibilities are made clearer with the introduction of formal procedures. Implementation in practice has yet to be tested.

Conclusion

JIBS contributed positively to the shaping and progression of the PhD studies in both departments, but more so with the Management department. However, the introduction of improved routines was a slow process, and it is only now that these have been made part of the formal PhD framework at AAU. JIBS has helped to introduce several guidelines and tools to the PhD process, in both the Economics and Management departments at AAU. The problem was that it took time for new suggested procedures and formalities to be formally approved in AAU.

JIBS had more influence and impact on the Management department than the Economics department. JIBS participated in designing the admission process, the written tests, and also participated in interviews of potential PhD candidates. There appears to have been closer communication and more inputs from JIBS to the Management department, than to the Economics department. According to a recent report (Watts et al. 2018), both CBE and JIBS reported poor communication between JIBS and AAU. The Ethiopian academics characterized this as JIBS refusing to engage with them. The closer thematic proximity between JIBS and AAU's Management department probably played a beneficial role as well as the joint design of the PhD program in Management – as the relationship between JIBS and AAU's Management department seen to have been a major contributor to the success of the Management department's growth in competence (PhDs) and capacity do deliver high quality courses.

The indications are that AAU's ownership of the first collaboration agreement was limited. This conclusion is based on the fact that JIBS managed all the resources, planned, reported to Sida and was the main contact point for Sida/the Embassy. AAU

department leadership changed frequently and there was a lack of formal procedures for joint management of the program. Nor did the program have clear, measureable objectives established against which success could be objectively monitored. JIBS emphasizes effectiveness concerns; that JIBS had to take responsibility when nobody else did – further showing that JIBS' assumed ownership of the objectives and the program. On the other hand, the program was, according to both JIBS and AAU, jointly designed and the objective, to graduate PhDs, was clearly AAU's objective. This situation was not truly changed until the new collaboration agreement came into force in July 2018.

Annex 6 - Country report: the JIBS-UR Collaboration

by Michael Watts

Design of the collaboration agreements

Research cooperation between Sida and what was then the National University of Rwanda (NUR) started in 2002 and, at the time of reporting, has been implemented in four phases:

- phase one from 2003 to 2006, with a total budget of SEK 78 million;
- phase two from 2007 to 2013, with a total budget of SEK 185 million;
- phase three from 2013 to 2019, with a total budget of SEK 364 million; and
- phase four from 2019 to 2024, with a total budget of SEK 332.8 million.

Fieldwork for this evaluation took place at the very end of the third phase.

The University of Rwanda (UR) was established in 2013 through the merger of NUR and six other public universities and the cooperation was formally transferred to UR. The collaboration with JIBS began in phase three (2013 to 2019) with, what was then, the Faculty of Economics and Management (FEM). The creation of UR saw the establishment of the College of Business and Economics (CBE) which then became the Rwandan partner in the collaboration with JIBS.

FEM had been very focused on teaching with very little research; the Economics faculty had few staff with PhDs and none of the staff in Management had PhDs. FEM was described by senior CBE staff as being good at knowledge transfer but not knowledge generation. It had a research-based PhD program but very few students on it. It was noted that lecturers on the MSc programs had good mastery of *what* to teach but not *how* to teach. FEM, and then CBE, therefore needed to improve the quality of its PhD and MSc programs and the academic environment in which they are delivered. UR management and Sida noted that the collaborations with JIBS involve more support for MSc and wider capacity building programs than other sub-programs.

The first collaboration between FEM/CBE and JIBS (2013 to 2019) was for the sub-program *Economics and Management*. However, under the new agreement (2019 to 2024) there are separate sub-programs for CBE's School of Business (SoB) and School of Economics (SoE). JIBS, together with the Karlstad Business School at Karlstad University and Umeå University, is collaborating with the SoB through the sub-program "Sustainable socio-economic transformation of Rwanda through relevant management research of high quality". The SoE is collaborating with the University of Gothenburg (UGOT) through a second sub-program: "Sustainable socio-economic transformation of Rwanda through relevant and high-quality economics research".

Collaboration agreement 2013-2019

Sida requested a concept note from NUR addressing where it saw itself in 10 years. FEM contributed to the NUR concept note, highlighting its needs, particularly the importance of developing its research capacity. Sida circulated the NUR concept note to Swedish universities which were invited to express interest in collaborations. JIBS responded to the FEM-focused section.

NUR then sent a delegation to Sweden to make presentations to different universities to find out how they might respond to NUR's needs. JIBS was the only university to respond. UR management and some senior CBE staff subsequently acknowledged they had wanted to work with other universities as they knew little about JIBS at the time. However, they also recognised that it was better to collaborate with JIBS than not have a collaboration and that JIBS had responded to the needs and interests highlighted in the concept note. These included substantive and theoretical issues (e.g. addressing Family Businesses from different perspectives, including Management, Leadership and Economics) and capacity building (e.g. support for PhD and MSc programs and the need to write and publish papers).

FEM staff travelled to Sweden, and JIBS' staff visited NUR. The drafting of the proposal was done jointly according to both parties. The FEM management had concluded that it would be better to submit one LoI rather than two and so it addressed the needs of both departments (i.e. Economics and Management). UR management and CBE management and senior staff acknowledged that FEM and JIBS worked well together to produce and agree on a feasible LoI.

The agreed proposal (as summarised in subsequent progress reports following the creation of UR) had the overall objective: "To enhance research, teaching, capacity building and the use of scientific knowledge of international quality that contributes to Rwanda's development". It was envisaged that the partnership would strengthen the SoB and SoE by training its staff to PhD level, reviewing its Masters' programs and developing in-house PhD programs needed for the development of Rwandan public and private sectors. This was to be achieved through the following specific objectives:

- establishing an environment more conducive to research and postgraduate training in the areas of Business and Economics at the University of Rwanda;
- increasing the number of PhD and Masters' degree holders within the field of Economics and Business Management in Rwanda, through the Program;
- increasing the quantity and quality of research within the field of Economics and Business conducted at the University of Rwanda, through the Program;
- increasing the use of research and competences produced at the SoB and SoE within the Program, in political decision and policy making in Rwanda; and
- increasing the use of research and competences produced by the SoB and SoE at UR and within the Program, by the Rwandan society at large.

The agreement between JIBS and Sida was signed in July 2013. An amendment to that agreement was signed in November 2014 following the formation of UR and CBE. The main change acknowledged the need for some budgetary adjustments because CBE now operated at several campuses across Rwanda.

The objectives, established in the results framework as part of the proposal and addendum to the proposal was monitored in the *Annual Progress Reports*. The objectives were realised through:

- the recruitment of eight students to the JIBS PhD program;
- teaching and supervision on the CBE MSc and MBA programs;
- reviews and revisions to home grown PhD and M-level programs;
- development of the Career Development Initiative (CDI); and
- workshops and seminars.

Collaboration agreement 2019-2024

Negotiations between CBE and JIBS for the current phase of funding (2019 – 2024) were more complicated, according to both JIBS and UR/CBE. Concerns had been raised about the capacity of JIBS to provide appropriate support to the SoE and further concerns had been raised by UR management about the capacity building elements of the earlier collaboration.

A similar process to the earlier collaboration was followed but CBE developed two LoIs: one focusing on a proposed collaboration with JIBS (in partnership with Umeå and Karlstad Universities) to support the SoB; and one focusing on a proposed collaboration with UGOT to support the SoE.

However, the CBE sub-program coordinator perceived that Sida was reluctant to accept two proposals from the same College and so CBE was invited to submit a single proposal. UR and CBE management acknowledged the advantages of submitting a single proposal, albeit one that clearly distinguished support for the two Schools, and so worked on that. However, as reported by UR management, discussions between the three main parties to the proposed collaboration – CBE, JIBS and UGOT – became increasingly difficult. It was reported that JIBS (which was now also negotiating on behalf of Umeå and Karlstad) wanted to have overall control of the Swedish side of the collaboration and that it refused to reduce its proposed budget in line with Sida's recommendations. Moreover, it was reported that JIBS was trying to manipulate costs by inflating the number of courses necessary for the delivery of the PhD program and that it took a 'take it or leave it' approach to UR's requests to change the budget. UR management explained that they would have preferred to disentangle the two elements of the proposal at this stage and drop the involvement with JIBS. However, they agreed to go ahead with the proposal in the knowledge that Sida would insist on the budget being cut. That is, UR effectively delegated budgetary decisions to Sida. Representatives from JIBS, UGOT and UR attended a meeting at UR after which it was made clear that Sida would divide responsibility for the collaboration with the two Schools between JIBS and UGOT.

Two proposals were subsequently finalised and submitted to UR to be included in the overall program proposal:

- One from CBE and the SoB partnering with JIBS (together with the SoB and Economics at Umeå University and Karlstad Business School at Karlstad University) titled "Sustainable socio-economic transformation of Rwanda through relevant management research of high quality".

- One from CBE and the SoE partnering with UGOT titled "Sustainable socio-economic transformation of Rwanda through relevant and high-quality economics research".

The main proposal from UR, *UR Sweden Program for Research, Higher Education and Institutional Advancement*, acknowledges both sub-program proposals and was submitted to Sida by UR in May 2019.

The main objectives of the collaboration between the SoB and JIBS are broadly similar to those of the earlier collaboration but with two important differences: (i) it is limited to work with the SoB; and (ii) there is a greater focus on delivery in Rwanda, particularly in support of the national PhD program. Those objectives are to:

- establish a more conducive environment for research and postgraduate training at SoB-CBE;
- improve the quality and relevance of post graduate teaching at SoB-CBE;
- increase the quantity, quality and relevance of research at SoB-CBE;
- increase the use of research produced by SoB-CBE faculty and faculty in the collaborating institutions in policy making in Rwanda; and
- improve the SoB-CBE interaction with the Rwandan society, industries and communities at large.

These objectives are to be met through support for:

- 12 PhD students recruited to CBE's PhD programs, including at least one year of study in Sweden for up to six students;
- 14 MSc students;
- two SoB staff identified for post-doctoral positions, including up to three months spent in Sweden, to produce up to 15 conference papers and up to six journal articles;
- the development and support for a new MSc program; and
- increased collaboration in teaching and research with regional partner universities.

The main UR proposal includes a similar results framework to that used in the earlier phase for monitoring progress.

Both sub-programs (i.e. the collaboration between the SoB and JIBS and between the SoE and UGOT) include outcome indicators intended to form the basis for monitoring progress with staff from CBE and the Swedish partners sharing responsibility for collecting data on those outcomes.

Monitoring and evaluation

The *National University of Rwanda Overall Proposal* for the *NUR-Sida Cooperation in Research and Higher Education* program for the 2013-18 funding period, dated June 2013, sets out the university's monitoring and evaluation plans. It acknowledges that previous reporting frameworks had focused too much on accountability and had not paid sufficient attention to opportunities to learn from the reported results.

Each sub-program was required to establish a Program Coordination Unit to coordinate the delivery of and document and report the activities carried out through the sub-program. Data and results were to be centrally coordinated by NUR/UR.

The *Overall Proposal* also explained that a framework for monitoring and evaluating activities conducted through the Sida collaboration would be developed and that it would focus on:

- relevance to national development and priorities;
- efficiency in implementation;
- effectiveness and quality of research;
- impact; and
- sustainability.

It would also record how the collaboration contributes to capacity building at the individual, organisational and institutional levels.

The *Addendum to the Full Proposal*, necessitated by the constitution of UR and dated June 2014, provided an early opportunity to present the Program Result Framework. The results framework offers a means of recording the outputs, outcomes, performance indicators, data sources, collection methods and assumptions of each of the program's specific objectives. The results framework was intended for central use for the overall program and there was no indication that sub-programs should use it. However, an amended version was used for the CBE-JIBS *Annual Progress Reports* with a separate results framework used to chart the progress and activities of the PhD students.

Funding

The agreement acknowledged the financial responsibilities of FEM/CBE and JIBS. Funds were disbursed from Sida to the two institutions. This disbursement – which was subject to budgetary adjustments as the sub-program progressed – formally acknowledged the division of responsibilities between the two institutions. The two institutions were responsible for disbursement of the funds allocated to them and for reporting on that disbursement.

The sub-program for Economics and Management allocated a noticeably high proportion of funding to JIBS.

The proposed 2013-18 budget for the Economics and Management sub-program was SEK 29,410,000 of which SEK 8,250,000 (28.1 percent) was to be allocated to NUR/UR and SEK 17,944,000 (61 percent) to JIBS[115]. When compared to the other thematic sub-programs, the proportions to be allocated to FEM/CBE and to JIBS for the 2013-18 funding period were approximately average. However, the reported budgets for the years 2015-18 show that the proportions allocated to JIBS were consistently higher than the average proportions allocated to Swedish partners across the program.

[115] Figures exclude allocations to ISP for subsistence grants in Sweden.

Year	UR-Sida total budget	Total to Swedish partners	Percentage to Swedish partners	JIBS-CBE total budget	Total to JIBS	Percentage to JIBS
2015/16	71,560,000	32,391,000	45%	8,587,716	5,091,000	59.3%
2016/17	69,356,000	39,482,108	56.9%	676,000	410,000	60.7%
2017/18	89,282,148	34,575,524	38.7%	5,925,000	3,469,000	58.5%

The initial 2018-19 budget (i.e. for the extension year) was SEK 4,590,200 of which SEK 1,708,500 (37.2 percent) was to be allocated to CBE and SEK 2,161,700 (47.1 percent) to JIBS. For the 2018-19 period, the initial allocation to CBE was the third highest and to JIBS the second lowest (i.e. proportionately more was allocated to CBE and less to JIBS than across the whole program).

The initial 2019-24 budget for Management Research is SEK 17,779,459 of which SEK 6,208,500 (34.9 percent) is to be allocated to UR and SEK 10,130,959 (57 percent) to JIBS and the other Swedish partners. The initial 2019-24 budget for Economics Research is SEK 9,597,000 of which SEK 4,010,500 (41.8 percent) is to be allocated to UR and SEK 4,884,500 (50.9 percent) to UGOT.

When compared to the other thematic sub-programs, the proportion allocated to UR is approximately average and the proportion allocated to JIBS and the other Swedish partners is the second highest (with Mathematics being allocated a marginally higher proportion at 57.2 percent of the sub-program's total budget). The senior management at UR acknowledged this but also noted that the collaboration with JIBS was effective inasmuch as it achieved more of its objectives than other sub-programs.

Results Achieved

The *Annual Progress Reports* for the academic years 2013/14 to 2017/18 indicate that most of the collaboration-objectives had been met. This was corroborated by UR and CBE management and acknowledged by Sida. Even those in the UR management and CBE staff who were critical of some components of the collaboration acknowledged that the collaboration had enhanced the capability and reputation of CBE.

This section is contextualised by a summary of CBE's staff profile and then considers the main outputs of the FEM/CBE-JIBS collaboration for the 2013-19 period.

CBE Staff Profile

Tracing the increased capacity of CBE is complicated by the creation of UR and CBE during the first collaboration phase with JIBS and by the number of other collaborations between FEM/CBE and other international institutions during the 2013/19 funding phase. A descriptive account of JIBS contribution to capacity development is therefore given below.

The proposal for the first collaboration phase noted that FEM, at that time, had 66 academic staff but only 15 (23 percent) were PhD holders[116] and two PhD students. The most recent records[117] show a total of 142 staff across the two Schools at CBE with 37 (26 percent) holding PhDs and a further 17 (12 percent) currently studying for their PhDs, including four studying with JIBS (below). There is a significantly lower proportion of PhD holders in SoB (collaborating with JIBS for the current phase) than in SoE (collaborating with UGOT):

- SoB has 103 academic staff of whom 16 (16 percent) currently hold PhDs and a further seven (7 percent) are studying for them, including two completing their studies with JIBS.
- SoE has 39 academic staff of whom 21 (54 percent) currently hold PhDs and a further 10 (26 percent) are studying for them, including two completing their studies with JIBS and four studying on the in-house research-based PhD program.

Of the 37 staff across both Schools currently holding PhDs, only 3 (8 percent) are women. Senior CBE staff noted that both Schools have sufficient numbers of competent and qualified academic staff to deliver all the MSc programs (although this does not apply to the new MSc in Contextualized Entrepreneurship which will be jointly delivered by SoB and JIBS staff together with staff from regional universities).

There were some minor discrepancies in the reporting of the the number of staff that are competent and qualified to act as doctoral supervisors. UR regulations allow all staff members with PhDs to become doctoral supervisors. It was also reported, though, that doctoral supervisors should hold the minimum academic rank of Senior Lecturer. Yet at least one PhD holder who only holds the rank of Lecturer is currently co-supervising one of the students on the JIBS PhD program.

It was suggested that approximately 25 CBE staff currently have at least some experience of supervising PhD students through either the existing research-based PhD program and/or co-supervision through the JIBS program. According to UR regulations, about 30 staff are competent to supervise PhD students because they have a PhD degree and have received training through another Sida-funded sub-program.

[116] Although the same document also notes elsewhere that there were 64 academic staff of whom 13 were PhD holders.

[117] May 2019.

The difference between UR's regulations (the number of staff qualified to supervise PhD students according to UR regulations) and practice (the number of staff qualified and competent to supervise PhD students in CBE) can be attributed to issues of quality: CBE staff are required to hold a PhD and to have completed an appropriate training program before they can supervise PhD students. This second requirement currently excludes the four graduates from the JIBS program from the pool of CBE staff who can supervise PhD students as they have yet to complete the training program.

UR and CBE management and CBE staff acknowledged that the collaboration with JIBS had helped improve the academic environment at CBE. However, it was also believed by many staff that some aspects of the collaboration could have been better. This view was more widely held by UR management and SoE staff with the CBE team leader and SoB staff typically expressing more positive views. This last point is not surprising given the history of the collaboration summarised above and examined below. However, the limited data means it is not possible to disaggregate the wider JIBS impact from the impact of other collaborations.

JIBS contribution to strengthening UR's capacity to manage and deliver PhD programs

Three aspects of the sub-program enabled JIBS to contribute to the strengthening of UR's capacity to manage and deliver PhD programs:

- support for the development of the in-house PhD programs in Management and in Economics;
- the enrolment of eight staff on the JIBS PhD program; and
- the potential for co-supervision.

JIBS staff collaborated with their CBE colleagues to develop the course-based PhD programs in Economics and in Management which will be awarded by UR. CBE has its own research-based PhD program but enrolment has been consistently low. The expertise JIBS brought to the design and development of all aspects of the in-house programs were widely acknowledged and appreciated. Those programs have been accredited by the Higher Education Council in Rwanda and, at the time of reporting, candidates are being shortlisted and selected.

Seven junior CBE staff were enrolled on the JIBS PhD program in the 2013/14 academic year and an eighth in 2017. Four have subsequently graduated but all – current students and recent graduates – are considered students here for ease of reference. This was a five year program for the students from CBE. They were required to complete two years of coursework, including nine mandatory and six elective courses, before starting two years of thesis-based research. They were also under contractual obligation from UR to spend a year (i.e. 20 percent of the total program time) teaching at CBE. This was arranged in blocks to facilitate their studies. However, the contractual obligation was waived towards the end of the program to facilitate their completion. The coursework and most supervision took place in Sweden in keeping with the sandwich model used in this collaboration.

Candidates were invited to submit a research proposal and then required to take a written exam and attend an interview in Rwanda with a panel of CBE and JIBS staff.

They were assigned two Swedish supervisors from JIBS from the outset. Rwandan co-supervisors from CBE were assigned later in the program.

Mandatory courses were taken at JIBS. Elective courses were chosen with the guidance of the Swedish (but not the Rwandan) supervisors and most students suggested they were given limited options. The elective courses marked a distinction in the experiences of students from the SoE and SoB. They all reported the option of taking these courses at other universities in Sweden which, as CBE management noted, was necessary for the timely completion of their studies. However, students from the SoB were able to choose courses at JIBS, although some took at least one elective course at another university, while those from the SoE were offered courses at other universities. This was because JIBS was not always able to offer relevant coursework within the timeframe of the students' study periods in Sweden. For students from the SoE, taking courses at other universities was facilitated by JIBS' membership of the Swedish Graduate Programmes in Economics (SWEGPEC).

The need to send them to other universities indicates a limitation in capacity. However, JIBS did have the institutional flexibility to meet those students' needs through its SWEGPEC membership. That JIBS made appropriate provision by arranging for them to attend courses at other universities clearly indicates appropriate flexibility. However, at least one UR Economics student reported that the necessary travel and accommodation costs associated with sending them to other universities were met from the budgets that should have enabled them to attend international conferences. One Economics student explained that the only international conferences he attended were those held in Kigali (i.e. conferences for which costs were met from other budgetary components) and described it as 'very, very poor and unprofessional' [118, 119]. This issue was recognized by UR management and CBE staff but no action was taken as it was seen as being part of JIBS' budget allocation. It is important for JIBS to communicate with UR leadership already at the outset of the collaboration any limitations to the collaboration that may impact on when and where the individual PhD students carry out their course work and any budgetary implications this may have.

These were the only concerns expressed by the students. Although they were initially taken aback as they realised what was expected of them, they appreciated the experience of studying at JIBS. They all noted the importance of studying in a research-focused environment in which they had greater access to online materials

[118] The CBE Team Leader denied knowledge of this matter but it was clearly evidenced.

[119] JIBS subsequently noted that budgets for coursework undertaken at other Swedish universities and for international conferences are separate but did not challenge the main point made here, i.e. that funds intended for attendance at international conferences were used to fund costs associated with the student attending other Swedish universities.

and were constantly, but supportively, challenged about their own research through regular meetings with their Swedish supervisors and at seminars. They all described considerable support from their Swedish supervisors during both the coursework and research phases of their PhDs. Meetings with the Swedish supervisors were frequent and regular. The students appreciated when they were critically examined about their work and that the Swedish supervisors typically had 'open door' policies to discuss issues on and *ad hoc* basis. Work that was submitted to the Swedish supervisors was promptly and carefully commented on and returned.

Here, JIBS met its objective of providing appropriate support to the Rwandan students from UR as they progressed through the PhD program. However, this provides a stark contrast with most reports from the students of the support they received from their Rwandan co-supervisors. Whereas the Swedish supervisors had been appointed as the students enrolled at JIBS, the Rwandan co-supervisors were appointed later, typically as the students were beginning the thesis-based research stages of their studies. This inevitably ruled the Rwandan co-supervisors out of any discussion about the elective courses the students might have taken but it also had a significant effect on their subsequent contributions to their studies. One student noted that his Rwandan co-supervisor had taken an active interest in his studies from the outset. Another co-supervisor had actively provided administrative and personal support and offered constructive criticism of the student's drafts. Other students, though, described limited input from their Rwandan co-supervisors and this goes to the heart of the co-supervisory problem addressed below.

Together with CBE colleagues, JIBS produced a *PhD Thesis Manual* to clarify the learning objectives, aims and expectations of UR PhD theses and so guide CBE students, supervisors and examiners.

JIBS contribution to strengthening UR's capacity to manage and deliver MSc programs

Senior staff at CBE explained that support had been needed to deliver quality MSc programs because of the limited number of staff, including PhD holders, who were familiar with new pedagogies, particularly those focusing on active learning. As they noted, the lecturers had 'mastery of *what* to teach but need support with *how* to teach.'

JIBS staff organised and, with CBE colleagues, conducted reviews of the MSc in Economics and the MBA in Management. JIBS staff are currently supporting the SoB to obtain international accreditation for its MBA program by the European Foundation for Management Development (EFMD)[120]. UR/CBE has conducted its

[120] https://efmdglobal.org/

self-assessment and is awaiting an international peer review session. Along with CBE colleagues, JIBS staff also produced the *Masters Thesis Assessment Manual* to clarify the learning objectives, aims and expectations of UR MSc theses and so guide CBE students, supervisors and examiners.

16 MSc and MBA courses were delivered by JIBS staff in Rwanda and each course was to be co-taught by different CBE lecturers to provide capacity building opportunities. Some staff described co-teaching 'many classes' and acquiring new pedagogic skills and technical knowledge. However, another explained that he was already familiar with the pedagogies used and, having nothing to do but observe, stopped attending. The issue seems to be that it was seen as the responsibility of JIBS staff to deliver these courses and that there was no formal structure for the co-teaching. This necessarily limited the capacity building potential of the co-teaching. It was also reported that the planned delivery of a further three courses did not go ahead.

JIBS lecturers also supervised five MSc theses in Economics and five for the MBA. These were all completed on time and led to the publication of some co-authored papers (although there was no record of the place or number of these publications). Six other students, and their supervisors, were given support during their fieldwork. JIBS staff initially provided supervision for another nine students but they failed to complete their theses in time and were transferred to CBE programs and staff. However, it was reported that JIBS staff continued to provide support for them.

Although CBE management and staff were mostly positive about JIBS' support for the MSc and MBA programs, Sida and some UR management questioned the need for it. The JIBS argument is that wider capacity building is required and the proposal for collaboration between the SoB and JIBS includes provision for the review of current MSc programs, the development of a new MSc program and teaching input from JIBS. In contrast to this, the proposal for collaboration between the SoE and the UGOT for the current funding phase does not include provision for MSc training.

The four graduates from the JIBS PhD program will all be contributing to the delivery of the MSc programs in Economics and Management. The MSc program in Economics will be fully delivered by CBE staff whereas the Management program will be jointly delivered by CBE and JIBS staff. Despite the continuation of JIBS support for Masters level studies, it is clear that CBE's capacity to deliver improved MSc programs has been enhanced by the collaboration with JIBS. Together with these other outputs, the Evaluation Team concludes that the collaboration with JIBS did meaningfully contribute to UR's capacity to manage and deliver MSc programs.

Improved teaching and supervision practices

A key component of the FEM/CBE-JIBS collaboration was to increase the capacity of FEM/CBE to provide PhD and Masters level programs meeting international standards. The sub-program has achieved this inasmuch as it has increased the number of CBE staff with the technical requirements to support programs at both levels. However, there are concerns about the sub-program's delivery of wider support.

Although proposals for the recent and current collaborations with JIBS note the importance of co-supervision, there is only limited evidence of it having happened[121]. Moreover, while some reports imply that co-supervision has been successful, the 2017-18 programme plan clearly states that the 'co-supervision process has not always worked'[122].

As noted above, CBE requires staff holding PhDs to complete an appropriate training program before they can supervise or co-supervise PhD students. This program had been delivered through a separate Sida-funded sub-program but this has not been continued into the current phase of cooperation.

The PhD students all appreciated the support they received from their JIBS supervisors. However, they reported wildly different experiences of support from their Rwandan supervisors – from good and regular support to none. The individual Rwandan supervisors and CBE must take most responsibility for this but it also points to systemic problems in the way co-supervision was perceived.

The type of sandwich program used in this collaboration, with all coursework and supervision delivered in Sweden, meant there was no provision for the joint delivery of the PhD coursework even though the original cohort of seven PhD students may have made this a viable option for at least some of the nine mandatory courses. This may have provided meaningful capacity building opportunities and may have been more cost-effective. However, it would have limited the students' access to the resources at JIBS and other Swedish universities and the experience of co-teaching on the MSc and MBA programs suggests that the potential for wider capacity building opportunities may have been limited. Moreover, the amount of time the students

[121] Different interpretations of 'co-supervision' complicated this aspect of the evaluation. Typically, co-supervisors actively contribute to the supervision of students and contribute substantive and/or theoretical and/or methodological expertise to the supervisory process. In response to the draft report, though, the CBE team leader suggested that co-supervision here was more of an 'induction' process for CBE staff. Such mentoring can be an important part of co-supervision, particularly in a developmental context, but it is not co-supervision as it is commonly understood. No documentary evidence made available to the Evaluation Team supports this unusual interpretation of co-supervision. Furthermore, the evidence for shortcomings in the co-supervisory processes apply equally to shortcomings in this suggested 'induction' process.

[122] UR-Sweden Programme for Research, Higher Education and Institutional Advancement: Programme Plan: Activity period 2017-2018, p. 46.

spent in Sweden facilitated the timely completion of their studies and this may have been negated by time spent in Rwanda.

PhD students registered on the JIBS program should have been allocated two Swedish supervisors and one Rwandan supervisor. In the very loosest of terms, this happened in that three supervisors were eventually allocated to each of the eight students. However, the Swedish supervisors were allocated when the students were enrolled at JIBS and the Rwandan supervisors were added at later stages of the program. This exacerbated a situation in which the Swedish co-supervisors were assumed to have greater pedagogic, technical and theoretical knowledge and the Rwandan co-supervisors might have some insight into local and regional issues. That is, the Rwandan co-supervisors had a lot to learn from their Swedish co-supervisory colleagues. This situation – and its consequent needs – was broadly acknowledged by UR and CBE management and CBE staff. Those needs, though, were not always met.

The two institutions – JIBS and CBE – identified and appointed the supervisors. There was no evidence to suggest that they collaborated in this. The students reported having no say in the appointment of their supervisors but this is not unusual. Although there was no evidence of formal matching procedures, the accounts given by students and supervisors indicate typical processes whereby supervisors are identified by having substantive and/or methodological and/or theoretical interests and experience in the research proposed by students. The appointment of supervisors is then typically dependent on their availability, which is usually related to the number of other students they are supervising, and their willingness to supervise individual students. The accounts given by the students indicate that the appointment of Swedish supervisors was appropriate. However, those same accounts indicate that the appointment of Rwandan co-supervisors was more haphazard. The appointment of inappropriate Rwandan co-supervisors did not seem to influence the students' progress. However, it does call into question what those co-supervisors learned from the supervisory experience and, therefore, then calls into question the capacity building of this aspect of the collaboration.

Nevertheless, some co-supervision clearly took place. One student described the active engagement of his Rwandan co-supervisor. One Rwandan co-supervisor described the administrative support given to his student and detailed considerable practical support given during the data collection needed for his thesis. Other students and co-supervisors, however, described significantly less engagement. Although some co-supervision took place, and the CBE team leader emphasized that the Rwandan co-supervisors had learned from this 'initial training', there was no clear

evidence of them actively and constantly engaging in the supervisory process from start to finish[123].

The views on co-supervision appear to differ between JIBS and the CBE team leader. JIBS' supervisors tried to involve the CBE supervisors in the supervision process by including them in correspondence, deferring to their input and meeting them and the students when visiting UR. However, they commented that the national supervisors were not very active. The CBE team leader, on the other hand, described the co-supervision by UR supervisors as an 'induction' and 'initial training' program in preparation for the launch of the UR/CBE PhD programs. If this was the objective of co-supervision, as seen by the CBE management, and its implications on national supervisors' responsibilities as part of the PhD supervision process, this had not been communicated to either JIBS or the PhD students. Since then, JIBS has reduced the number of supervisors allocated to a PhD with the expectation that national supervisors take on a more active role. As there are differing views on the supervisors' roles, these need to be clarified jointly between JIBS and CBE/UR and clearly explained to all supervisors and to the PhD students.

The collaboration clearly succeeded in developing CBE's capacity to provide doctoral supervision by increasing the number of academic staff with PhDs. However, in the rush to ensure doctoral students successfully completed the program, it missed the opportunity to increase capacity through appropriate training and support for Rwandan co-supervisors. The successes of the PhD students can unquestionably be attributed to the time they spent studying in Sweden. However, this limited opportunities for their Rwandan co-supervisors to contribute to their studies and so limited the wider benefits of this aspect of the collaboration.

Two issues cut through these complexities. Firstly, the data generated from interviews with students and co-supervisory staff indicates that at best there were limited opportunities for CBE staff to develop their supervisory capacities through the collaboration with JIBS. Secondly, the proposals for the collaborations with both Schools at CBE for the current funding phase (i.e. 2019-24) involve significant PhD supervision by staff from Swedish universities. The team leader for the SoB sub-program explained that CBE will provide the primary supervisors for the 2019-24 collaboration and that staff from JIBS (or other universities) will act as co-supervisors. However, this is not made clear in the proposal and there is no indication of how supervision will be conducted if and when students are in Sweden.

[123] The CBE team leader denied knowledge of the matter above when funds intended for a student's participation at international conferences were used to support attendance at other Swedish universities. This raises questions about the extent and nature of communications between Swedish and Rwandan co-supervisors.

Building capacity to deliver PhD training takes time. However, even though some workshops had been offered, there was no evidence to suggest that JIBS had made significant efforts to support CBE's ability to deliver PhD training beyond training the eight students enrolled on its PhD program. This observation was subsequently challenged by the CBE team leader for the first collaboration who noted that there had been 'attempts by JIBS during the seminars on academic writing, theory building etc., to prepare UR-CBE staff to become supervisors' but no other evidence was presented to suggest significant efforts had been made. Recommendations to structure the supervisory process can be found above in the main report and include recommendations on the appointment process, clarifying roles and responsibilities of supervisors and establishing tools to monitor progression of PhDs.

Publications and conferences

UR and CBE management, CBE staff, and JIBS staff all acknowledged the importance of academic institutions generating high quality publications, particularly those published in international journals after having gone through a rigorous peer review process. The 2017/18 *Annual Progress Report* noted that the 'publication record among Rwandan colleagues from the start of the collaboration is impressive, with 200+ publications, in 10 books, in working paper series and in journals.' However, the extent and quality of these publications was challenged by some of UR's management.

Publications are important in the context of this evaluation because:

- UR management and CBE management and staff recognised the need for CBE to raise its international profile and they are an internationally acknowledge indicator of academic quality
- they are needed for promotion; and
- they may constitute the main part of the theses produced by students on the JIBS PhD program.

The third point is regulated by JIBS. There was no evidence from UR or CBE of any formal processes or requirements concerning the number of publications staff should be producing or where they should be published. An unknown number of these publications were generated through JIBS' support for PhD, MSc and MBA students. This support was particularly important for PhD students taking the publications option for their theses. Papers written as part of a PhD thesis have gone through appropriate peer review processes. Students described discussions with their Swedish supervisors on the identification of appropriate journals. However, most of the publications, as a result of the JIBS-UR collaboration, have been published in

journals that were not in any of the journal indexes used in this evaluation (see Chapter 4.1.4 of the main report for a detailed analysis).

The CDI was introduced as a means of raising the academic profile of CBE. It was intended to generate publications in international peer-reviewed journals through a process of support for the development of papers to be presented at conferences and then revised for publication[124]. It was launched in 2014 and ran for four years. 32 CBE staff (eight each year) travelled to Sweden to develop one or more research papers under the mentoring of JIBS staff. It was reported that most papers produced through the CDI were finalised. At the time of reporting, most publications have been in books edited by JIBS staff and published by high quality publishing houses and in the working papers series *East Africa Research Papers in Economics and Finance* which is hosted by JIBS. Both collections have limited academic exposure and authority. The *Annual Reports* also noted that 16 case studies authored by CBE colleagues were finalised and published in JIBS research publication series and made available online. These were intended to provide local teaching material to contextualise teaching with the use of Rwandan case studies.

UR management and CBE management and staff typically disagreed over the value of the CDI. CBE management and staff tended to acknowledge the benefits of some form of publication. CBE staff participating in the CDI appreciated the mentoring support and greater access to online libraries enjoyed by the participants. UR management tended to believe that the time and money invested in the CDI should have led to higher quality publications i.e. international peer-reviewed journals instead of as conference papers and in edited books and in-house collections.

International conferences were held in Kigali in 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2019. As well as providing opportunities for Rwandan academics and scholars to present their work, these typically attracted delegates from JIBS and from the other four African countries with which JIBS is associated either through Sida-funded collaborations and/or its Entrepreneurship and Innovation for Development (EID) program: Ethiopia, Mozambique, Tanzania and Uganda. JIBS also invited affiliates from European and US universities to these conferences.

These conferences provided an early opportunity for CBE staff to present work generated through the CDI as well as to showcase other work. However, there has been no documentation provided to the Evaluation Team to allow for an analysis of the review processes to ensure the quality of the conference papers.[125] Some CBE

[124] The CBE team leader for the 2013-19 collaboration subsequently challenged this by noting that the CDI was 'mainly intended to expose the staff to research culture.' However, the proposals for that collaboration, including the revision necessitated by the formation of UR, has as specific goal and indicator the number of articles in international peer-reviewed journals.

[125] The CBE team leader for the 2013-19 collaboration challenged this observation, noting that the

staff reported that the overall quality of the conference papers was typically poor, which was challenged by the CBE team leader stating that the conference papers were reviewed and ranked by a scientific committee. There was no suggestion that the collaboration encouraged the development and revision of conference papers for publication except through the CDI.

Other support

It was reported that regional collaboration for research and entrepreneurship development had been reinforced and the sub-program had enabled CBE to be a part of the EID program. This was challenged by some of UR's management. However, the CBE team leader for 2013-19 collaboration explained that membership of EID was intended to replicate the benefits of SWEGPEC. There was no evidence of these benefits during the 2013-19 collaboration, except for EID being a vehicle for recruiting delegates to the conferences hosted by UR/CBE, but it is intended to draw on EID to support the delivery of programs during the 2019-24 SoB collaboration.

JIBS staff delivered 17 workshops across several UR campuses between 2014/15 and 2017/18 on topics including:

- academic writing skills;
- thesis writing;
- policy brief writing;
- research proposal writing;
- research dissemination;
- co-teaching; and
- postgraduate supervision.

A monthly research seminar series was organised at CBE. JIBS staff made at least five presentations and PhD students registered at JIBS made at least six presentations.

PhD students at JIBS regularly attended and contributed to research seminars at JIBS.

Between 2014 and 2016, six business outreach meetings – two in Rwanda and four in Sweden – were organised with the intention of supporting Rwandan businesses. However, it is not clear how these meetings benefitted CBE or the collaboration.

Ownership

Involvement in the design of the collaboration agreement, activities, objectives

'papers were reviewed by the appointed scientific committees and they were ranked. Those paper that did not fit to the standards were rejected.' CBE and JIBS were invited to support this challenge with documentary evidence (e.g. copies of the review guidelines) but declined to do this.

Within UR, UR and CBE management were both clear that CBE had ownership of the collaboration. NUR/UR had oversight of the collaboration but FEM/CBE had been responsible for identifying its institutional needs, working with JIBS to develop the proposals, monitoring the progress of the collaboration and reporting on it.

Ownership at the international level has been more complex. UR management suggested that JIBS was trying to take control of the Swedish side of the collaboration during discussions for the current phase and was trying to manipulate costs by increasing the number of courses to be delivered in Sweden. However, UR and CBE management also maintained that CBE had ownership of the collaboration in both phases of support.

CBE had identified its institutional needs and it was broadly acknowledged by UR management and CBE management and staff that JIBS was meeting them. There was, though, a sense of trade-off. It was accepted that the main needs concerning the enrolment of PhD students, support for MSc students and the development of PhD and MSc programs were met. The evidence supports this. The trade-off concerned the wider capacity building elements of the collaboration, including the co-supervision, co-teaching and CDI. The evidence indicates that, although these activities occurred, the quality of provision was lower than might have been expected. This was viewed differently by UR and CBE management. CBE management appears to have accepted this lower level of quality on the grounds that its main needs were being met and that any wider capacity building was better than none. UR argued that the wider capacity building, particularly the generation of publications, should have been of a higher quality. There was no suggestion that either UR or CBE management had challenged JIBS about the wider provision of capacity building until the collaboration was being renegotiated. Nor was there any suggestion that CBE was using its control of its allocation of Sida funding as leverage for improvements to the capacity building until that renegotiation.

CBE recognised the problem that funding intended to allow Economics students to attend international conferences was being reallocated to send them to other Swedish universities for their elective courses. No action was taken, though, until the collaboration was being renegotiated and the SoE elected to collaborate with the UGOT rather than JIBS. The issue here seems to be that this funding was part of the Swedish allocation and that CBE therefore had no control over its use providing the main aim – that is, the successful completion of the PhDs – was being met.

Allowing JIBS to take charge of the teaching and (to all intents and purposes) the research stages of the PhD program does not necessarily imply a loss of ownership. After all, CBE had identified the need to increase the number of staff with PhDs and it was a JIBS program. The delivery of all course-based work for the PhD students

and their supervision in Sweden necessarily increased the costs of the sub-program. The quality of their PhD training in Sweden is not questioned and it is acknowledged that this contributed to the timely completion of their studies. However, at least some coursework and at least some supervision of thesis-based research could have been delivered in Rwanda at a lower cost. This could have potentially provided more opportunities for Rwandan co-supervisors to actively engage in the supervision of the students and therefore increased institutional capacity development[126].

Stronger structures for the co-teaching and co-supervision at MSc and PhD levels would have enabled greater capacity development. It can and should be argued that JIBS, as the partnering institution FEM/CBE turned to for support, should have ensured that those stronger structures were in place. Both sides, however, seem to have been content with the limited capacity development that took place. The failure of CBE to insist on stronger structures needs to be contextualised by JIBS having responsibility for leading on the teaching and supervision. However, even within this context, it indicates a loss of ownership by CBE.

The CDI provided viable publishing opportunities for UR's staff and researchers and opportunities to share these with fellow researchers at conferences organized by UR and JIBS and AAU and JIBS. Staff completing the CDI noted the benefits of greater access to the internet and to e-libraries but this cannot fully justify the greater costs of delivering the CDI in Sweden rather than Rwanda. An alternative would have been for a few JIBS supervisors to visit UR and mentor a number of UR staff and then continue remotely (as was done with the PhDs supervised). The CDI was designed to create a more sustainable research culture, and has been introduced by JIBS in other collaborations. This seems to be an instance of CBE allowing JIBS to take ownership of the capacity building.

What links these issues is that CBE seems to have been content to let JIBS take charge rather than protesting and requiring greater investment in capacity development[127]. Underlying them, though, was the point made by one senior member of the CBE staff: it was better to have the collaboration with JIBS than no collaboration at all. That collaboration enabled the achievement of CBE's main aims of increasing the number of staff with PhDs and developing the UR PhD programs.

Management of the budget and funds in the collaboration agreement

[126] Sida establishes a maximum amount of time and cost for sandwich PhD students, and not a fixed amount. There is thus flexibility to have more course work and/or supervision in the home country.

[127] The CBE team leader for the 2013-19 collaboration challenged this interpretation because 'UR-CBE… proposed the mentorship activity under CDI' but it remains valid because CBE had been willing to accept downgraded outputs instead of insisting that JIBS delver what it had proposed.

The main budget-related issues discussed during the negotiation of the proposals concerned the amount of time allocated to activities in Sweden and the competence of JIBS to support the SoE (with the latter only emerging during the development of proposals for the current phase of funding). Both have implications for the ownership of the sub-program. Concerns about activities in Sweden, particularly the CDI, were mostly voiced by UR management rather than CBE management and staff. Concerns about JIBS' competence to support the SoE led to the ultimate sanction of CBE not seeking to renew that component of the collaboration.

Reports from CBE and UR indicate robust discussions about budgets, particularly for the current funding phase. However, except for the decision of the SoE to enter into discussions with UGOT rather than JIBS for the 2019-24 collaboration, they also indicated a willingness to compromise. Perhaps the most obvious example of this was the delivery of the CDI in Sweden even though its cost-effectiveness and outputs were questioned during the negotiations. Concerns about the budgetary implications of the sub-program were raised by UR management who had the advantage of being able to make comparisons with other Sida-funded sub-programs (see section on funding above) rather than CBE. There were also indications that both UR and CBE management were willing to demonstrate compromise with JIBS on the assumption that Sida would intervene to resolve differences.

Funds for the sub-program were disbursed to the three institutions involved in the collaboration: JIBS, FME/CBE and the International Science Program (ISP) at Uppsala University. The costs met from the JIBS budget included:

- enrolment, coursework and supervisory costs in Sweden for PhD students (including the 8th PhD student admitted later in the funding phase);
- academic support for CBE staff participating in the Career Development Initiative (CDI) in Sweden; and
- teaching, seminars, program development in Rwanda (including staff salaries, travel to and from Rwanda, accommodation and living costs).

The costs met from the UR/CBE budget included:

- travel to and from Sweden for PhD students, CBE supervisors and CBE staff participating in the CDI;
- books and equipment for PhD students; and
- accommodation and living costs for CBE staff participating in the CDI.

The costs met from the ISP budget included:

- accommodation and living costs of PhD students in Sweden.

Once the collaboration agreement was approved, neither CBE nor JIBS exerted any influence over the other's use of the funding[128]. However, this was in the context

[128] The UR/CBE response to this comment was to note: 'That is the nature of the programme. Why one

of most of its components being delivered. There were, though, two illustrative deviations from what had been proposed. The first concerned the enrolment of the eighth PhD student to the JIBS program with the costs being met and divided between the three institutions according to the arrangement above. Here, CBE and JIBS were in agreement about a change that enhanced the sub-program and agreed to meet the extra costs from their allocations of the budget.

The second concerned the reallocation of funds from the JIBS budget intended to send at least one PhD student from the SoE to international conferences to cover the costs of sending them to other Swedish universities for elective courses that could not be delivered by JIBS. This was more problematic as it detracted from the quality of the sub-program. The students, CBE and UR were all extremely frustrated by this but there was no indication that JIBS had been requested to cover both sets of costs or that CBE had been willing to make use of its own funding to ensure the students attended international conferences.

Although there were discussions and disputes concerning the development and delivery of the collaboration, UR and CBE management acknowledged that control of the Sida funds disbursed directly to NUR/UR legitimated their control of it. However, CBE appears to have been willing to accept the allocation of funding according to the agreement rather exert its ownership of the collaboration to challenge JIBS over its own spending. Instead, there was what could be considered a strategic acceptance: CBE was able to meet most of the needs addressed through the collaboration and was willing to accept small deviations from the proposal in return for that. Then, once negotiations about the next funding phase started, it adopted the ultimate budgetary sanction of seeking to discontinue the collaboration between SoE and JIBS.

Ability to change direction/activities/systems as part of the collaboration

There was limited evidence of CBE's ability to make changes to the collaboration except for the SoE's decision to enter into negotiations with UGOT rather than JIBS for the 2019-24 collaboration.

FEM and then CBE identified their institutional needs as part of the negotiations for the sub-program. JIBS responded with what appears to be a standard approach, especially concerning the argument for wider capacity building that includes Masters level support, the CDI and engagement with its regional network of African universities. Once that sub-program had been approved, CBE appears to have been content to allow JIBS to implement it because the main objectives – the increase in staff with PhDs and the development of the national PhD programs – were being met.

---

controls the other, once the activities are planned and approved by the Programme Coordination Office as per the initial signed agreement.' .

However, the SoE began discussing a collaboration with the UGOT during the lifetime of the 2013-19 sub-program. This clearly suggests that although CBE, and particularly the SoE, may have been content to let JIBS implement the collaboration, it was not prepared to continue accepting what it considered to be a comparatively poor collaboration.

Commitment of time and resources to the activities within each collaboration agreement

Academic staff from CBE and JIBS are expected to perform their duties within their existing contracts. This was a particular source of frustration for some CBE staff who believed they should be paid extra for performing these additional duties (this is not unusual in North-South collaboration, particularly when local staff believe international staff are being paid extra). The team leaders from CBE and JIBS, as well as UR management, have all invested significant time in the development of the collaborations. Other CBE staff have contributed to the development of the concept notes and LoIs.

Sida's standard commitment to Swedish universities enrolling students through the research cooperation (two months per student per year) might be considered generous. However, PhD students reported significant support, including what might be characterised as the professional commitment of academic staff (i.e. working beyond their contracted hours). This was also acknowledged by CBE with one senior member of staff noting that JIBS staff replied promptly to emails even if they had been sent at midnight. JIBS supervisors also stated that they spent significantly more time on supervision than is stated in JIBS' procedures.

There are no records or indication of the time commitment required of CBE staff but, as noted above, the time spent co-teaching and co-supervising varied between individuals. There are not formal reports on this from JIBS or from CBE – and, where there was limited input from CBE staff, both parties seem to have defaulted to the position of JIBS staff delivering the supervision.

The time commitment of JIBS staff to the CDI was supposed to be limited to mentoring to UR staff visiting JIBS for two weeks. This limit may have contributed to the fact that the resulting publications were in edited books and working paper series rather than international peer-reviewed journals. CBE staff attending the CDI did so within their contracted time. It was not clear how much additional time they may have invested in developing their papers.

Most resources (e.g. access to online libraries) have been provided by JIBS although CBE was responsible for some of the less costly resources (e.g. books). Sida funds UR's library infrastructure through a separate sub-program and CBE submits annual requests for e-resources.

Management and JIBS coordination of the Program

UR management were involved in developing the proposals for the collaborations and Sida was also involved in managing the development of the proposals for the second phase of CBE-JIBS collaboration. Thereafter, management has been the responsibility of the two collaborating parties – CBE and JIBS.

Despite the disagreements during the development of the proposals, and except as indicated above, UR and CBE management and CBE staff reported that communications with JIBS were good. The management of the collaboration was reported to have been characterised by regular meetings.

Leadership of the JIBS team transferred from a senior academic to a coordinator early in the collaboration and the coordinator became the main focal point of communication even though academic staff regularly visited CBE. UR and CBE management acknowledged that the new coordinator was an effective manager and that he oversaw the timely completion of most of the collaboration's objectives. UR management and Sida also acknowledged that the collaboration had a more effective completion rate than other sub-programs.

The change in the JIBS leadership marked a change in communication with UR management and some senior CBE staff noting that the new coordinator often appeared to be pursuing a JIBS agenda instead of focusing on the capacity development needs of CBE (with the CDI being cited as an example of this). This was more clearly articulated by UR management than CBE staff and by staff from the SoE within CBE. However, as noted above, it seems that CBE's approach to managing of the sub-program was strategic in that it was mostly getting what it needed for the required capacity development.

As a joint venture, the expectation is that management should be shared. The *Annual Reports* are jointly signed by the team leader and JIBS coordinator. The reporting mechanisms informing those reports allocate responsibilities to the team leader and coordinator and the budgets clearly indicate the different financial responsibilities of their institutions. There is, therefore, a clear demarcation of responsibilities. Within the limits of those responsibilities, there was nothing to suggest improper or inefficient management at CBE except for the apparent failure to address the issues concerning co-teaching and co-supervision noted above. As also noted above, this indicates a default position whereby JIBS assumes responsibility and CBE accepts that.

However, this needs to be put into context. Most activities in the recently concluded collaboration took place in Sweden and were therefore the responsibility of JIBS. Of the majority of the activities, together with the bulk of the funding, was under JIBS' management.

The new UR-JIBS collaboration is only just starting at the time of reporting. Unlike the earlier collaboration, most activities in the new collaboration are to take place in Rwanda (even if the bulk of the funding has again been allocated to JIBS). At this stage it can only be noted that it will be interesting to see if this provides CBE with more obvious opportunities to clearly demonstrate its management of the collaboration.

Conclusion

The collaboration between JIBS and CBE/UR met most of its objectives in a timely manner and several PhD students graduated sooner than anticipated. Support for the PhD students was good and JIBS was able to offer SoB students courses at JIBS while SoE students were offered elective courses at other Swedish universities through JIBS' SWEGPEC membership. The reallocation of funds intended for

international conferences to meet the costs of sending them to other Swedish universities for elective courses was an issue for CBE/UR during the previous collaboration.

The capacity of CBE staff to supervise and co-supervise PhD students was only developed to a very limited extent. CBE and JIBS staff appear to have been willing to overlook this. However, support for the development of in-house postgraduate programs was appropriate and, according to CBE staff, necessary. Although CBE staff appreciated the opportunities offered by the CDI, and recognized that the amount of publications increased substantially, the (possibly too ambitious) objective to publish in international peer-reviewed journals was not met. CBE participation in the regional network does not appear to have yielded any benefits to CBE, yet.

The scientific quality in terms of PhD training was adequate. There were problems with making suitable provisions for students from the SoE but JIBS took appropriate steps to address this. Moreover, these concerns do not appear to have impacted on other activities (e.g. the CDI). Nevertheless, although JIBS has sufficient and appropriate capacity to provide support to the SoB, it had limited capacity to provide similar support to the SoE.

The collaboration has been time-effective, especially with the early graduation of some PhD students, but this was at the expense of wider capacity building opportunities, particularly concerning co-supervision. Also in comparison to other Swedish universities collaborating with UR, a larger part of the total budget was allocated to JIBS. This was due to the number of activities taking place in Sweden, especially the CDI.

Identifying the ownership of the collaboration is not straightforward. It is clear that JIBS had its own model for support and that CBE accepted it in order to secure the collaboration and its benefits. JIBS' budget and activities (the larger part of the collaboration) was managed by JIBS without the involvement of UR and vice versa. CBE/UR was able to meet most of the needs addressed through the collaboration and was willing to accept that JIBS managed a substantial part of the collaboration. Then, once negotiations about the next funding phase started, UR management questioned certain components of the proposed method and showed strong ownership of the next phase in its negotiations with JIBS.

Annex 7 - Country report: the JIBS-UEM collaboration

by Michael Watts

Background

The Universidade Eduardo Mondlane (UEM) has a 41 year history of collaboration with Sida. The current phase of support (2017-22) includes 21 sub-programs: 15 thematic sub-programs addressing research and training and six in cross-cutting key supporting elements (e.g. gender, quality support).

Although the collaboration between the Faculty of Economics (FE) and JIBS is in its infancy, JIBS has demonstrated flexibility in seeking to address the Faculty's needs. However, the adaptability of both partners in the collaboration has been necessitated by problems delivering the initial plans for an over-ambitious collaboration. Nevertheless, both partners have worked together to generate a more feasible revision of the approved collaboration. At the time of reporting, that revision has yet to be approved by Sida.

UEM wants to shift from being a teaching-led to a research-led institution. The FE was described as currently lacking the critical mass to engage in research. Of 42 full time staff in the FE, only nine hold PhDs and too many staff with Masters degrees are teaching Masters courses. The FE also wants to raise its academic profile through the generation of research projects and the publication of academic articles. It wants to address this through the development and delivery of its own PhD programs but this requires sufficient academic staff with the necessary qualifications and experience to teach and supervise PhD students.

Capacity development is currently supported by a Portuguese-funded collaboration with the Instituto Superior de Economia e Gestão da Universidade de Lisboa (ISEG). Graduates will be awarded their PhDs by UEM. Two course-based PhD programs are mostly delivered in Mozambique by Portuguese staff. There are 11 PhD students enrolled on the program and seven of them are FE staff. Portuguese funding for these programs will not be renewed when they end. The FE's own PhD programs in Economics and Management, which were approved by UEM and accredited by the National Council on Quality Assurance in Higher Education (CNAQ) prior to the collaboration with JIBS, are based on these Portuguese programs and were developed with support from ISEG.

Design of the collaboration agreement

The FE had been involved in a long-standing partnership between UEM and Sida in the past (1991-94). It had begun the process of registering interest in the previous phase of Sida funding (2011-2017) but its *Concept Note* had not been put forward by UEM because it did not comply with Sida requirements. Recognising that the FE

could benefit from Sida-funded collaborations, UEM therefore prioritised the FE's needs as the university prepared for the current phase of that funding.

Research cooperation 2017-2022

When Sida announced the current funding phase the Cooperation Office requested department and faculty heads to produce concept notes highlighting their needs and their plans for addressing them. A delegation from UEM, led by the Rector, then went to Sweden to present these concept notes in March 2015. This was intended to encourage interest from Swedish universities in collaborating with UEM. Presentations were made to several universities and the concept notes were then posted on the Sida website to further encourage engagement with Swedish universities.

JIBS showed interest in collaborating with the FE during these presentations in Sweden and established direct contact with the FE. No other universities showed interest, and the two institutions then began to develop a joint proposal.

The overall objective of the sub-program, as recorded in the proposal submitted to Sida, is: 'To strengthen the capacity to generate scientific knowledge and increase research output and innovation for national and regional development in line with UEM vision and mission.' The proposal has gone through several iterations. The original proposal was to train 24 PhD students (16 in-house at FE and eight in Sweden at JIBS) at a cost of SEK 52m. Much of this cost was attributable to the amount of activity planned to take part in Sweden. The activities in Sweden included PhD students undertaking coursework and supervision and FE staff attending capacity building programs which initially included lecturing MSc and MBA students at JIBS. It also included sending MSc students to Sweden for part of their studies. UEM had recognised that this was an exceptionally high budget but was prepared to put the proposal to Sida as the FE had not recently been in receipt of Sida funding and was anticipating being able to recruit a significant number of PhD students. Sida insisted that the budget for the proposed collaboration be reduced to SEK 16m. Sida also noted that this initial proposal had a higher proportion of capacity building elements not leading to the award of postgraduate qualifications than other thematic sub-programs and that it involved students and staff spending a lot of time in Sweden.

The revised sub-program was submitted in June 2017 and set out to provide for:

- up to two students to study on the JIBS PhD program in Management and Economics;
- the development of a course-based PhD program in Management and Economics with JIBS staff supporting the teaching and supervision;
- support for the development and delivery of MSc programs; and
- a capacity building program involving short-term research training and focusing on: (i) English language training as needed by FE staff; (ii) the CDI whereby up to eight FE staff would be invited to Sweden each year for four years; (iii) the establishment of a regular seminar series (starting in 2019); and (iv) the establishment of an international conference to be hosted by the FE every second year (starting in 2020).

However, subsequent problems recruiting the two students to study in Sweden (see below) led to further discussions between the FE and JIBS and a third version of the proposal. This involves:

- one student taking a preliminary PhD Competence Development Program (an intensive three month discipline-based program at MSc level) and, subject to passing it and demonstrating sufficient English, studying on the JIBS PhD program;
- increased support from JIBS for the development and delivery of the UEM course-based PhD programs; and
- support for up to 16 PhD students in Mozambique (eight from Economics and eight from Management) studying on the in-house PhD programs with degrees to be awarded by UEM; as well as
- the continuation of support for MSc programs and of the CDI and other capacity building activities.

At the time of reporting, this revised proposal was under consideration by Sida.

Monitoring and evaluation

The Cooperation Office at UEM is responsible for the overall collaborative program between Sida and UEM and has oversight of the collaboration. Regular meetings are held with Sida. Each of the collaborations has a coordinator responsible for day-to-day monitoring and reporting jointly with Swedish and other partners. Sida meets regularly with these coordinators.

The March 2018 Sida-generated appraisal for support to UEM during the current phase of funding noted adequate monitoring and evaluation mechanisms across the university. It noted that Results Based Management (RBM) workshops conducted in 2011 and 2015 had enabled UEM to develop an appropriate results framework and explained that:

- there is a clear description of the intervention's intended outcome;
- here are objectives at different levels that together describe the intervention logic, i.e. how outputs will lead to the intended outcome;
- there are relevant indicators with target values;
- there are baseline values to measure indicators against; and
- the partner's results framework identifies critical assumptions for the achievement of the objectives.

The appraisal also noted that UEM generates adequate financial reporting. It was also noted that the collaboration has not yet had a financial audit.

The *Annual Progress Reports*, uses a leaner framework which records activities, which institution/individual is responsible for them, LFA outputs and status of completion as well as very brief narrative accounts. Senior staff at UEM and FE suggested that the monitoring and evaluation processes for the program and the sub-program were appropriate and that 'the peer review mechanisms in place help in terms of guaranteeing that high quality standards are met.'

Funding

The full program for the current phase has a total budget of SEK 355 million and the average allocation for Swedish partners (excluding ISP) is 36 percent. However, 73.5

percent of funding for this sub-program is currently allocated to JIBS. This is the highest proportion allocated to a Swedish partner across the whole program and is significantly more than the second highest allocations of 58.9 percent for the thematic program "Biocultural Heritage in Mozambique: developing new heritage industries" (SEK 6,475k from a budget of SEK 11 million) and the for the cross-cutting "Quality Assurance of Research and Post-Graduate Training program" (SEK 10,006k from a budget of SEK 17 million).

The initial budget proposed to Sida for the JIBS-UR collaboration, and supported by the Collaboration Office, was SEK 52 million. Sida restricted this and approved a budget for SEK 16 million. The funding for JIBS was intended to support activities in Sweden – including the two PhD places and the CDI – and Mozambique. At the time of reporting, it is not clear how the proposed revision to the sub-program will affect the proportionate payments to JIBS and the FE.

However, the FE wants to use unspent funds that had been allocated for the two places on the JIBS PhD to support the PhD Competence Development Program and the coursework component of the UEM PhD programs. It is intended to use funds provided by the current collaboration with the United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU-WIDER)[129] to support the generation of research articles during the research component of the PhD programs. The FE is aware that these proposed changes mean that PhD students supported by Sida funding will not complete their studies during the current funding phase as anticipated in the approved proposal. It is also aware that there are problems trying to have the Sida funds reallocated to support only part of the program. This, senior FE and UEM staff stressed, is why the research component has been linked to other guaranteed funds.

Results achieved

The outputs from the collaboration have been limited to date and mostly concern preparation for the collaboration. However, the FE has made progress with preparations for the delivery of the in-house PhD programs it proposes to support through the revised proposal.

FE staff profile

The FE currently has 42 full time staff. Nine of them currently hold PhDs. As the FE coordinator explained, 'a lot of effort is being undertaken to change that situation'

[129] https://www.wider.unu.edu/project/inclusive-growth-mozambique-scaling-research-and-capacity

and another seven staff are likely to graduate from the Portuguese PhD programs during the lifetime of the current phase of Sida funding.

The proposal submitted to Sida indicated that five staff were Associate Professors and seven were Assistant Professors. However, an updated staff list records one Full Professor, two Associate Professors and four Assistant Professors. The reasons for this disparity are not clear but can, perhaps, be attributed to limited record keeping concerning part time staff. The FE has a limited number of staff competent and qualified to teach and supervise PhD students. Seven staff are reported to have experience of PhD supervision and three of them were identified as only having co-supervisory experience. This underlines the need for support from competent and qualified staff from JIBS to help deliver PhD training. As well as the limited number of staff with PhDs, the FE has an aging staff profile with only 15 currently under the age of 40 (i.e. the maximum age at which students can be enrolled on PhD programs funded by Sida). Moreover, many of the senior staff are in high demand as external consultants and such work is typically prioritised over academic work.

Also, as a lusophone country, some FE staff have limited English language skills. This was acknowledged by officers from UEM and the FE. The FE coordinator expressed the desire to have all graduate programs delivered in English – which is clearly an important consideration in the context of this collaboration with JIBS – but no clear timeframe was given. There are mechanisms for dealing with language issues (e.g. English language support had been given to FE staff as part of the collaboration) and it may be sensible to ensure they are included in the future. However, it should also be noted that sufficient numbers of staff had sufficient proficiency in English to benefit from the CDI (although it was not clear if any or all of them had also benefitted from the language support made available through the collaboration).

JIBS contribution to strengthening capacity to manage and deliver PhD programs

JIBS' contribution to the strengthening of the FE's capacity to manage and deliver PhD programs needs to be contextualised by support from other donors and the difficulties experienced in delivering the FE-JIBS collaboration.

There were considerable problems recruiting and selecting candidates for the JIBS PhD program. The FE had hoped that there would be many candidates and that those who were unsuccessful could then be re-directed to the in-house programs. However, the potential pool of candidates was restricted by the Sida requirement that applicants must be aged no more than 40 and this ruled out applications from many FE staff. There was a limited number of applications and only one candidate met the standards required by JIBS. Other candidates failed because of their limited academic qualifications and/or English language skills. However, the successful candidate then dropped out, citing delays in the admission process at JIBS – from July 2018 (when he was accepted) to April 2019 (when he dropped out). This then led to the recall of the applicant with the next highest ranking, even though he had initially failed to directly secure a place. At the time of reporting, he had been admitted to the PhD Competence Development Program and was taking language classes as a condition of being subsequently admitted to the JIBS PhD program.

Senior FE staff acknowledged that this has been frustrating but recognised that – subject to Sida approving the proposed changes to the sub-program – it has allowed them to focus on the in-house PhD programs. They also acknowledged that JIBS has been supportive of these proposed changes.

It had been intended to develop in-house course-based PhD programs in Management and Economics during the collaboration. Although not specified in the proposal, they were to be based on the programs developed through JIBS' collaborations with AAU and UR. However, when the FE reviewed the programs proposed by JIBS it was concluded that the content was too similar to the existing in-house programs supported by ISEG to merit development. However, the FE working group established to review the programs proposed by JIBS recommended that some of their content be added to the existing in-house programs.

The in-house programs will include one year of coursework and two years of research. The FE acknowledges that applicants are likely to be academically weak and they will therefore be required to undertake a preliminary PhD Competence Development Program. Recruitment is currently underway. It is expected to begin the PhD Competence Development Program in late 2019 and to start delivering the PhD programs in early 2020. The intention is to recruit a pool of potential 40 candidates who will go through a staged recruitment process:

- Up to 40 candidates – 20 each for Economics and for Management – will be selected for the preliminary PhD Competence Development Program. Up to 12 students from each course will then progress to the next stage. It is anticipated that they will have scored a minimum of 14/20 (70 percent) for the coursework.
- The 12 students from each course selected from the PhD Competence Development Program will then take the coursework component of the PhD programs.
- At the end of the coursework, up to eight students from each course will then be selected to complete the PhD programs.

The programs will be delivered in Mozambique but students progressing to the research stage will be allowed to study in a country of their choice for up to one month providing suitable supervisors can be found and pending UEM and Sida approval.

It is expected that most of the teaching for the coursework will be provided by JIBS staff or staff from other universities. This is particularly important for courses where FE staff lack sufficient expertise (e.g. micro- and macro-economics). It is therefore similar to the initial agreement with the important difference that the coursework will be delivered at UEM rather than in Sweden. ISEG has agreed to contribute to the delivery of the programs in principle and subject to funding being made available. As noted above, UNU-WIDER will support the generation of research articles during the research phase of the programs. However, it is expected that FE staff will provide at least some input to the taught components of the programs.

At the time of reporting, the call for applications for the JIBS PhD program had been launched and candidates shortlisted and interviewed. It was not clear how much input JIBS provided on the development of the PhD Competence Development Program but preparations are currently being made for JIBS staff to help deliver it.

JIBS contribution to strengthening capacity to manage and deliver MSc programs

The two UEM MSc programs in Economics and in Management had been developed with support from ISEG and accredited prior to the collaboration. JIBS had no role in this process but is currently reviewing them with a view to ensuring they meet international standards.

50 candidates are currently undertaking a two month induction course prior to the selection of 35 students for the programs starting later in 2019. It is expected that JIBS will provide input to the delivery of these programs but, at the time of reporting, that has not been finalised.

Improved teaching and supervision practices

The FE readily acknowledges that its staff need to develop their technical knowledge and pedagogic skills and it is anticipated that the collaboration will provide opportunities for co-supervision and co-teaching. However, delays to the implementation of the PhD and MSc programs mean that there has been no co-supervision or co-teaching to date. Insights from the CDI (below) suggest that at least some FE staff are keen to make use of these opportunities.

Publications

Seven papers have been presented at international conferences. Two were co-authored by a PhD candidate from UEM and a JIBS professor. The others were sole- or co-authored by FE staff. The two papers co-authored with the JIBS professor have both subsequently been submitted to journals for publication. These two papers were generated through the CDI.

The CDI involves FE staff submitting proposals for a paper to be developed under the mentorship of JIBS staff in Sweden. The intention is that papers should be further developed for presentation at an international conference and then published. The collaboration makes provision for up to eight FE staff to travel to Sweden each year for four years. If more than eight staff apply in a year, JIBS reviews the proposals and selects the eight with the most potential. The call for applications to the CDI was launched in 2018. The call for applications had to be repeated, as there were few applications. Nevertheless, those staff who did attend the first iteration of the CDI were mostly positive about it. Eight faculty members travelled to Sweden to work on the development of papers under the guidance of Swedish supervisors. They spent two to three weeks in Sweden, during which they had regular meetings with their supervisors, made good use of the better connectivity and access to online libraries at JIBS and attended seminars. Four of those eight attendees returned a questionnaire about their experiences of the CDI. The responses were mostly positive and included:

'In general, the work performed was of fundamental importance, as it allowed through meetings with the mentor / supervisor:

- Analyse and discuss in depth with the mentor / supervisor the proposed research topic;
- Access to the library (physical and virtual), taking advantage of the detailed explanation of some pertinence;

- questions that arose during the meetings, as well as, the aid in the search of articles in scientific journals;
- Participation in the research seminars held by PhD students.'

And:

'The direct interaction with the research professors of Jönköping International Business School (JIBS) had an impact of fundamental importance, as it allowed me to acquire fundamental knowledge for job research. Direct interaction with the mentor / supervisor has made it possible to uncover analysis opportunities for a greater breadth of job research so that, after feedback, research can be developed in a more concise manner and with the internationally required scientific methodology.'

There have been at least two conference presentations generated through the CDI and both have been submitted for publication. Both were co-authored by a PhD candidate from FE and a professor from JIBS. Additionally, the four respondents returning the questionnaire reported producing five draft papers, including one paper submitted for publication (although the title of the journal was not given).

One attendee stressed that she had continued to receive support on returning to Mozambique but another noted that communication with the supervisor ceased two weeks after his return. The CDI is intended to lead to publications and the inference from these two comments is that more support may be needed to achieve that but sufficient support may not be given.

Other support

English language training was provided at UEM for 21 FE staff.

Ownership

Involvement in the design of the collaboration agreement, activities, objectives

Senior officers from the FE and UEM emphasised that the FE had ownership of the collaboration and its development, particularly concerning the proposed revision to the approved collaboration, supports this. Once JIBS had expressed interest in the potential collaboration, UEM delegated responsibility for developing the proposal to the FE. Ownership on the Mozambican side of the sub-program was therefore clear: although UEM was willing to provide support, the FE was in charge.

It was noted that JIBS has been willing to listen to FE concerns and has been flexible in addressing them. It was clear that FE and JIBS both had their own agendas but these coincided around the desire to significantly increase the number of PhD holders at the FE and to enrol a large number of PhD students. However, subsequent problems with the enrolment of students onto the JIBS PhD program and the proposed development of an in-house PhD program necessarily raise questions of due diligence. The FE sub-program coordinator acknowledged the desire to enrol that many students but JIBS appears to have been too ready to agree to this.

It also seems clear that JIBS was too ready to promote the development of the in-house PhD program based on its collaborations with AAU and UR and that the FE was too ready to accept it. Neither side seems to have given sufficient consideration to its value to the FE. However, the FE subsequently demonstrated its ownership of the sub-program when declining to continue with the development of this proposed

PhD program (below). Disagreements concerned the extent of capacity building activities not leading to academic qualifications proposed by JIBS and the resolution of those issues tends to indicate greater ownership by the FE.

The team leaders from the FE identified on the FE-JIBS proposal eventually submitted to Sida were the Dean and Deputy Dean. The Deputy Dean was subsequently promoted to Faculty Director and given responsibility as the FE coordinator of the collaboration. That proposal also identified a professor and manager as the team leaders from JIBS. However, senior staff at UEM and the FE only referred to the manager when communications with JIBS were discussed. That is, whatever the proposal stated, the effective team leader from JIBS was a manager. This meant that the discussions for the development and subsequent implementation of the collaboration mostly took place between an academic from the FE and a manager from JIBS.

There appears to have been little communication with academic staff from JIBS during the development of the collaboration and this raises the question of how far this influenced what was agreed. For example, the presentation for the proposed in-house PhD program – given to the FE once the collaboration was underway – was made by a senior academic from JIBS: the professorial team leader named on the collaboration. It is possible that FE's decision not to progress the development of this PhD program could have been made at an earlier stage if suitably academic discussions had been held during the planning of the collaboration.

Senior officers at UEM and the FE emphasised that the FE had taken the lead in making clear its needs but they also noted that there had been disagreements with JIBS. Officers from the Cooperation Office explained that managing the development of the collaboration with JIBS had been more difficult than managing the development of other sub-programs. Problematic issues that were reported included the number of PhD students to be enrolled at JIBS and on the in-house PhD programs, the language of instruction for the in-house PhD programs, the nature of the proposed CDI and the involvement of FE in the EID program which links universities in Ethiopia, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda. These issues were eventually resolved and a jointly agreed proposal for the collaboration submitted to Sida. Moreover, the proposed revision to the sub-program suggests that the FE and JIBS have been willing and able to discuss and address concerns (see below). However, even though these issues were resolved inasmuch as there is current agreement between the FE and JIBS concerning their resolution, they do indicate concerns around the issue of ownership in the design of the sub-program.

Perhaps the greatest concern here is the over-ambitious initial proposal that had intended to train 24 PhD students, including eight in Sweden on the JIBS PhD program. The two institutions had initially agreed this number but, with this acknowledgement, there is a lack of clear evidence indicating which one was primarily responsible for what was obviously a considerable miscalculation. The FE sub-program coordinator acknowledged that the FE had proposed these numbers to meet its institutional needs but this requires closer analysis.

The FE recognised the difficulties of recruiting potential PhD candidates with sufficient competences (and has been addressing this through the development of the PhD Competence Development Program). Senior UEM officers recognised that this

initial proposal was extremely costly and believed that JIBS was seeking to prioritise its own agenda (although it delegated responsibility for developing the proposal to the FE). Moreover, UEM was prepared to let Sida make a decision about the proposed budget. Taken together, these issues indicate a lack of control from the FE and a willingness to allow JIBS to dictate the terms of the collaboration.

However, this needs to be put into appropriate context. Firstly, that senior UEM and FE officers acknowledged the costly ambition of the initial program but were prepared to let Sida decide the budget suggests they were aware it was unrealistic. Secondly, although clearly over-ambitious, the proposal gave the FE what it wanted: significant input into the development of the in-house PhD programs. Taken together, these issues indicate a more strategic approach to the development of a collaboration that would enable the development of the in-house PhD programs. That is, the FE was prepared to let JIBS recruit students to its PhD program (together with all the financial benefits of that recruitment) in return for further international support for its in-house PhD programs.

This shifts the interpretation of the negotiations from a lack of control from the FE to a strategic concession. JIBS would have the opportunity to recruit up to eight students to its PhD program (which, although not all of them would necessarily have been recruited from current FE staff, would potentially benefit the FE by increasing the number of academic staff holding PhDs) and the FE would have significant support for its in-house PhD programs. This was a win-win situation for the FE indicating ownership.

Yet this interpretation cannot disguise the readiness of JIBS to agree to an unrealistic initial proposal and should have been preceeded by a thorough and joint due diligence process.

UEM and Sida had expressed concerns about the CDI and the need for it to take place in Sweden. Although JIBS had proposed the CDI, basing it on a similar capacity building program already used in its collaboration with the College of Business and Economics at the University of Rwanda, the sub-program coordinator from FE acknowledged its benefit and supported it.

A clearer example of FE ownership concerned the EID – the network of universities in Sub Saharan Africa organised by JIBS. JIBS wanted the FE to join the network but it has declined to do so yet. Several reasons were given. A senior UEM officer suggested that the FE had not joined because it would not contribute to its own capacity building but the sub-program coordinator subsequently indicated that he was waiting to see what benefits it would bring.

Management of the budget and funds in the collaboration agreement

The proposal allocated responsibilities to the two collaborating institutions. Management of the budgets and funds should therefore have been clearly demarcated. However, this situation was upset by the necessary changes to the collaboration and it was reported that only 40 percent of the year-by-year budgets had been spent.

It was also reported by UEM and FE officers that there had been robust discussions between the FE and JIBS concerning the activities to be included in the collaboration and therefore of its costs. The increased number of students (see above) and the increased number of activities taking place in Sweden (e.g. CDI) would have

increased the funding allocated to JIBS. The FE was more concerned to establish the collaboration and so presented only limited resistance to this. However, this limited resistance took place within the context of knowing that Sida would query the proposed budget. Within this strategic concession, the costs to be met from the JIBS budget would have included:

- enrolment, coursework and supervisory costs in Sweden for PhD students;
- academic support for FE staff participating in the Career Development Initiative (CDI) in Sweden; and
- teaching, seminars, program development in Mozambique (including staff salaries, travel to and from Mozambique, accommodation and living costs).

The costs to be met from the UEM/FE budget would have included:

- travel to and from Sweden for PhD students, FE supervisors and FE staff participating in the CDI;
- accommodation and living costs for PhD students, FE supervisors and FE staff participating in the CDI; and
- books and equipment for PhD students.

However, if the FE took a strategic concession approach to the budget for the approved proposal, it has taken a far more dynamic approach to the budget for the revised proposal. It has driven this revision which involves significantly more activity in Mozambique. The FE has also been responsible for identifying funds for the research phase of the PhD studies which will take place after the end of the current funding phase. The revised proposal will still involve considerable input from JIBS, and therefore considerable allocation of the budget to JIBS, but this will be geared towards what the FE wanted from the collaboration: a greater focus on the development and delivery of the in-house PhD programs.

Ability to change direction/activities/systems as part of the collaboration

The development of the revised proposal provides clear evidence of the FE's ability to take ownership of the collaboration. Senior staff at UEM and FE acknowledged that the in-house PhD programs are the main focus of capacity building at FE. It has been central to all iterations of the collaboration, from the over-budgeted initial proposal to the proposed revision of the currently approved sub-program. The proposed revised proposal centres on activity in Mozambique that has accelerated the development and delivery of the in-house PhD programs. As one senior member of UEM staff observed: 'If the curriculum approved by UEM for the current PhD [i.e. the programs developed with ISEG] were to be adopted, rather than JIBS trying to introduce one of its own, it would be a desirable situation.' FE appears to have demonstrated its ownership of the sub-program by insisting on that desirable situation.

Commitment of time and resources to the activities within each collaboration agreement Management and JIBS coordination of the Program

The problems delivering the activities outlined in the approved proposal have impacted on intended time commitments. The two team leaders invested significant time in developing that proposal. That time commitment was increased by the extended discussions needed to scale back the proposed activities. The robust

discussion between the FE and JIBS also necessitated time commitments from UEM and Sida.

The development of the revised proposal has been led by the FE team leader but further time commitments have been made by the JIBS team leader to secure agreement. JIBS staff will contribute to the delivery of the PhD Competence Development Program and the in-house PhD program but, at the time of reporting it was not clear how much time commitment will be required and can be agreed. FE and JIBS staff working on these programs will do so as part of their institutional contracts.

The time commitment of JIBS staff to the CDI is difficult to assess but it clearly varied between individuals. Support for FE staff in Sweden was provided within their contracted time. Some, but not all, mentors subsequently invested further time in providing support to FE staff on their return to Mozambique and it can be reasonably assumed that this was done outside of their contracted hours.

JIBS provided FE staff with access to online libraries while they were in Sweden for the CDI. Access to online libraries in Mozambique is limited.

Management and JIBS coordination of the Program

Senior UEM officers and Sida were involved in managing the development of the proposals for the overall program. Concerns about the scale of the initial proposal for the FE-JIBS sub-program also required their involvement. However, management has mostly been the responsibility of the two collaborating parties – the FE and JIBS.

Although there were robust discussions about the development of the proposal, senior UEM and FE officers described good communications with JIBS. The management of the one student initially selected for the JIBS PhD program was poor and required more effective management, particularly from JIBS.

The development of the revised proposal indicates stronger management from the FE and highlights its strategic approach to the collaboration: what could be interpreted as too many concessions to JIBS indicates a clear focus on the capacity development required by the FE.

Conclusion

There are a limited number of conclusions that can be drawn from this collaboration as it is in its infancy and planned activities have not happened.

The proposal drafting process appears to have been over ambitious on the part of both stakeholders and not based on a thorough and joint due diligence of UEM's needs. This resulted in a series of issues at the start of the collaboration necessitating a substantial re-write of the collaboration, activities and budget. This has been presented to Sida in a revised proposal yet to be approved. The FE has shown strong ownership during the process of submitting a new proposals. The new proposal increases the number of activities taking place in Mozambique and therefore offers greater potential opportunities for capacity development (e.g. through the co-supervision of PhD students).

The scientific quality of the sub-program cannot be fully determined at this early stage. However, the FE has been working with JIBS to ensure that appropriate and

necessary courses are included in the PhD Competence Development Program and the in-house PhD programs.

Annex 8 - Comments from stakeholders on Draft Report addressed

Comments addressed on the **Draft Report on Evaluation of Jönköping International Business School's (JIBS) collaboration with Sida partner universities in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Mozambique** dated 2019-08-01

Sida's general comments on Draft Report	Comment by Evaluators	Change to report
The chapter on cost efficiency (4.3) could have been more elaborated. We assume that its weakness is connected to the limitations of the chosen methodology and the limited availability of necessary data. At least a note on that would be useful.		Sentence added in section 4.3.
In the case of Ethiopia, the evaluators point out that the annual supervision cost is relatively cheaper than standard sandwich, but also that it is unclear if this affected the delays and therefore in fact might have made it more expensive. It would be interesting to investigate this further.	There were many reasons for the delays, of which issues at the AAU played a significant role. Key is that students apparently did not spend enough time on their studies. JIBS invoiced only the time spent by their supervisors on each student, and travel to Sweden when students where sufficiently qualified to go (passed exams and tests). Thus, it was the students own progression that drove costs, and not JIBS that budgeted too little for each. The annual budgets were – except for 2014 – never fully used.	-

Regarding AAU; the evaluation should have elaborated and commented more on the what happened during the period 2015-2017. This was a period with a considerable increase of enrolment of doctoral students (against the background of slow progress of the doctoral program from 2011) while at the same time the relevance and effectiveness of the whole economics program with JIBS was questioned (p 69), the Ethiopian government clearly instructed AAU to prioritize natural sciences and technology (p 61), and Sida and AAU agreed on that "Management and economics will be phased out between 2017 and 2021" (Minutes from the meeting at the embassy on 10 March 2016).	This is correct and valuable context information.	Para added in in annex 5.
There are limited links between the findings in the three target areas of the evaluation (ownership, scientific quality and cost efficiency) and the recommendations. For example, there are no recommendations to Sida on how work/change working methods to ensure scientific quality		Recommendations added after each section and at the end.
Recommendations are directed to Sida and JIBS only but not to the embassies and partners. However, they are also intended users of the report and thus recommendations to them are expected from the evaluators.		Recommendations added at end of the main report
The relevance of the recommendations is somewhat unclear. A more explicit explanation on what issues the recommendations address and what changes are these		Recommendations added after each chapter to better show link

recommendations expected to contribute to would be desirable.			
In the draft evaluation there is heavy criticism towards JIBS' management of the partnerships, however, in the recommendations this appears not to be addressed. Are there any specific recommendations that could be directed towards JIBS to ensure that collaborations are managed more effectively?			Recommendations added and reworded for clarity
In general, we miss a more in-depth discussion and analysis of the gender situation in the three partnerships.		There is no reference to gender in the ToR or Inception Report.	Para on gender at AAU added in annex 5.
We find it unfortunate that the organization/timing of the field visits did not seem to have taken in account public holidays and/or availability of key stakeholders. The evaluation would have benefitted from spending more time in the field. Also, it should be noted that the evaluator of Ethiopia arrived when the conflict around supervision between the division of the 8 PhD students in economics was at its peak, which certainly affected many of the discussions and interviews.		The timeframe was short and coincided with graduation periods in all universities. Sida insisted we visit the partner universities in June.	-
In the correct spelling of Sida only the first letter is capital (i.e. not SIDA).			Corrected everywhere in the report.
Page	**Specific comments by Sida**		
iv	Perhaps it could be added "contrary to Sida's purpose to strengthen local ownership as key to achieve sustainability of the support".	The conclusion is correctly phrased based on the Evaluation Team's evidence. Sida may wish to discuss this point separately with the relevant stakeholders.	-
v	It could be of value to briefly explain the aim of		Information added

	CDI the first time it is mentioned.		
v	Strange recommendation/phrasing. What does it really mean?	See above re: recommendations.	
2	Is it really correct? Sida has general guidelines for bilateral research partnerships where it is explicitly stated that the objective of Sida's support is institutional capacity building. There must have been a reference made to this document in the agreement or its annexes. Could you double check? The guidelines is also available on Sida's website (updated in 2018, but originally from 2008 or so).	This was made explicit in interviews between Sida and the evaluation team. It is part of the Sida –AAU agreement, but not mentioned in the JIBS-Sida agreement.	-
3	My understanding is that it is one course-based PhD program in Economics and one in Management and that the funding from Portugal has ended. Future funding seems unclear.		Changes have been made throughout the report to acknowledge the two current in-house programs at UEM/FE. Details of the Portuguese collaboration, including the termination of funding, have been addressed more fully in Annex 7 as this is contextual information rather than information about the JIBS collaboration.
4	"Home-grown" is a very common term in Rwanda, but perhaps in the context of the bilateral research cooperation it would be better to call the programs local PhD/master programs		Wording changed
5	The program has not been evaluated in Ethiopia. If you refer to Watts et al., this is not an evaluation but a review, and it is specifically not an evaluation of the Block Grant.		Report changed to reflect this.

11	Please clarify how much of this progress can be attributed to the collaboration with JIBS?		Clearer explanations of JIBS' contribution to the in-house PhD programs have been made here and in Annex 7 following clarifications from UEM/FE.
11	Accredited by who?	This is no longer relevant as the programs were not developed in collaboration with JIBS. However, a note on accreditation is made in Annex 7.	Sentence deleted in main report.
12	What does it mean?	The text has been revised to make clear that reports of the success of the co-supervisory process were challenged by documentary evidence and evidence from UEM/CBE staff and current and recent PhD students. Revisions have also been made to Annex 6 to explain these concerns in more detail.	Revised text in main report and in Annex 6.
12	It would be good to highlight that these are PhD programs combining course work and research. And the two accredited programs are among the first such PhD programs at UR.		The text has been revised to acknowledge these points.
13	Out of total how many?	It has not been possible to obtain this information and so no revisions have been made to the text.	-
13	What does it mean? What was the exact level of involvement of the CBE staff in the teching?		The text has been revised for explanation Further text has been added to address issues of co-teaching and co-supervision in more detail.

13	What has been the outcome of these conferences other than the "reinforced collaboration"? And what does "reinforced collaboration" actually mean in concrete terms?	Additional analysis of JIBS-supported/organized conferences is presented in chapter 4.1.4	Text changed.
14	I think that the accreditation is the result of the collaboration with the University of Lisbon, who have been teaching and supporting these PhD-programmes. My understanding is that the collaboration with JIBS regarding the PhD programme is in the early stages – please clarify if this is the case.	Changes have been made here and in Annex 7 to provide a more accurate account of the development and accreditation of the programs following clarification from UEM/FE.	Changes have been made here and in Annex 7
14	The evaluation seems to miss the fact that the economics and management programs are the only partnerships with AAU where the supervisors are assigned for only the last two years (i.e. as per the formal requirements in the AAU senate legislation). Compared to the new partnerships (bio-tech and electrical engineering), this leaves the economics and management programmers only "half-funded", when it comes to Swedish supervision. CBE maintain that there is no need for supervision (even Swedish supported) during the first two years, but this was never mentioned or brought up by any of the other collages that happily included Swedish support for supervision also during the first two years. Why this is the case for CBE, or if this is per design of the JIBS program, is still unclear. How this "half-funded" sandwich-hybrid affected	This is an interesting issue, but where we ought to be careful with conclusions. The 2+2 is standard for AAU PhD programmes, but there is flexibility as to when/how supervisors are appointed. The 2+2 is decidedly not a JIBS idea. Rather, it is how the two departments traditionally "do" a PhD process. CBE says that students need the first two years to decide their topic for research, and it is only when that topic is chosen that suitable supervisors can be appointed – and also that the candidates have proven aptitude to do research. Do the students really need two years to decide and prove themselves? Perhaps, but we do not have sufficient	Sentences added.

	quality, compared to the fully funded, other partnerships, would be interesting to evaluate.	evidence to say whether that strategy materially affects quality. It also touches upon the issue of "ownership", as an informal impression is that both departments take pride in their "exclusive" delivery of courses. That is of course only partly right, as some of the courses are done in Sweden and/or with external assistance. This does expose the students to Swedish academics, and for instance UGOT appointed "mentors" for students also in the first phase. At least the economic department found that an interesting solution.	
16	Did AAU select JIBS supervisors?	Yes as stated in sentence	-
16	Does this mean that most research is applied research and of relevance to the national priorities of each country?	The sentence reads "according to JIBS". This cannot be verified unless all dissertations and study schedules are read. From the titles of papers, there is a mix of e.g. "Persihable goods marketing in Ethiopia" (applied and in line with national priorities), and "Causal Association between Exchange Rate and Inflation in Africa", which is perhaps less applied, but probably interesting to the Ministry of Finance.	-

21	Has the team looked into the issue of the quality of the conferences?	Yes	More information on conferences is now added.
21	Although we do not have any hard evidence, the embassy in Kigali received indications that these conferences did not represent high quality.		More information on conferences is now added.
23	This is very concerning. Would be good to see if JIBS has any explanation.	See JIBS' response from 20190930.	-
25	The last article in the table is a very interesting article, not only in itself, but also because it was sent specifically to the research advisor at the embassy by the JIBS coordinator as an example of quality research from the collaboration. How is it that the author can be so sure this was not done with Sida support? Did the student not have a supervisor from JIBS? If not, how come it was included in the list of publications, but then the author specifically wanted to exclude it?	We double-checked this article from two sources: 1) the article's acknowledgments, which do not credit Sida, but credit AERC for their support to preparing this paper and to visiting three conferences on the topic. 2) the author, who confirms that no Sida funding was received for this research, and requested that this paper should not be included in the programme results. The evaluation team does not know why this was sent to Sida as an example of output from the JIBS collaboration	Added a mention of funding source being AERC, not Sida, and that this was confirmed from two sources.
25	What kind of results do the universities need? According to whom?		Added an example from AAU who give the same, fewer or no points for book chapters and conference papers (compared to journal articles), depending on their academic merit and contribution to discipline, judged on a case-by-case basis. (AAU Senate Legislation 2013 §32.3.5 and §32.3.6). Also changed the

			word “need” to “value”.
27	The fact that AAU economics now run all their courses is interesting and should be evaluated further. This has been brought up by JIBS as an indicator of success for the collaboration, i.e. AAU is now self-sufficient due to JIBS. But in the new proposal UoG insisted to run Phd courses on economics due to lack of quality of the existing courses. This was not disputed by AAU whereas JIBS claimed this was only to "sell" more activities from UoG side, since JIBS had already phased out their support to economics. In light of the evaluation you are led to believe that the support from JIBS was in fact minor in economics and that AAU run their own courses simply because they had limited support previously. Is it a correct interpretation of your findings?	Partly, as JIBS taught some courses in 2013 and 2014 (4 courses each year out of 8). However, from 2015 AAU did all courses themselves. There is little documentation except the sentence in the Annual Report for 2015: *“In 2015 JIBS did not teach in any PhD courses as the department of economics reported that the department staff themselves handled all courses.”* This is repeated in every annual report afterwards, with the exception of 2017 when it says “*Due to lack of human resources at AAU due to changing of staff at the department, JIBS taught one PhD course in 2017.*” Staff have different stories about what happened, with AAU people emphasising their own skills – they did not really need JIBS to do this. They do also say that there was limited support from JIBS, and that they were disapointed with what they got. Students, though, say that when they went to Sweden, they learned a lot they did not get in the courses back home.	-

		Thus, the interpretation that JIBS provided limited input to the runing of the courses in economics is correct. But JIBS may not be the only at fault for that situation. On the current quality of the courses, that is according to most students talked to OK, but especially those that went to UoG say that they got a "fantastic service" there.	
29	Finding suitable students has been a challenge and can affect the scientific quality of the PhD course. The language has also proved to be a challenge and is an additional factor to consider. The programme has been taught in Portuguese previously and will (at least partly) be given in English if JIBS are involved. Any comment you have on this would be useful.		Comments on language, etc. have been added in Annex 7.
29	Have any specific universities been mentioned? Has UNU-WIDER committed to teaching or funding? Funding for the PhD program seems unclear to me.		The roles of the University of Lisbon, subject to funding, and UNU-WIDER have been added here and in Annex 7.
29	The plagiarism case detected by JIBS at AAU is only mentioned in passing. It would have been interesting to have a more nuanced discussion about this, especially since one of the main findings concerns the quality issues regarding publication.		Explanation added.

30	The process is incorrectly described in this section. It starts with partner universities being invited by Sida/the embassies to submit a concept note (CN) for research capacity building at their institutions and of relevance to their country. The CN is written by partner universities only to ensure relevance and ownership. There are specific instructions for this. The CN is later posted on the Sida webpage as part of a call for proposals to submit Letters of Intent (LoI). These are developed jointly by Swedish and partner universities and submitted by the latter to embassies/Sida. Both LoI and later the full proposals are externally peer reviewed		Text changed to reflect this.
30	The evaluators missed to note that after the LoI phase (where two separate proposals were submitted by UR with GoU and JIBS) the three universities put together a joint full proposal that was recommended for funding, though with substantial budget cuts. During the negotiations on how to handle the cuts it became clear to the embassy that there are serious tensions among the collaborating partners not only related to budgetary issues but also regarding the (perceived) capacity of the two Swedish universities, and the approach they apply in their collaboration. Therefore, the embassy decided to instruct the partner to separate the Economics		The text has been revised to address these issues. Revisions have also been made to Annex 6 to acknowledge them.

	and Management parts.		
30	Are you referring to the new phase, 2019-2024? Please specify	Yes	The text has been revised to make this clear.
31	The JIBS support from 2011 was not considered as sub-part of the grant but rather as a complement to it. Although both the Block Grant and the JIBS project were discussed at the annual meetings, these were two different forms of support.	Agree – even if it in practice appeared as a sub-part of the block grant to stakeholders, albeit with a different set-up.	Sentence changed, page 29/30
31	Is it correct to write that it was Sida that "forced" the universities to write a joint proposal? This is what the evaluation suggests here and at several other places of the text. The previous responsible research advisor's comments to this is as follows: *In the call for a renewed proposal (November 2017), it was clearly stated that the embassy requested AAU to "assess and decide" (or something similar) how to treat the collaboration in management and economics and the situation with UoG and JIBS. When the topic was brought up with the management of CBE, during a visit from Sida\Stockholm, it was clear that they did not want to make any decisions on this, but leave it up for the Swedish partners (or Sida?) to decide. UoG was only interested in the economics part, and assessed as the strongest partner, but there were no intentions to scale up the economics program by accepting many more*	A key source is the MoM from the Sida/AAU meeting in September 2015 (page 4), where Sida's representative commented the four project proposals that had been submitted: "*Very unique was the Management-Economics PhD Program that has come up with two competing Swedish universities, namely, Jonkoping and Gothenburg Universities. Either, these universities have to agree to work collaboratively with AAU in one and same PhD program or one of the two must be taken based on the merits it has. It would be too expensive for Sida to take both of them parallel to support one PhD program at AAU. It was then suggested that within a limited period of time all four must come up with improved*	Sentence modified to reflect the impression that Sida's actions had on the stakeholders.

	students, other than the old. The compromise was to say that UoG was to supervise all new students (4 if I recall correctly). The question was what to do with the students already in the program and that already had assigned supervisors from JIBS, especially the 8 accepted in 2017, and then a compromise was made to split them 50\50 between JIBS and UoG (note that this was not in the proposal as such, but in the budgeting discussion), with the understanding that this could be revised during the Annual planning meeting. Of course, now we know that those 8 students in fact did not have supervisors from JIBS assigned yet, and therefore all of them should have been transferred to UoG. It came as a surprise that all 8 so clearly wanted to be transferred to UoG and equally surprising that JIBS did not simply accept this. That AAU took a more decisive stand on this (as mentioned in the evaluation) is partly true. When the decision from the DGC came (which looked like a good and properly done decision process, even though very delayed), and decided that uphold the 50\50 split, this turned out to be (allegedly) because CBE though the original budget must be kept, despite many attempts to communicate (both from the embassy and the AAU general coordinator) that this was not the case.	*versions of their proposals.* The message from Sida to the collaborating universities, as interpreted by them, seems to be that either you collaborate on this, or one of you have to go. AAU found this choice uncomfortable to make, and wanted the Swedes to sort it out. This clearly moved ownership of the programme towards the Swedish side. There may have been correspondence between Sida and the Universities that elaborated and mitigated what seems like an either/or choice, but the end result was that the three universities made a joint proposal for both disciplines. The evaluation believes that to have been the second best choice – the two departments should have been allowed to each choose the best university to collaborate with. Of course, this is with the benefit of hindsight, and it is possible that a joint programme could have worked if there had been different personalities involved.	

32	In Sweden??		This section and its conclusion have been slightly amended following clarification from UEM/FE and notes that JIBS was hoping to enroll up to eight PhD students in Sweden.
33	Be specific. It is the proposal writing phase for the 2019-2024 program		Yes, and the text has been revised to make this clear.
35	Is it correct?	Yes, AAU has recently made important decisions to solve the UGOT and JIBS issue. Minutes from two recent internal meetings are instructive (one in the DGC, the other with the CBE Dean). To illustrate that they do take this seriously, this is from the May 19th minutes of the DGC (page 4): “The representative of SIDA has claimed that it finds itself in a very difficult situation to accept the DGC's decision, arguing that "the assignment was not done based on actual matching of research interests and capacities". According to the AAU legislation on Article 120.2, "A Ph.D candidate shall have a supervisor assigned by the DGC". In view of this the DGC considered the recent intervention of Sida on the Department's affairs on both	Additional information added in the text above this to explain better the conclusion. Conclusion remains unchanged.

		the supervision assignment and allocation of the students between JIBS and UoG is a misunderstanding of the mandate of the DGC of the Department of Economics of AAU (See Annex V).The DGC members thus are unhappy with SIDA's unexpected interventions on the Department's affairs. Therefore, all academic affairs should be up to the DGC since it is too professional. Otherwise, the collaboration would be in trouble"	
37	Is this collaboration that is referred to under the EID programme? An explanation of what the EID programme is would be useful somewhere in the report.		Information added in footnote in section 4.1.1
39	Sida does not have regulations or rules on partner university overhead.	OK	Sentence changed.
61	Again, scientific quality might have not been explicitly mentioned in the agreement, there is a general Guideline to Sida's bilateral research cooperation (available also on Sida's website) that emphasizes the importance of ensuring scientific quality and it is also evident from the research policy/strategy that quality has to be present in all Sida supported programs.	Certainly correct, but there is little mention of "quality" as an objective of the cooperation back in 2011.	Sentence added.
61	Should be 2018	OK	Corrected
63	What did the 32 faculty that visited JIBS for "supervision visits" do (says 47 on page 72)?	Information provided in writing from JIBS: "The supervisors from AAU were involved	No change

	Where there any documented results or activities of the co-supervision in Sweden?	in co-teaching doctoral courses and in supervision activities with their doctoral students and the Swedish main supervisors. In some cases, the supervisors were also involved in data collection activities with their doctoral students, using JIBS data bases that are not available at AAU. They also attended regular research seminars. Based on initial experiences, we found that the start-up of a student's dissertation work (i.e. after all courses has been finalized), is a good time for supervisors' visits. This means that the AAU supervisor can meet her/his JIBS counterpart and discuss the planning of the thesis project with the student and both supervisors involved in a face-to-face meeting. The supervisors' visits create an opportunity for the AAU supervisors to establish a personal relationship with the JIBS supervisors and they also get acquainted with the research infrastructure as well as the research and work environment at JIBS. Doctoral supervision meetings are normally not formalized events. They are based on	

		an informal dialogue between supervisors and students and there is no formal, structured documentation collected or archived." As there is no further documentation on this, we do not have additional comments.	
64	In what way are they the strongest? A clarification would be useful.	This was a statement by a senior staff member, included to illustrate the department's general satisfaction with the outcomes of the JIBS cooperation. It was not further explained, except that they now had "great staff" and good courses running.	Section clarified in Annex 5 and in the main report
67	What stipend are they referring to? A clarification would be useful.	This was a general wish for support – they had no particular stipend structure in mind.	Report clarified.
70	This can be interpreted as deliberate design by Sida, which was not the case		Section clarified
93	See earlier comments.		The main body of the report and Annex 7 have been amended to acknowledge the two in-house PhD programs.
93	Please clarify whether they will they get a PhD from UEM or University of Lisbon.		The report has been amended to make clear that the PhDs are to be awarded by UEM.
93	My understanding is that this is their own PhD programme – approved by UEM and accredited by CNAQ (?).	Yes.	The text has been amended to acknowledge this.
95	Is there any observation to support this interpretation?		Additional text acknowledging the benefits of the PhD Competence

			Development Programme added following clarifications from UEM/FE.
101	Allowances (including accommodation costs) are paid by UEM.	The text has been revised to acknowledge this.	
101	And I understand that his acceptance as a PhD student took more than a year, with little communication from JIBS?	Please note that the information from the (non) student indicates that there was more than a year between his application to and withdraw from the programme but it was less than a year from his being accepted to his withdrawing from it.	Further text has been added concerning the communication.
101	The local PhD programmes are central to capacity building at UEM – ie the natural progression of supporting sandwich PhD-students in Sweden. However, Sida needs to be sure that the current local ('Portuguese') PhD programmes are sustainable (given uncertainties on funding) and that the quality is high (given the language issues, problems with recruiting students, 1 year coursework and 2 year of research set-up). Would you be able to comment on this?	Limited comments have been added throughout the case study noting that: ISEG supported the development of the in-house programs; (ii) they have been accredited by CNAQ; and (iii) recruitment is underway. Limited comments have been made about language but it is not possible (within the terms of the evaluation) to comment on them further.	Limited comments have been added throughout the case study

Page JIBS' response to the draft report	JIBS' comments on Draft Report	Comment by Evaluators	Change to report
2-5	1.1 The evaluations use of the ABS list as a benchmark of scientific quality	The interviews as well as written communication from JIBS were clear about the centrality of the ABS list for JIBS's quality control. In the email where JIBS summarizes "*the principles that we endorse in the evaluation of the research output from the students in the East Africa partnership programs*", JIBS is clear that they "*strive to transfer these principles to our sandwich doctoral students from UR and to those AAU doctoral students*" … "*For instance, when it comes to submitting papers to journals we are encouraged to consider the ABS list. … or any similar journal ranking (e.g. the ABDC list) for appropriate journals (meaning that it is listed in a journal that corresponds to category 3 or higher on the ABS list.*" All this comes in one single message and it is difficult to read it in any other way but a strong commitment to ABS list in the programme quality evaluation, and	The specific references to ABS list as a measure of journal quality have been changed to cover all the seven indices used in the report (ABS, ABDC, NSD, BFI, JUFO, WoS, and Scopus). To avoid confusion with JIBS's promotion criteria, "indexed journals" is used in a number of contexts. The report now explicitly states that ABS3-4* are JIBS internal promotion criteria, but quotes verbatim an email from JIBS that explicitly states that JIBS "strive[s] to transfer these principles to our sandwich doctoral students from UR and to those AAU doctoral students who we supervise."

		especially to levels 3, 4, and 4* of the ABS list. However, in the feedback from JIBS to the draft report, it came clear that instead of what was said in the first email and in three interviews, they wish to clearly distinguish between the ABS list and what they expect from the East African programme. Hence, this evaluation will note inconsistencies in JIBS statements, but ignore the ABS3-4* levels and primarily assess journal quality by journal inclusion in any of the following lists: ABS, ABDC, NSD, BFI, JUFO, WoS, and Scopus.	
5&6	1.2 Publications in predatory journals	JIBS acknowledges the problem and states that the problem happens when the collaboration with supervisors is lacking. JIBS offers no explanation of how seven publications in predatory journals ended up on the programme results sheet, compiled by JIBS.	No change
6&7	1.3 The evaluation team does not make a distinction between “publishable” and “published”	The evaluation team did contact three UR PhD graduates with open questions asking them for details about conferences, publication venues etc. There was no mention of rules or similar. The Evaluation Team has	We changed the occurrences of “published” into “publishable” and amended the description by details of how the process happens.

		not assessed nor criticized the dissertation process.	
8-11	1.4 Academic capacity and quality of JIBS supervision A. JIBS internal promotion criteria B. Slow completion is used as an example of bad supervision C. The evaluation states that publications in predatory journals are due to lack of guidance from supervisors A. The evaluation claims that one of the main supervisors at JIBS has supervised 10 PhD students for 7 years, and that this corresponds to 40% of full time. This is not correct.	A. JIBS internal promotion criteria – has been addressed in section 4.1.4. B. The Evaluation Team has not drawn that conclusion. C. Three professors interviewed at JIBS stated that supervision quality is measured by where the research is published. JIBS also acknowledges in its response this: "We realize that our partners would have needed better and also more formalized information from JIBS, on why publications in predatory journals need to be avoided and how this can be done." D. According to JIBS records this professor supervised 10 students between 2015 and 2017. The report has been corrected to reflect this.	A. addressed B. – C. Report clarified to reflect JIBS' input D. Report corrected.
12	1.5 PhD Courses at other universities		References to SWEGPEC have been added and the critique of capacity removed.
13&14	1.6 The evaluation team's critique towards CDI and conferences jointly organized in the framework of the collaboration	No change required. The statement that CDI should result in publications in international peer reviewed journals emanates from the following	-

		documents: National University of Rwanda Overall Proposal (dated 23rd June 2013) and the Addendum to Full Proposal: Economics and Management sub-programme necessitated by the incorporation of UR – make specific reference to the '# of scientific articles accepted for publication in international peer reviewed journals' (Addendum, original emphasis) in relation to the CDI. The aspects of the quality of the research outputs JIBS claims from the collaborations are analyzed under 4.1.4	
14&15	Ownership		A section explaining how the Evaluation Team (in accordance with the Inception Report, has broken the term "ownership" down and assessed it has been added as chapter 3.4
15&16	Management	The conclusion that AAU did not have ownership of the 2011 collaboration results has been evidenced in the report. Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2. provide this evidence. Regarding key individuals at UR not interviewed face to face, see response to	Conclusion not changed.

		Comments from UR below.	
16	Cost efficiency	No changes are required.	
17-19	Evaluation method	The timeframe was short and coincided with graduation periods in all universities. Sida insisted we visit the partner universities in June. Convenience sampling was appropriate and necessary in the context of the ToR. The evaluation team interviewed as many staff, students and graduates as possible to obtain insight into their expectations and experiences of the collaborations. This enabled the team to identify and address key issues relevant to the evaluation. The methodological approach used does not undermine the conclusions. It is a matter of extreme regret that key officers at UR, particularly the CBE team leader, were not available for interview during the fieldwork conducted in Rwanda. Repeated attempts to conduct a remote interview with the team leader were unsuccessful. However, he has subsequently contributed to the evaluation through	The text referred to has been slightly revised to address the matter of students in the plural. The original and subsequent phrasing are considered more appropriate than 'at least 25% of the SoE students…' The note on the CBE/UR team leader's participation in the evaluation has now been revised at his request.

		comments on the draft report and these comments have been taken into consideration in the review of that draft. No false claims were made concerning his participation in the evaluation. Interviews can be conducted by email. The CBE team leader provided some information by email and was offered the opportunity to have this email correspondence referred to as a remote interview and made no protest until submitting comments on the draft report. The comment on separate budgets has been noted. The comment on ethics is responded to: Respondents from UR were offered the opportunity to review interview notes and check them for accuracy and fairness.	
iv	"Overall, the Evaluation Team's findings show that JIBS collaborations with AAU and UR succeeded in increasing the amount of research being produced by the partner universities. However, the quality of the research produced, including its dissemination through publications, remains	JIBS considers the sentence "*However, the quality of the research produced, including its dissemination through publications, remains questionable*" to be strong and misleading.	The passage in question has been changed to "*However, most of that research is published as working papers, conference papers, and book chapters, while the number of articles published in quality journals is very small*."

	questionable. All three partner universities' faculties claim ownership of the collaboration and university leadership agree. However, the evidence leads the Evaluation Team to conclude that ownership of the collaborations has rested with JIBS to a significant extent."		
iv	"The findings showed that JIBS was not able to make appropriate provision for AAU and UR PhD students in Economics. "		The text has been revised to note that appropriate provision was not *always* made.
iv	"However, the research produced from the CDI has not resulted in publications in international peer-reviewed journals (which was the intention)".	The evidence supports this statement.	-
iv	"The few journal articles published in the JIBS-UR and JIBS-AAU collaborations do not reach the quality criteria JIBS has set internally; only one article reached JIBS' criteria".	Although this statement is correct, we agree to not refer to JIBS's self-described quality criteria in the executive summary.	The sentence now stands "Majority of the few journal articles published in the JIBS-UR and JIBS-AAU collaborations appeared in journals of very low or undetermined quality." This is for the fact that there were about as many predatory publications as there were articles in indexed journals (seven and eight), and the rest appeared in non-indexed, non-accredited journals.

iv	"JIBS' measure of quality education and supervision is that research is published in 'decent' journals." JIBS argues that no such statements were made in interviews, and asks: "We ask the evaluators to remove this and similar statements in the evaluation."	Three separate interviews with three professors at JIBS where the response to the question "how do you measure the quality of supervision?" was "by the publication of articles" and follow-up questions on this then referred to the ABS list etc.	Removed the incorrect reference to Section 5.1.4. (the section does not exist)
v	"JIBS maintains that supervisors are responsible for guiding students to appropriate publishing outlets, and that the main measure of the quality of supervision is the quality of the research output but that has not been successful. JIBS'measure of quality education and supervision is that research is published in "decent" journals. JIBS' main contribution is to help PhD students produce "publishable" research. The finding of the Evaluation Team has shown that JIBS has not succeeded in this nor to ensure that the research produced meets JIBS' own quality criteria for publications or for thesis dissertation."	We have not, in the draft version, drawn the same connection JIBS is drawing in their response. However, the edits above make this distinction clearer so no such misunderstanding should arise from the report now.	
vi	"JIBS' measure of quality education and supervision is that research is published in 'decent' journals."	"decent journals" was a word choice of the a JIBS staff member	-

81	"The inevitable conclusions here are that: (i) JIBS is not able to make adequate provision for Economics students; but (ii) was willing to accommodate their needs; but (iii) not at the cost of providing equal doctoral experiences for students from the CBE SoE; and therefore (iv) 'oversold' itself in the provision it could make." (p 81)	No change is required. However, the earlier comment about budgets has been noted.	-
14	"The need to send them to other universities clearly indicates a limited capacity". (p14)	Text changed to reflect this point	Text changed to reflect this point
vi	"JIBS need to modify its mode of publishing to ensure that a larger number of research outputs are published in journals that match JIBS' own publishing rules."	JIBS writes, "*It is not JIBS that defines the "quality criteria" to guide PhD students or researchers at AAU or UR; these criteria should be set by the universities themselves as a part of their ownership of the program. We ask the evaluators to revise or remove this statement from the evaluation*." Insofar as JIBS continue to guide and advise partners in order to make their research publishable in "decent" journals, there is a need to re-focus on quality journals.	Edited this into: JIBS should re-focus its publishing priorities and policies to ensure that a larger number of research outputs end up published in journals that are well recognized in the field.
vi	"JIBS should furthermore ensure that its rules for multi-paper thesis are followed."		We have added a part that describes JIBS' rules to detail.
25	"As JIBS sees the role of working papers, conference papers, and book chapters to be forums for developing early versions of	Sida requested, both in Terms of Reference and their feedback to the Inception report, a focus on journal articles. We have paid	To accommodate JIBS's objection, we have changed references to "gold standard" and "JIBS rules" to

	research reports, as well as opportunities to learn how the publishing process works, this evaluation focused on what JIBS considers the gold standard of research publishing: journal articles. Regarding the quality of journals to publish in, the JIBS target level (3, 4, or 4* on ABS list) was reached by only one of the journal articles listed as collaboration outputs.	specific attention to journal articles by Sida's explicit request. Throughout the JIBS response, there are statements that directly contradict responses from a number of interviews and other communications, most importantly regarding JIBS's internal standards for selecting journals for JIBS staff. There was a strong consensus in the interviews that there are criteria that constitute an "indirect publication policy" (direct quote) and a consensus over "decent journals" (direct quote). But JIBS response states, for instance, "*The evaluation refers to 'JIBS rules' and 'JIBS gold standard of research publishing', understood as journals at the 3 or higher level on the ABS list, throughout the report. This is misleading. JIBS faculty are free to publish in any outlet they find appropriate. This is part of the freedom of research (that has constitutional protection in Sweden and other countries)" (footnote 4, page 3).*"	"indirect publication policy" and "decent journals", as those are direct, verifiable quotes from JIBS employees. We added the information that Sida explicitly requested (in ToR and inception report) that there is a focus on journal articles. We have also added, in several occasions, that conference papers and book chapters contribute positively to individual researchers' career advancement, and have quoted AAU rules on promotion.
25	"The JIBS-UR/AAU output portfolio contained only a few articles in indexed journals. Nor do the journal articles published	See above for changes made to accommodate this.	

	in the JIBS-UR and JIBS-AAU collaboration reach the quality criteria JIBS has set internally.		
18	"The quality of JIBS' supervision however, appears not to reach JIBS' own standards in terms of 'publishable' research as the main publication venues for UR and AAU students supported through the JIBS collaboration have been book chapters, conference papers and, for articles, either predatory journals or in journals not rated in accordance with JIBS' own recommendations regarding publishing."	JIBS states "*The evaluation team states that publications in predatory journals are due to lack of guidance from supervisors, but there is no supportive evidence presented in the evaluation*." However, the email from JIBS on June 21 states, "*It is the responsibility of the supervisors to inform their doctoral students about appropriate publication outlets and to outline a publication strategy that is tailored to match the students specific research area*." This has not been enough, as 7 predatory articles were published. What is more, the fact that articles in predatory journals are included in programme results reported by JIBS is evidence of failure at several levels, not just the student.	Added further description on the programme-level failure to address predatory publishing.
34	"JIBS reports that he has disregarded JIBS' own internal rules, taken decisions related to the collaboration agreement without consulting his superiors and ignored instructions from superiors."	Information provided in interviews by more than one JIBS staff member and relevant to the evaluation of the management of the program.	-
11	"One conference was organized at AAU as	It was also for Management	Corrected.

	part of the JIBS-AAU collaboration; in Economics in December 2017, with about 50 participants, 103 presenters from 18 different countries, with 96 papers being selected."		
16	"4.1.3 Academic capacity of Swedish supervisors"		Heading changed.
19	"…. most of the 12 journal articles published through the JIBS-UR collaboration were generated by PhD students taking the option of producing a thesis based on journal articles."		Sentence changed
20	"Given the nature of working papers, conference papers, and book chapters as 'an opportunity for junior scholars to get introduced into the publication process', many of those outputs are likely to go largely unnoticed by the broader research community.	JIBS asks, "*Without having assessed the quality of the research or its potential, we ask the evaluators to explain why they believe that the research published in conference papers and book chapters by researchers at our partner universities are likely to go largely unnoticed by the research community*." The explanation was in the draft report immediately after the part that JIBS quoted (sentences that start "Firstly, …", "Secondly, …" and "Thirdly…". The reasons for the statement "are likely to go largely unnoticed by the broader research community" are as follows: 1) The conference proceedings are not available in the Internet (JIBS declined to respond the	To make sure that the justification for that statement will not go unnoticed, we added a phrase "That is due to three reasons.", and also added further explanation under the three existing points.

		question about their availability), so they cannot reach the broader research community. 2) Almost all working papers have zero citations. 3) The Springer books have between one and eight citations to all their chapters combined. At the moment those three have gone largely unnoticed by the broader research community.	
21	"JIBS intended them [the conferences] to be important learning experiences, and not first and foremost outlets for significant research findings."		The text has been revised to read 'as well as'
23	"JIBS' rules establish that a compilation thesis (multiple-paper thesis) must consist of four published articles."		Corrected "published" into "publishable"
23	Footnote 41 is not correct The 6 criteria are correctly cited from JIBS' policy document "Compilation of articles dissertation in Business Administration at JIBS", but this document has a 7th criterion that was left out, which reads "A compilation dissertation shall include a comprehensive introduction section and conclusion section which embeds the four papers (the so called "kappa")."	The seventh criterion was omitted as it is not related to articles in a multiple-paper thesis.	The seventh criterion is now added.
Sections 4.2 and 4.3	In these sections, we ask the evaluators to provide established definitions of ownership and cost efficiency.		Section 3.4 added.

Section 3.2	We ask the evaluators to motivate why they find it relevant to consider students from Batch 6 at AAU in the interviews, given they had not been assigned supervisors at JIBS, and had not interacted with our research environment at the time the interviews were conducted.22 To date, two of the Batch 6 students from AAU have been assigned supervisors from JIBS. This allocation decision was taken by the DGC on July 12th. According to Annex 3, none of the interviews with AAU students took place after that.	A total of 25 PhD students from AAU and from different batches were interviewed, of these 6 were from batch 6. They were also included as they were approved PhD students.	-
18	The evaluation claims that one of the main supervisors in Economics at JIBS has supervised 10 PhD students for 7 years, and that this corresponds to 40% of full time. This is not correct. The percentage given is speculative and erroneous as the supervisor did not supervise these PhD students simultaneously. They were spread across the student-intake (batches). New students were taken on by this supervisor after having successfully completed the supervision of students in earlier batches. Four of his PhD students have successfully defended their thesis the remaining will finish in short. This supervisor can be found among the world top	According to JIBS' records, between 2015 and 2017, the professor in question was supervising 10 PhD students. This would represent at least 40% of a FTE position at JIBS during two years, not seven.	The statement has been corrected.

	10% authors in Economics (IDEAS/RePEc).		
Annex 3	As indicated in Annex 3, the evaluators use of convenience sampling led to one single interview among 4 sandwich PhD students in economics at UR. We ask the evaluators to motivate why they think that one observation is sufficient for making recommendations to Sida.	That one of four students (or 25% of students) described a matter that needs to be addressed does not invalidate that need.	-

Page in Draft Report	AAU's comments on Draft Report	Comment by Evaluators	Change to report
34	the Head Department of Economics refused to RATE the relationship between JIBS and AAU (page 34). Quite not interesting to report officially this way. It should be revisited and the relationship can be good, but has challenges.	Ok	Corrected – and added ratings given by the former head of Economics
	A narration about the supervision trip to Sweden is not right in particular the visit trip to Sweden. "A series of supervision trips to Sweden have been made by AAU staff from the Departments of management and Economics. " From the side of Economics department, we had no staff have gone to Sweden for supervision purpose.	Sentence not in document. No correction needed.	-
	You have not suggested any recommendations to the African universities, in my case, AAU, as to what they should do about JIBS or the relations they have with it. Why?		Recommendations added in main report.
v	Collaboration in economics		Changed
2	?? not yet (Comprehensive Exam)		Changed

70	Could not be an indication and related with the project. It is typically an internal case!		Sentence taken out
31	We know that we have to follow AAU's regulations to disburse funding, though that might take its own time. However, this does not mean that we don't feel ownership ??? How can the two departments totally rely on JIBS to solve all the administrative issues given that the AAU's administrative structure has its own rules and regulations which JIBS cannot manipulate? I would say the conclusion is a bit simplistic.		Adjusted sentence – added AAU comment as a reference.
35	The cause effect relationship is not clear at all.		Adjusted sentence
iv	If the response of the three partner universities' faculties indicate that they have ownership, "what evidence" is the evaluation team stating about? It is really seems as if the evaluation team knows better than the partnering universities with respect to what is ownership means. In my view what the partnering universities state can explain their position regarding the ownership; unless we differ in the definition of ownership per se. And for the matter of the fact what they stated could have been considered as a fact.		Section 3.4 added to explain how the evaluation team has broken down and assessed ownership
iv	Does it mean that while producing the 12 PhD graduates there was no input from the national supervisors? Actually, the local or national supervisors have been involving in making the 12 PhD graduates capable for graduation through local supervison. Why the evaluating team failed this as part of core evidence for the improvement of the national supervision?	The findings are presented in 4.1.2	-
iv	We have CLEARLY discussed during the evaluation that CDI and regular seminar series at AAU have not yet been	Agreed, this refers to the collaborations where the CDI has been	-

	implemented. The first batch started to work on CDI this August on it. And for regular research seminar researchers are still in the process of data collection.	implemented and mentions UR.	
Table 4	Please see your Table 4: Summary of quantifiable results achieved which clearly indicates for CDI and Research seminars at AAU as n.a which is actually correct. You indicated them as activities which are not yet implemented at AAU. So how can you rate the performance for an activity which is not yet implemented? I would say it is indeed unfair.	This is not criticism of AAU – conclusion that comparing the quantity of research outputs from both AAU and UR overall with UR having the CDI has meant more research produced. No change necessary	-
iv	Please add the 9 (nine) for AAU publications in the book chapter by the PhD students and staff members of management department in 'Frontiers in African Business Research Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2017' This is the updated information the we have not complied and submitted during the evaluation.	We cannot add more at this stage, sorry.	-
v	Again I am not clear at all what are the measurements for evaluators to state as 'limited' versus 'appears to be increasing'? what scale has been used to state this? Please also see my number 2 comment above. Why the evaluation team could not state the ownership which the partner universities have indicated as they have owned?	See section 3.4 of the Final Report. That partners feel ownerships is presented in the Executive Summary and discussed in section 4.2	-
v	If there was no enough communication between JIBS and partner universities, how was the activity implemented? Does it mean that activities were not implemented during those times? I doubt the responses of previous chairperson for Management department (my predecessor) which I have NEVER heard of complaint about. The evaluation team has already interviewed	This is a aggregated conclusion based on both documents and interviews and relate to all partners.	-

	him as well.		
v	This could have been good to state which partner university resisted which modality? Otherwise it puts all partner universities in one basket, as if their views are the same.	This information is provided in the main report	-
10	It must be stated as in Economics and Management. Because the program was organized by both departments.		Report changed
26	Please refer Table B in the annex for the updates in the staff profile of the management department		Report changed
31	We know that we have to follow AAU's regulations to disburse funding, though that might take its own time. However, this does not mean that we don't feel ownership.	The facts are correct. Ownership assessment not solely based on who controls the resources, but is an important aspect.	-
31	??? How can the two departments totally rely on JIBS to solve all the administrative issues given that the AAU's administrative structure has its own rules and regulations which JIBS cannot manipulate? I would say the conclusion is a bit simplistic.	This is what was presented to the Team in interviews	-
35	? The cause effect relationship is not clear at all.	We are not sure which conclusion this refers to.	
63	Table B Academic Staff Profile; Management Department, 2014 - May 2019 is updated This is the corrected statistics for staff profile of management department during the evaluation		Table updated
70	As far as I know, there was specific incidence regarding three staff travel where SIDA Coordinator, AAU SIDA coordinator office together with JIBS had involved to arrange through and made the trip possible which otherwise could have not been possible per to the scheduled. The difficulty was not because of AAU bureaucracies in that specific case but because of time	The information in the report was gathered from several sources.	No change to report

	that we need to process in other higher government offices all the necessary elements to realize the trip. For that we had no time because of the overlapping of some national holidays. In this point all (JIBS, SIDA, AAU SIDA coordination office) did a good discussion though it was a holiday in Ethiopia. I think this specific context has been a bit zoomed by the evaluator. By the way there are also government required procedures for travel which are beyond AAU, and hence AAU should follow.		
71	Changes in the departmental chairmanship ends every three years per to AAU senate regulation. Even before three years a chair can resign if there is a sabbatical or administrative leave. So no link at all with the stated project.		Footnote added
73	Yes they were in use before the stated time.		Sentence changed
73	This needs to be reconciled with what is stated in the executive summary section.		Conclusions reviewed.

Page in Draft Report	UEM's comments on Draft Report	Comment by Evaluators	Change to report
3	Corrections in track changes	The proposal does not mention the AAU and UR PhD programs but this point is noted elsewhere in the report. Other changes (e.g. dates) have been made to the text.	Point is noted elsewhere in the report. Other changes (e.g. dates) have been made to the text.
Table 4	Correction in table		The table has been updated to acknowledge the comment and

			further relevant changes have been made throughout the report.
12	Corrections in track changes		Changes have been made here and throughout the report to acknowledge the status of the in-house PhD programs following clarifications from UEM/FE.
26	Corrections in track changes		Changes have been made here and throughout the report to acknowledge the number of FE staff studying on the current ISEG-supported program and the role of ISEG in supporting the development of the in-house PhD programs.
28	Corrections in track changes		Changes have been made here and throughout the report to acknowledge issues concerning the in-house PhD programs.
30	Corrections in track changes		Changes have been made as suggested by UEM/FE.
31	Corrections in track changes		Changes have been made as suggested by UEM/FE.
33	This observation seems to be not correct, because the problem was well identified and clearly identified, as follows. “The problem of the collaboration is the persistent lack of highly educated personnel to	The argument has not been changed but text has been added to contextualize it.	Text has been added to distinguish between FE’s recognition of the need to develop capacity and the proposal’s ability to meet that

	undertake research and teaching at graduate level within the areas of management and economics."		need.
33	This contradicts the same annex 7 when it states -- UEM wants to shift from being a teaching-led to a research-led institution. The FE was described as currently lacking the critical mass to engage in research. Of 42 full time staff in the FE, only nine hold PhDs and too many staff with Masters degrees are teaching Masters courses. The FE also wants to raise its academic profile through the generation of research projects and the publication of academic articles. It wants to address this through the development of its own PhD programme but this requires sufficient academic staff with the necessary qualifications and experience to teach and supervise PhD students. It currently has one course-based PhD programme that has Portuguese funding and is mostly delivered in Mozambique by Portuguese staff. There are 11 PhD students enrolled on the programme and five of them are FE staff. The FE intends making this programme the basis for its own PhD programme.	See above.	See above.
101	I have no ideia were this comment comes from. I never heard it before.		Additional text has been added to clarify this comment.
	This observation "All three partner universities' faculties claim ownership of the collaboration and university leadership agree - Page 5 – Executive	Some issues concerning the collaboration with UEM have been modified, particularly in light of clarifications about the in-house	

	Summary " contradicts the following two passages: 1 - The Evaluation Team got the strong impression that UEM/FE are highly active and feel a strong sense of ownership of the collaboration, challenging JIBS during the proposal and re-drafting phases. Page 42. 2 - Although the collaboration between the Faculty of Economics (FE) and JIBS is in its infancy, JIBS has demonstrated flexibility in seeking to address the Faculty's needs. However, the adaptability of both partners in the collaboration has been necessitated by problems delivering the initial plans for an over-ambitious sub-programme. Nevertheless, both partners have worked together to generate a more feasible revision of the approved sub-programme. At the time of reporting, that revision has yet to be approved by Sida. Annex 7	PhD programs, but the overall argument remains valid. That overall argument refers to all three collaborations and attention is paid throughout the report to the individual collaborations.	
	Finally, the major problem is the budget allocation 73.5% of SEK 16 m is allocated to JIBS, as stated in the page 103. Funding The initial budget proposed to Sida for the sub-programme, and supported by the Collaboration Office, was SEK 52m. Sida restricted this and approved a budget for SEK 16m. The bulk of this is to be allocated to JIBS. The full programme for the current phase has a total	This comment acknowledges the point made in the report and no change is needed.	-

	budget of SEK 355m and the average allocation for Swedish partners (excluding ISP) is 36%. However, 73.5% of funding for this sub-programme (SEK 11,765k) is currently allocated to JIBS. This is the highest proportion allocated to a Swedish partner across the whole programme and is significantly more than the second highest allocations of 58.9% for the thematic programme Biocultural Heritage in Mozambique: developing new heritage industries (SEK 6,475k from a budget of SEK 11m) and the for the cross-cutting Quality Assurance of Research and Post-Graduate Training programme (SEK 10,006k from a budget of SEK 17m).		

Page in Draft Report	UR's comments on Draft Report	Comment by Evaluators	Change to report
Iv	UR-CBE has the over-arching goal of transforming itself through this collaboration in to a sustainable research institution. In this transformation process, the collaboration with JIBS has focused on Strengthening of local Masters Programmes, sandwich and local PhD training as well as Research Dissemination through conferences, seminars, policy briefs and publications.	The general point made here is recognized but it is too detailed for inclusion in an Executive Summary.	Changes to the main report not to the ES
iv	Transforming UR-CBE into a sustainable research institution is a process. The evaluators may kindly note the 3rd phase of UR-Sweden Program (2013-2019) started when UR was just being created from the merger of 7 public higher learning institutions and	Contentious points (e.g. the outputs from the CDI) are properly addressed in the main text of the report and in the case study of the UR-JIBS	The benefits of CDI have been recognized in the main report and in the ES

	that UR-CBE resulted from the merger of business and/or economics programs from NUR, SFB and UP. Most staff in these former public HLIs had no research culture. In addition to the PhD training that the UR-Sweden program offered through in collaboration with JIBS, we introduce CDI to expose academic staff to research mentoring by JIBS staff and this resulted in a number of book chapters and conference publications. These are indeed not very high-level publications as these in international pear reviewed journals, but it is a first stage of research writing and publication training. The UR-CBE-JIBS collaboration has made steady progress in achieving the set outputs and met all its targets. With reference to realizing the outcomes, there has been a remarkable improvement in the research environment along the path of its 'Theory of Change'. It may be noted that the staff of UR-CBE were exposed to research environment, engaged in the research processes, enabled to do research and learnt and practiced scientific academic writing. It's a long term process to see these staff to become fully trained and capable to publish in high ranked international peer reviewed journals. The UR-Sweden/CBE Sub-programme has succeeded in introducing the mechanisms of a conducive research environment. UR-CBE published various policy papers/briefs and organized policy dissemination meetings attended by policy-makers.	collaboration (Annex 6).	
iv	We beg to completely disagree with this finding about ownership of the collaboration. It is worth noting that the programme proposals (both in 3rd phase and 4th phase) were initiated by the UR-CBE by involving almost every teaching staff of the college in the process of needs assessments, writing of Concept Note, Letters of Intent (LoIs) and final proposals (FPs). JIBS staff contributed at	Evidence from the evaluation supports the finding and no evidence has been subsequently submitted to the evaluation team to challenge it. However, the evaluation team	Section 3.4 added to explain how the Evaluation team has analyzed ownership

	the stage of LoIs and FPs because it is indeed a collaboration, but they were responding on clearly determined research priorities indicating the contribution they can bring. All the research subjects pursued by UR staff were identified by UR-CBE in consultations with national stakeholders, and not by JIBS. The sub-programme has been fully owned by the UR-CBE and implemented with the JIBS support. The sub-programme planning, implementation, monitoring and controlling has been pursued always keeping the super-ordinate goal of "What UR and UR-CBE wanted to be".	recognizes that the definition of 'ownership' extends beyond what is formally agreed to what happens in practice.	
iv	The evaluators may give more clarification as towards what they mean by 'there is little evidence to show that the co-supervision by national supervisors improved significantly during the period'. Co-supervision of sandwich PhD students was inducted as a measure of exposing at least a handful number of potential PhD supervisors for UR-CBE to the art of PhD supervising. Co-supervisors from UR-CBE were appointed by the JIBS at the request of UR-CBE and their identification was done by UR-CBE. The aim of this activity is to prepare the potential supervisors to be competent enough to run the UR-CBE's own PhD programmes with course work. The main supervision task rested with the principal supervisor at JIBS, where the student was registered, and the UR co-supervisors were first and foremost in the PhD supervision apprenticeship. A great deal of learning the art of PhD supervision did happen and most of the co-supervisors are now capable and ready to be main supervisors of PhD students in the local PhD program that is going to be launched. It might have enabled the evaluator to know much about this, if he talked to each co-supervisor. Speaking to persons who are not directly involved	Responses to this issue are dealt with in the main text of the report and in the UR case study (Annex 6) including a note on different interpretations of what is meant by co-supervision.	Dealt with in the main text and in Annex 6.

	in this process might have given a different perspective. As a co-supervisor, I believe that we learnt the process of research supervision and engaging and monitoring PhD students in the research cycle. May be the evaluator has a different perspective of this activity.		
iv	This finding is not supported by facts. The fact is that two out of the three students admitted initially in 2013 have completed their studies before the study contract period ends. It is not possible for those students to have graduated before the end of their contract without having enough of the provisions at JIBS. One student was admitted a year later, but she has been progressing well and yet the 4th PhD student in economics was admitted in 2017 as we wanted an additional PhD. On the contrary, JIBS went out of its way in providing to these PhD students by facilitating them to take courses that would enable them to progress in the PhD research at other Swedish universities when such courses were not available at JIBS.		The text has been slightly revised to acknowledge that JIBS was not *always* able to make appropriate provision. The evidence supports this conclusion.
iv	This is the first stair in the ladder of the' Theory of the Change' that UR-CBE had adopted. Though it's first concern was to attain the targeted outputs but without impairing the quality, which is a process and relative to the context of the research environment in the institution. Quality improvement has always been there on the top of the agenda of UR-CBE. CDI winners have the practice of making submissions not only to international conferences but also they have been encouraged to publish in the peer reviewed journals. In the RBM, we mentioned that the CDI has the objective of inculcating and helping staff to acquire the good academic writing skills and producing publishable articles. It is aimed to prepare the	The UR proposal and results matrix for the period make clear that the CDI would lead to the publication of articles in international peer reviewed journals.	-

	staff to be able and encouraged to publish in international peer reviewed journals, which is a process in capacity building but not a target in itself. Publishing in top rated international peer reviewed journals depends heavily on the competencies of the staff. This collaboration was sought because of those competencies gaps among CBE staff. Building high quality competencies enabling staff to publish in high ranked journals cannot be done in a short period. Mentors can only advise and motivate but the achievement lies in the hands of the mentees.		
v	I, as a co-supervisor of a student at JIBS, am aware that there exists guidelines and processes in JIBS. The supervisory team advises the students to publish in ABS categorized journals. We also at UR-CBE advise our staff about the standard journals and the need to avoid predatory journals. Our UR-Directorate of Research periodically circulates the information to the staff about the need to avoid predatory journals. However, sometimes the staff did not pay attention to it.	No changes are required as the comment refers to practices at UR and not JIBS. The comment on UR/CBE advising against predatory journals is address in the main text of the report.	No change
v	The evaluator might have misunderstood the whole process. The partner universities in Africa are the initiators of the collaboration. For the current 4th phase, the very first step began with writing the Concept Note which shows where that African partner university wants to be in the next 5 to 10 years in terms of research and how it intends to get there. For example, we at UR, after a broad-based internal consultation with all the departments, schools and colleges as well as consultation with national institutions in public and private sectors and looking at national and global development policies and programs such as Vision 2020, Vision 2050, SDGs, AU Agenda 2063, etc., we produced a Concept Note that identified 10 research clusters and an operating principle of		Changes have been made in the main body of the report and Annex 7 clarifying the process of starting the collaborations. A discussion on the definition of 'ownership' has been added in section 3.4

	interdisciplinarity. It only when Sida had evaluated this Concept Note and found it to a sound base for continued support to UR that Swedish Universities were invited to work with UR to submit Letters of Intent that would address research issues that UR wants to address. Even in the development of Letters of Intent and Full Proposals, UR staff remained in the driving seat, but given the fact that these LoIs and FPs have to be co-owned and co-signed by both UR and Swedish university partners, it is understandable that the voice of the Swedish university had to be listened to, for the proposals to exist and move forward. But, none of the proposals was out of what UR wanted. Therefore, I don't know how this observation by evaluator came out. For the completed 3rd phase, I would like to inform that the first proposal document was prepared by the then Faculty of Economics and Management (FEM) of the former National University of Rwanda (NUR) after careful needs assessments within the faculty and also after conducting a survey of the market needs for PhD graduates in business and economics and many consultations with the stakeholders. The complete ownership was with the FEM-NUR. When we did it, we were not knowing about JIBS. The original proposal and agreement was modified by incorporating the modified needs due to the integration of business faculties from former Kigali Institute of Education (KIE) , Kigali, former Umutara Polytechnique , Nyagatare and the former School of Finance and Banking (SFB), Kigali. Thereby new activities like CDI, International Conferences and Policy Interaction and Business Community Interaction Etc. have been added to the activities list. They came up out of the merger process as UR-Sweden programme asked us to integrate all the programmes from		

	the former institutions.		
v	As the Team Leader from very beginning of generating the idea and preparing concept note, that led to the development of the LoI, I humbly submit that this statement is far from the truth. There is not a single stage of our collaboration with JIBS at which we have not been in the driving seat. Even when the PhD students are at at JIBS for their courses and data analysis, we have continuously kept in touch with them and their supervisors to check on their progress. The UR-CBE has been the one, developing and implementing the activity plans, of course ensuring that part of the activities to be implemented by JIBs get done. The UR-CBE Academic Council oversees the entire working process of the sub-programme. The Team Leader of the UR-Sweden/ CBE-JIBS Economics and Management Subprogram was the one who drives the programme in collaboration with JIBS. I am not able to comprehend the meaning of the phrase **"reducing the responsibility of the partner university "**. We never experienced this situation. The Activity Plans have been proposed and prepared jointly according to the approved RBM and presented to the UR-CBE management and the Academic Council for implementation. The related academic units in the CBE are the implementing units. I might have clarified this to the evaluator, if he had been in touch with me and spoke to get the clarification. For the sake of clarification, I wish to bring to the kind notice of the evaluators that I have been associated with the sub-programme since 2012 to date while the current Deputy Team Leader was there for only the last six months.		The text is revised to clarify the point.
v	Although the Deputy Vice Chancellor explained to the evaluator how the split of the Management and Economics came about, it	The development of the proposals is addressed in Annex 6 and in changes	Development process clarified.

	appears that he didn't get it fully. The Management and Economics Full Proposal was a result of the merger of two successful LoIs – one titled "Partnership for Capacity Building and Impact: A Joint Program for Training and Research in Economics and Environmental Management" submitted in collaboration with Gothenburg University, and the other titled "Institutional capacity building for relevant management and economics research of high quality towards sustainable socio-economic transformation of Rwanda" submitted in collaboration with JIBS, Karlstad and Umea. At full proposal stage, CBE decided to merge the two LoIs into one Full Proposal to increase its chances of success. However, during the process of finalising the full proposal, it was a bit difficult to agree to a reasonable budget for this Full Proposal and this caused a bit of friction between the UR team that was putting together the overall full proposal and Mr. Lars who was speaking on behalf of the Swedish and refused the proposed budget reduction. Fortunately, the new combined "management and economics" full proposal was selected for funding. During, the negotiation for funding when the Sweden Embassy together with the UR leadership were meeting Team Leaders of full proposals that had huge budget to suggest to give them guidelines on how to reduce their budget, the UR-CBE/JIBS/Gothenburg team proposed that they had agreed that on the Swedish side, the Management component shall be coordinated by JIBS and the Economics component shall be coordinated by Gothenburg. Obviously this proposal was welcomed by UR leadership because of the reputation of the Economics Program at Gothenburg. However, Lars said that this decision of splitting the coordination of the program was not final and could be revisited later when they are	have been made to the report to clarify these developments. The relevance of this comment to the point made in the ES is not always clear but there are no obvious points that need to be addressed. It is also worth noting that the formal response of UR/CBE has not offered an alternative interpretation for the decision to separate the full proposal in two.	

	able to consult with the Principal of CBE who outside Rwanda on mission. Few days later, the Head of Cooperation at the Sweden Embassy in Rwanda wrote to UR and all the Swedish partner Universities involved in the Management and Economics subprogram, i.e JIBS, Gothenbrg, Karlstad and Umea, that to ensure the efficient implementation of the subprogram, Sida has decided to split the management and ecoomics subprogram into two separate subprograms: the Management to be coordinated by JIBS and the Economics coordinated by Gothenburg on the Swedish side. Therefore, we wish to clarify that the separation of the full proposal in to two and giving economics to Goteborg came as independent of the previous programme's implementation. Therefore, this separation in the current phase cannot be attributed to the performance of previous agreement.		
v	I wish to clarify that as a Team Leader at UR-CBE, I was not in isolation. I have intensive and intimate communication with the Team Leader's on the JIBS's side such as Prof. Mathias Nordqvist, Prof. Vivian Vimaralund, Prof. Paul Nysdt, Prof. Ethel Brundin and the current Prof. Daniel Pittinos. In addition, that we used to have regular communications with the programme in charge in JIBS, Prof.Francesco and Prof. Olog Brunninge on management side and Prof. Par Sjollander and Dr. Pia Nelson from the Economics side. It would not be justified, if I say that I have not sufficient communication with my counterparts in JIBS. Because, Mr. Lars Hartvigson, as an administrator of the partnerships at JIBS , had more time to visit partner universities (AAU, UR, UEM) than the academic staff involved in the	The main text clearly notes this extensive communication.	It is suggested that no changes are made here as the comment does not contradict the statement in the ES.

	partneships, it gave the impression that he centralised the communication, but this is not the reality.		
v	I presume that the evaluator did not capture well the very mode or approach of the previous phase as compared to new phase. I wish to clarify that training the PhD students in Sweden (Sandwich Mode) was adopted because we didn't have a critical mass of local PhD holders to deliver PhD training locally. We knew all along that this was going to be expensive and take most of the budget in Sweden. That is why we insisted on co-supervising and PhD supervision training as well as developing PhD programs in Management and Economics during the completed phase, to prepare us to deliver local PhD programs in the 4th phase, which we are going to do. The introduction of the PhD Programmes in Management and Economics in the 4th phase was planned within our Theory of Change. Having developed the programmes and got accredited them by the Higher Education Council of Rwanda and getting them prepared for launching from the academic year 2019-2020 was perceived and achieved planned activity, which can be seen as a reward of the success achieved in the 3rd phase of UR-Sweden programme. Starting of our own programmes is a sign of the success of the previous programme. Success in terms of improved capacities of the UR-CBE schools to run their own programmes out of the lessons learnt in the previous phase of the programme. It's a strength that we have gained. It helped the UR-CBE to prepare it journey to become a sustainable research institution. I believe it is a result of misinterpretation, perhaps due to lack of proper information given to the evaluator during his visit to UR-CBE in my absence.		The main text and Annex 6 have been revised to address concerns about claims re: co-supervision.

v	The CDI was there in Sweden to provide exposure to CBE staff to the research environment, who are having little research culture. The staff shall be exposed to the utilization of electronic resources, visiting to the extensive library resources, participation in mentorship sessions with the mentors, some practical exercises on academic writing and establishing a road map to write the research paper. As many as 32 persons have visited JIBS in the first phase. CBE has taken another initiative to inculcate the research culture in the second phase. In the current phase, the selected staff shall be supported to get the research papers' presentation in international conferences.		The points raised in the comment are addressed in the Annex 6.
v	Regional collaboration (otherwise called EID – Entrepreneurship Initiative for Development) was initiated by UR-CBE in 2015 with a foresight by the then Principal of CBE. And it was accepted by the JIBS . The first meeting was conducted in May 2015 in Kigali and then we had subsequent meetings in Dar es Salaam and Addis Ababa to materialize the regional collaboration. The UR-CBE had pushed this idea and requested JIBS to help in the process to bringing together the universities in the region to have the collective pool of resources like expertise to teach doctoral courses on the similar lines of SWEGPEC (Swedish Graduate Programmes in Economics) where the partner universities collaborate in offering PhD courses at several universities due to their specialized expertise while other universities send their students to take courses. For this purpose, these universities at Addis Ababa, Dar es Salaam, Makerere and UR-CBE have developed common programmes of PhD with course work in management as well as economics. These universities have developed the new PhD programmes and got them accredited by their national regulatory	Thank you for the description of how EID came about, which differs from that given by JIBS. However, Sida specifically instructed the Evaluation Team not to assess the EID and the Evaluation Team therefore did not collect information about it.	References to SWEGPEC have been made in the main text and Annex 6. A brief mention of EID and its purpose has been added as a footnote in section 4.1.1 at Sida's request. References to the EID being a JIBS-initiated and organized program have been removed.

	bodies. It enhances the mobility of students, and pooling of scarce resources to teach PhD course on the similar lines of SWEGPEC. Therefore, it's an initiative of UR- CBE to establish this regional network. And it is being continued in the current phase. We are planning to launch our own and new PhD programme as a symbol of our improved capacity out of the previous phase, as we have already started admitting students and allocated PhD courses. For example, in Management PhD programme with courses, we have 12 modules to teach and we have allocated 4 to Swedish universities, 3 to regional universities and 5 to UR-CBE staff as module leaders and off-course there shall be at least one UR-CBE staff associated with each 12 modules as co-module teachers/partners. The Swedish universities will teach only once in the current cohort and in the subsequent cohorts, the UR-CBE will take over fully the teaching and supervision with a provision of meeting deficiencies from the regional universities. I hope this, explains how UR-CBE is aspiring to become self-sufficient by the end of the current phase of the Sida support.		
v	It may be kindly noted that, joint research studies were not there in our planned activities both in the previous and current phase of collaboration with JIBS. Sida funding targets Masters and PhD training and not UR-Sweden Universities joint research studies.	No revision is required as the statement refers to joint authorship of studies.	-
v	Partner university researchers, UR in particular, did not mention international collaboration other than with JIBS and UGOT, because the Evaluator did not ask about it. Otherwise, UR has countless number of international research collaboration and as a matter of fact UR publish more with US University researchers	Agreed as it was not the focus of this evaluation.	Sentence removed.

	than Swedish ones. In particular, UR-CBE has other collaborations with World Bank, SDSN, Kuheen Foundation Germany, RURA etc., to mention a few.		
v	Although it may be the responsibility of Sida to react to this statement, but I felt the need to state that Sida, through the Embassy of Sweden in Rwanda, is in close and regular communication with UR leadership, the PCO and the Team leaders. The PCO organizes a monthly meeting of all Team and Deputy Team leaders which are often attended by the Sweden Embassy Staff who is in charge of the Research and Higher Education Cooperation.		Recommendation has been removed
vi	Sida has been doing this and as a matter of fact, it part of the regular policy discussion between Sida and UR.		See comment above.
vi	That is what RBM does.		Further explained in section 4.3
vi	This is what is provided for in the new phase of UR-Sweden Program.	Excellent	-
6	This component is not there in the UR/Sweden-CBE –JIBS-Economics and Management Sub-programme . It is there as a central sub-programme at UR by the UR Directorate of Research.	This refers to the overall ToC that informs this particular sub-program. That CBE is now challenging outputs from the collaboration is worrying as it implies either: (i) a failure to understand the purpose of Sida funding; and/or (ii) an attempt to justify the failure to meet targets (e.g. publications). On balance, however, it is suggested that no revisions are	-

		made to the text.	
6	This component is not there in the UR/Sweden-CBE –JIBS-Economics and Management Sub-programme . It is there as a central sub-programme at UR by the UR Directorate of Research.	See above.	-
8	Though the evaluator claims that he interviewed Prof. Rama B. Rao, Team Leader at UR-CBE. That did not take place. Similarly, the formal functional in-charge of the sub-programme at UR-CBE, Principal Dr. Faustin Gasheja was not interviewed. This might have led to the paucity of proper factual information to the evaluator coupled with misinterpretation of the subjectivities of some respondents	The evaluator made considerable efforts to interview Prof Rama and Dr Faustin but they declined to be interviewed either in person or remotely. There is an extensive email trail documenting these attempts to secure interviews. That email correspondence indicated that Prof Rama was uneasy about not having been interviewed and so the evaluator suggested that email correspondence about particular issues could be recorded as a remote interview. Prof Rama did not object to this and the Evaluation Team therefore listed his role as informant by the word “remote”.	No revision required but see accompanying comments
11	The evaluator might have given more clarification towards this observation. The aim of the co-supervision to JIBS PhD students (please be noted that they are not UR-CBE PhD students) by UR-staff was like an induction/initial training to them to prepare them to launch our own PhD programmes. These co-supervisors have to	More clarification has been given towards this observation.	Issues concerning co-supervision are addressed in Annex 6.

	involve in the process along with other main supervisory team at JIBS. The purpose was achieved as these co-supervisors have got exposure to the task of supervision.		
12	There was a co-teacher from UR-CBE schools for every module taught by the JIBS professors. The factual information might have been obtained from the coordinator of postgraduate studies at UR-CBE.	The text has been revised to clarify the point.	Further text has been added to address issues of co-teaching and co-supervision in more detail.
	It was taken up as a business community awareness initiative to encourage businesses to have collaborations and to get expert guidance from the UR-CBE staff. There were some propositions came up between Swedish entrepreneurs expressing interest to tie-up with Rwandan entrepreneurs in the energy sector, but did not materialize due to lack of feasibility. Some of the local entrepreneurs came up with requests for funding, which is out of the scope of the sub-programme.		The text has been revised.
13	One of the CDI winners succeeded in getting a PhD scholarship from Belgium out of the publication of the CDI paper with his mentors at JIBS; see : Nilsson, P., Backman, M., Berkje, L., & Maniriho, A. (2019). One cow per poor family: effects on consumption and crop production in Rwanda. World Development, 114, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.09.024		This has been noted in the section on CDI.
13	Management PhD students also took courses at other Swedish universities.	No change required as this has already been noted.	-
13	This is a Swedish national arrangement through Swedish Graduate Programme for Economics (SWEGPEC). In order to optimize the human resources and to avail expert teaching JIBS sends its economics PhD students to other Swedish universities and also it receives from other universities, when such particular courses are offered. It would be better to clarify, who are those UR staff stating		The text has been revised to note the arrangement through SWEGPEC.

	this, and perhaps , they might have been poorly informed.		
13	This observation needs to be modified. Under SWEGPEC even Stockholm and Goteborg universities send their students to other universities to avail the benefit of timing and the relative advantage of expertise that a course facilitator has. In fact, this was the inspiration to us at UR-CBE to devise the regional collaboration initiative to have secured sustainability in teaching PhD courses.	No revision required.	-
13	This information needs to be checked and verified. I was never informed, though I am the Team Leader, about this by any PhD student during their tenure at JIBS. The PhD main supervisors at JIBS are the right persons to be asked about this. Because they are the ones who clears/ recommends whether his/her PhD student is qualified to attend an international conference. Moreover, attending an international conference at UR- Kigali cannot be underrated.	No revision required. The team leader not knowing of this matter has been noted.	-
13	This is the information gap that the evaluator has. Since, the Principal and the Team Leader were not interviewed, the evaluator might have asked this question to the other officials like Director of Research and the Deans whom he has interviewed. There was no separate process of identifying and appointing the co-supervisors by JIBS and UR-CBE. Appointment of supervisors is the authority of JIBS for its PhD students. UR-CBE assists in the process for identification of suitable persons. UR-CBE has identified the interested staff in the particular research topic of a PhD student through an open call of providing the research concept note. The received applications were screened by the committee as constituted by the Dean of respective school involving Director of Research and other expert –member. Then the Principal of UR-CBE verifies it, approves it and transmits to JIBS for	Minor revisions have been made to clarify the point already made.	Revisions have been made to the main text and Annex 6 to clarify concerns about co-supervision.

	consideration. Then it is the JIBS ,which appoints the co-supervisors for their orientation, exposure to the supervision process and the mechanisms. These co-supervisors from UR-CBE are there for their own capacity building, so that they are not having discretionary powers in the supervision of the students at JIBS.		
14	The research topics were identified and suggested aligning to the Rwanda's national priorities and strictly within the limits of the Sida research policy guidelines. The research needs were identified through an assessment and those topics were indicated in the open call for proposals to which the candidates applied. The Open Call was done collaboratively by JIBS and UR-CBE (the then FEM-NUR). I believe that the topics were the national priority but the JIBS was aware of it much earlier even at the time of call for proposals. But they were refined and adjusted fully on technical basis by the supervisors by the time of research proposal approval by the JIBS research committee.	No revisions required as the comment expands on the point already made.	-
14	The main aim of having the national supervisor is to have undergone through the process of research supervision to get themselves equipped to take up this task at later stage independently. It's like a training process.	No changes required. However, comments on the interpretation of 'co-supervision' have been addressed elsewhere in the report.	-
15	This conclusion may be revised in the light of the fact of that JIBS sending PhD students for courses at other Swedish universities is an arrangement that they have under SWEGPEC.		Membership of SWEGPEC has been noted and the conclusion modified
18	Given the capacity of the staff at UR-CBE in general, the publication approach was centered around the provision of intensive guidance to them in publishing chapters in edited books. It is not possible and feasible in short term to get prepare them to	No changes required. The context is acknowledged but it is clear that JIBS failed to deliver what had been	-

	be able to publish in ABS journals. That's why the path chosen for creating research and publication culture is CDI competition, mentorship for the winners, exposure visit to Sweden, paper presentation in the international conference and publication in an edited volume or an international peer reviewed journal.	agreed.	
20	UR-CBE has organized 4 international conferences with participation from Americas, Europe, Africa and Asia.		The text has been revised to note the conferences were international. The issue of attendance is dealt with elsewhere.
21	These are among the top 5 world class publishers, which have quality control checks and there are explicit ways of looking at the quality of these publications.	No changes are required as this issue is dealt with elsewhere.	-
22 Table 8	The first paper in the table is still under review. Hence you can not find it in the journal. The second paper entitled " Corporate governance, institutional quality and bank performance " was not submitted to Financial Stability Journal , Fall 2017, as such you cannot find it there. This paper was first published as a discussion paper in DIW university working papers. This can be accessed on google. In the second step, it was submitted to the Journal of Banking and Finance. He got major revisions. Then it was revised and resubmitted to the journal but the paper was rejected and a proposal to transfer it to the journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money (also ABS3) was given. So the author is currently working on it. Among the papers in the table 1,2,5,and 7 were by the PhD students. 3, 4,6 ,11 are from the papers by CDI winners.		This has been addressed in chapter 4.1.4

28	At UR-CBE Masters Theses Manuals and PhD Thesis Manuals were developed. Two masters programmes curriculum were reviewed. MAB accreditation process was initiated and admitted in to the Deans Across the Frontier (EDAF) process by the European Foundation for Management Development (EFMD). Under this the UR-CBE has prepared a self-assessment and the mentor has visited CBE for preparing a peer review assessment to be undertaken shortly. The Principal of UR-CBE has been supervising this process personally. Please refer to the document I sent earlier to the evaluators email.		These additions have been made to the text earlier in the sub-section.
28	The co-teachers at UR-CBE were there along with the JIBS professor with the principle that they will eventually take responsibility to teach those courses independently.	The evidence from the evaluation contradicts this observation.	However, some changes have been made to the text to clarify the point made.
29	At UR-CBE as Team Leader , I was the person responsible to lead the group to develop the theme, concept of our proposals (LoI and Full Proposal) aligning to the national priorities and the skills gaps at the Schools and their needs for capacity building. It's a group process at UR. UR has given the team leaders and groups a well-crafted concept note describing what we are supposed to do and we ventured in to developing our own proposals, but off-course with the participation of JIBS. It's a joint process. It is far from reality to say that JIBS has drafted the proposals for us.		The text has been revised to clarify these issues.
29	The collaboration for management and economics were separated due to the non-readiness of Sida to consider one unit in two applications and later separated due to some internal developments. SWEGPEC was the reason why the economics PhD students take courses outside JIBS. We have taken a sequential staff capacity development process other than CDI, though CDI has resulted in awareness among the staff about research environment and also	No revisions are necessary here. The issue of Sida's involvement is dealt with in detail in Annex 6.	-

	contributed to inspire staff to undertake research. And its UR-CBE decision to take up the priority activities in alignment with the UR broader concept and vision of development in making UR a research led global university.		
31	This experience of economics PhD students was never brought to my notice as I have been there as the Team Leader since the beginning up to now. I did not get any representation from any single economics student. Otherwise we could have interfered and asked UR-Sweden Programme PCO to rectify it.	These points either: (i) highlight problems of poor communication; or (ii) underline the argument in the report. This has been discussed in a footnote and the conclusion is that CBE has limited ownership and control of fund management.	The points have been noted in the report.
32	CDI was designed at the instance of UR-CBE staff needs. It came up as motivation tool to integrate the programme from the former FEM-former NUR Economics and Management sub-programme approved early 2013 in to the new University of Rwanda crated by merging of 7 public institutions. CBE was formed bringing together the staff of former FEM, former SFB and staff from former KIE and former UP. There was an initial setback of colleagues from these 4 former institutions coming together and understanding the sub-programme component, which were originally designed addressing only former FEM of former NUR. Then, we at the sub-programme, under the guidance of the former Principal, UR-CBE have taken an intensive drive to create awareness among the whole staff of UR-CBE thorough consultation at all the 4 locations. We have also undertaken the needs assessment of the staff, out of which we got that the capacity to do research and writing scientific research papers and their dissemination. Therefore, the decision came out of those deliberations and formally approved by the UR-CBE management	No change is required. The comment does not address or add any further information to the key concerns that JIBS failed to deliver on the issue, i.e. the generation of publications in international journals through the CDI. SWEGPEC has been acknowledged elsewhere in the report.	-

	to have the CDI on one hand to inculcate research culture by exposing them to successful research environment and mentorship by JIBS professors and to organize international conferences enabling the large number of CBE staff to participate and present papers. Regarding the deployment of economics PhD students at JIBS to other universities to learn PhD courses was mainly due to SWEGPEC and off-course it is an arrangement of JIBS out of its policy.		
32	It was a decision of the UR-CBE to have one collaboration with UGOT on environmental economics and climate change. And unfortunately, we are not aware of the discontentment of the School of Economics about the JIBS. And off-course it needs to be addressed.	No changes are required.	-
33	CDI as mentioned earlier came out of the process of needs assessment to introduce the CBE staff to the research culture. Publication in the international ranked peer reviewed journals was not the objective of the CDI. The major part of the cost was on the side of UR-CBE not on JIBS side. During 2018-2019, the CDI budget for UR-CBE was 450,000SEK while for JIBS it was only SEK 150,000. How can it be treated as the JIBS agenda? The publication comes out of the personal capacity of the researcher.	The text has been revised to more clearly explain the point being made. The comments on the outputs of the CDI are worrying given that publications in international journals was clearly specified in the agreed proposal.	Changes have been made throughout the report to acknowledge the CBE team leader's acceptance of the downgrading of outputs from the CDI.
33	It was not so difficult and complicated. UR-CBE has taken the ownership of the proposals and agreed to have the two proposals separating management with JIBS and Economics with UGOT. Concept notes, LoIs and Full Proposals were developed. No complications were there for UR-CBE to own the processes, but	The issues noted by the CBE team leader have been addressed elsewhere in the report. No other explanation has been given	-

	difficulties were created perhaps by the external forces, which were ultimately subdued for the cause of having continued the collaborations and support from the Sida.	to account for the SoE seeking to collaborate with UGOT rather than JIBS.	
33	This is the evaluator's own interpretation perhaps based on wrong premises. UR-CBE has definitive aims to have CDI for inculcating research culture among the staff and the economics PhD students have been doing well comparatively and in fact we added one more PhD student in 2017 in economics. It evidences that UR-CBE has been benefiting from the collaboration.	Yes, this is the evaluator's interpretation based on the evidence presented. Other issues (i.e. CDI and appropriate support for SoE students) have been addressed elsewhere.	-
34	From our side at UR-CBE, I have been in touch with the colleagues at JIBS (its not only the coordinator). I used to have communication with all former Team Leaders who include Prof. Mattias Nordquvist, Prof. Vivian Vimarlund, Prof. Paul Ndyst, Prof. Ether Brundin and with the current TL Prof. Daniel Pittinos. And also have the required communication with the discipline-wise responsible persons for PhD students at JIBS who include Prof. Francesco Chirico and Prof. Olof Brunninge for Management, Prof. Scott Hacker, Prof. Par Sjollander and Prof. Pia Nelsson for Economics. In addition, Prof. Almas Heshamati in organizing the international conferences. Perhaps the evaluator might have got all this information, if he might have talked to me.	Changes have been made to emphasize the problems of a coordinator (from JIBS) dealing with academic issues.	The text has been revised to acknowledge the general point.
35	As a Team Leader from the side of UR-CBE, I have always been working for the promotion of the objectives of UR-CBE . I am not aware of such things as that of JIBS agenda. The programme is owned by UR-CBE and JIBS is only there to facilitate to UR-CBE ,if that it is named as JIBS Agenda, by the evaluator, that's fine	No changes are required as the argument presented in the report is substantiated by evidence from the evaluation and no other evidence has been produced that might challenge that argument.	-

35	As explained above, that UR-CBE did not experience any communication blockade with any colleague at JIBS.	No revision is required. The issue raised in this comment has been sufficiently addressed.	-
36	The purpose of CDI as mentioned already is to expose the UR-CBE staff to research culture and motivating them to at first to motivate them to do research and write something publishable, though not in high ranked international peer reviewed journals. If the staff are mobilized and take a positive outlook of research and inclination to publish are the prime target.	The comments from the CBE team leader contribute to arguments made elsewhere in the report about ownership and control of the collaboration.	The text has been revised to clarify the CDI initiative and JIBS' failure to deliver on what was proposed.
38	It is obvious that sandwich PhD programmes should be delivered in Sweden not in the beneficiary university in Africa.		The text has been revised to acknowledge the definition of sandwich programs agreed in the collaboration.
38	The very purpose of CDI was to encourage the UR-CBE staff by exposing them to research environment and providing mentorship to inculcate research culture. It is less expensive to take 8 CDI winners to Sweden than bringing 8 mentors from Sweden to Rwanda for two weeks.	The point about CDI has been addressed elsewhere in the report. The evaluators are not sure why it would be necessary for 8 professors to travel to Rwanda for mentoring when it may be sufficient with two staying for a few weeks?	-
40	Exposure to research culture was the major aim of CDI. Comparatively it is cost effective to bring 8 junior staff from Africa to Sweden rather than 8 senior professors from Sweden to Africa.	No change is required as the collaboration clearly states that the CDI would lead to publications.	-
40	This is the evaluators own interpretation deviating from the evidences and witnesses they have.	No change is required as the evidence supports the conclusion. No evidence to support the comment made here	Section 3.4 added to explain the Evaluation Team's analysis of

		has been produced.	ownership
40	UR-CBE has the evidences for the full claim of ownership. Having no other choices except JIBS is not a limitation . We have our ownership. We at UR-CBE prevailed all along the period of collaboration to keep our ownership and kept the management of the programme in our hands. JIBS as a partner was active and supportive. UR-CBE succeeded in getting almost all objectives in terms of output and off-course with some limitations in realizing the outcomes as stated in RBM. Our PhD students are graduating, master were strengthened, research output is growing, research culture has been implanted though it is in initial stages, passion for publishing in high ranked journals is started sprouting, increased the number of PhD students from 7 to 8 , organized 4 international conferences, contributed to edited book volumes and also to international peer reviewed journals though not in ABS category and have a strong commitment to have own PhD programme with course work, new masters programmes and more stress on policy initiatives and research dissemination with a quality edge.	Other issues (e.g. the graduation of PhD students) have been noted elsewhere in the report but – importantly – none of these points challenges the issue of ownership.	The evaluation reflects the partner universities contradicting the Evaluation Team's conclusion regarding ownership.
41	As UR-CBE entered second term of collaboration, it has to got all necessary inputs to be self-sustained in the future. It's a process that JIBS has been assisting in making UR-CBE a sustainable research institution. There is no complaint in it form the side of UR-CBE.	The comments of the CBE team leader are at odds with all other evidence collected.	-
41	Its only because of the SWEGPEC in Sweden. Evaluators' have to see the brighter side of it. Even Stockholm and UGOT send their students to other universities for PhD courses. It also inspired us and tried to create Regional Collaboration in Africa to share the scarce resources in offering the PhD programmes with course work. Even we went ahead and succeeded common curriculum for		This has been changed, see above.

	PhD programmes in economics and management with course work in Addis Ababa, Dar es Salaam, and Makerere.		
41	Even sometimes management students take some PhD courses outside JIBS for the sake of expertise the other university is having.	No change is required.	-
41	Papers presented in the conferences are not publications. Conferences are only the platform for discussing the research results with peers to get comments for improvement.		The comment has been acknowledged and the report has now used the term 'presented'.
41	CDI is to expose the staff to research culture and the sandwich PhD programme is to fill the gaps that the African universities have at present but eventually moving to self-sufficiency.	No changes are required as the argument has been made elsewhere in the report.	-
41	Activity Based Costing is a most accepted way of planning the costs and controlling them. We have seen the results based management, but not results based costing.		Section on results based budgeting expanded to explain.
42	Although it may be the responsibility of Sida to react to this statement, but I felt the need to state that Sida, through the Embassy of Sweden in Rwanda, is in close and regular communication with UR leadership, the PCO and the Team leaders. The PCO organizes a monthly meeting of all Team and Deputy Team leaders which are often attended by the Sweden Embassy Staff who is in charge of the Research and Higher Education Cooperation.		Recommendation removed.
42	Sida has been doing this and as a matter of fact, it part of the regular policy discussion between Sida and UR.	See above.	-
42	This is what RBM does	See above.	Section on results based budgeting expanded to explain.

42	This is what is provided for in the new phase of UR-Sweden Program.	See above. However, no change is required as the evidence clearly indicates that this point needs to be very clearly made, recognized and realized.	-
58	I was not interviewed. I have requested either to prepone or postpone the visit of Michael Watts as I was travelling to India to celebrate my daughter's marriage. But he promised to interview via skype which did not take place while I was in India or after reaching Rwanda. I was allowed to send some information by email.	See comment above re interviewing Prof Rama	-

Annex 9 – Sida management response

Sida

Management Response

Evaluation manager: Veronica Melander

2020-08-12

cc: Biståndsråd amb Etiopien, Mozambique, Rwanda

AnnaMaria Oltorp, Head of Research Cooperation Unit

Ärendenummer: 19/000454

Management response to the ”Evaluation of Jönköping International Business School’s (JIBS) collaboration with Sida partner universities in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Mozambique”

Background

Sweden has a long history of supporting low income countries to develop their capacity to independently carry out and manage research. The training of researchers at national public universities in these countries is often done in partnership with Swedish universities. The collaboration between universities and researchers is highly valued both by Sida and partners as a way to build sustainable research capacity and create long-term partnerships beyond the Sida funded cooperation.

In 2018, Sida and Addis Ababa University (AAU) in Ethiopia decided to evaluate AAU’s collaboration with its long-term Swedish partner Jönköping International Business School (JIBS) at Jönköping University[130]. AAU and JIBS have partnered since 2011, funded by Sida. However, as JIBS is collaborating with other universities in the region – notably University of Rwanda (UR) and Universidade Eduardo Mondlane (UEM), Mozambique – Sida saw an opportunity to obtain a broader picture of how JIBS contributes to develop institutional research capacity in low income countries by including also these in the evaluation. This is

[130] Jönköping University is a non-profit foundation and one of few non-public institutions of higher learning in Sweden. JIBS is one of four colleges at the university. These are managed as joint stock companies fully owned by the Jönköping University Foundation. JIBS offers PhD training through four programmes in Business Administration, Economics, Informatics and Statistics.

the first time an external evaluation is focused on a Swedish university or university college partner within Sida's bilateral research cooperation programs.

The purpose of the evaluation was to increase the understanding of if and how the partnerships between JIBS and AAU in Ethiopia, UEM in Mozambique, and UR in Rwanda have contributed to the objectives and modalities in the Swedish policies and strategies governing Sida funded research cooperation from 2010 and onwards.[131] The evaluation is especially relevant for the their first objectives; to strengthen and develop research of relevance to the fight against poverty in developing countries, and to focus on capacity building for research, primarily in low-income countries and regions. The evaluation was also expected to guide the future direction of the collaboration with JIBS with the three countries.

The evaluation focused on *scientific quality, ownership, and cost efficiency*. These three areas were chosen as some questions had been raised in these areas within the collaboration.

Primary intended users are the Unit for Research Cooperation at Sida (FORSK), the Swedish embassies in Ethiopia, Mozambique, and Rwanda, and JIBS.

The evaluation had a budget of 1.2 million SEK and was procured under Sida's framework agreement (renewed competition). Sida received one tender, which was assessed by FORSK. A contract was signed with FCG Sweden on April 4, 2019 and the evaluation was conducted between April and October 2019. It was coordinated by a senior research advisor at FORSK with a steering group/reference group that commented on the draft inception and final reports. The group included research advisors at the embassies in Ethiopia, Mozambique, and Rwanda. The evaluation was approved by Sida on November 6, 2019.

Assessment of the quality and usefulness of the evaluation

OECD DAC's principles for evaluation of development cooperation and its related quality standards[132] state that evaluation processes should be *independent* and *impartial* and provide information that is *credible* and *useful*. Sida's evaluation unit has developed a checklist based on OECD DAC's quality standards to facilitate assessments of credibility and usefulness. The Steering Group used this in its assessment of the evaluation process and for its approval of the final report.

---

[131] Policy for Research in Swedish Development Cooperation 2010-2014, Strategy for Sida's Support for Research Cooperation 2010-2014, Swedish Strategy for Research Cooperation and Research in Development cooperation 2015-2021.

[132] Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance (OECD, 1991) and Quality Standards for Development Evaluation (OECD 2010).

Sida assesses that the evaluation process has been independent and impartial. The evaluation was procured in a transparent and open procurement procedure. The contracted evaluation team had relevant thematic knowledge and evaluation experience and were independent from the evaluation object. They have been backed up by a quality assurance function at FCG, independent from the rest of the team. Constraints encountered during the process, such as lack of access to individuals for interviews, have been addressed and have not affected the independence and impartiality of the process.

Sida assesses that the evaluation provides information that is credible and useful. Overall, the evaluation has sufficiently answered the main evaluation questions and is deemed to be valuable for the primary intended users. The method used is qualitative based on individuals' subjective accounts triangulated against comparison between accounts and with other data sources. In accordance with the ToR, the method was refined in the inception report. The final report acknowledges potential weaknesses in the method and implications for findings to a satisfactory extent. Data sources are described and deemed sufficient, and where triangulation was not possible this is stated in the final report. The analysis is clear; there is a link between data, findings, conclusions and recommendations. However, some recommendations may not be fully actionable.

Sida, embassies, JIBS and partner universities commented on the draft inception and final reports. The revised draft of the final report was subject to an additional round of comments at the request of JIBS. Factual errors have been addressed and where differences of opinion or interpretation remained JIBS' comments were reproduced verbatim in footnotes. This is according to the OECD DAC quality standards.

JIBS has made further comments on the findings of the evaluation in their management response to the evaluation, which is to be published as an appendix to the evaluation (as will this).

Evaluation conclusions

The evaluation concludes that JIBS' collaborations with AAU and UR succeeded in increasing the amount of research being produced by the partner universities. These collaborations were particularly important in supporting PhD students and the development of in-house PhD programs. However, most of that research is published as working papers, conference papers, and book chapters, while the number of articles published in peer-reviewed established journals is very small. The evaluation identifies some areas of concern, and concludes that there are weaknesses and possibilities for improvement.

With regards to *scientific quality*, the evaluation finds that most publications are working papers, conference papers and book chapters. Few studies have been published as articles and none in double-blind peer reviewed journals of reputable quality. The Career Development Initiative (CDI) has helped UR staff to increase outputs and UEM staff to begin writing papers for publication. However, the research produced through CDI has not resulted in international peer-reviewed journals, which was the initial intention. There have also been publications in predatory journals. The evaluation concludes that the guidance for writing for publications has not been adequate and questions the publication strategy of JIBS with regards to individual PhD candidates' dissertation work.

The evaluation finds that all three partner universities' faculties claim *ownership* of the collaboration and that university leadership agree. Still, the evidence collected lead the evaluators to conclude that ownership of the collaborations has rested with JIBS to a significant extent. Aspects include JIBS using a standard approach in the design of the collaborations and partner universities not challenging components perceived by them to contribute less to the institution's capacity development needs. This applied in particular to UEM. JIBS has in some cases managed all funds and all narrative and financial reporting to Sida, with partner universities perceiving the collaboration as JIBS' responsibility and that JIBS is delivering the outputs.

The evaluation concludes that JIBS' budgeting and financial reporting has not been fully results-based and that a *cost-efficiency* analysis of each component is not possible. It notes that the proportion of funding going to JIBS compared to other Swedish partners working in different faculties at AAU, UR and UEM was noticeably higher. It was not possible to assess the reason based on the budgets, as they were not sufficiently disaggregated. The partner universities argued that this was due to JIBS holding PhD courses in Sweden (according to the agreements reached by partner universities) and the CDI taking place in Sweden. Both UR and UEM challenged JIBS about the value of this, which the evaluators interpret as an indication that the partner universities see these Sweden-based solutions as less cost-efficient. The evaluation notes that the average annual cost of educating PhD students varies between the universities. The AAU is not a traditional sandwich program and has the lowest cost. However, progression is slow among PhD students, meaning that the total cost to educate a PhD could be higher than calculated. At the UR the average annual cost has been significantly higher than that stipulated by Sida guidelines.

Proposed management response for Sida and concerned embassies

The evaluation gives recommendations to Sida, to JIBS, and to JIBS and partner universities jointly. The four recommendations listed below are those directed to Sida.

Recommendation 1:

The evaluation recommends that Sida should provide for formative and summative evaluations of collaborations, or components of collaborations. Consideration should be given to requiring independent evaluations to inform collaborating and partner universities.

Sida agrees with the recommendation. Evaluation is a tool to promote learning inhouse as well as for partners within Sweden's bilateral research cooperation. Summative evaluations and mid-term reviews (MTR:s) are normally part of the agreements. Other types of formative evaluation (i.e. iterative, quick, often more informal evaluations to help adjust ongoing program implementation) have so far not been used much but could be explored.

Measure: Sida will continue to commission evaluations of collaborations, or components of collaborations. In addition, future evaluations of Swedish partners are planned.

Responsible: FORSK and relevant embassies.

End date: Continuously.

Recommendation 2:

The evaluation recommends that Sida should work with partner universities to support and sustain the development of realistic human resource policies that allow for appropriate salaries, responsibilities and allocation of time to research and supervision. Consideration should be given to realizing this through training/workshops delivered by Swedish universities. Further consideration should be given to making such policies a key criterion in the assessment of overall programs and the sub-programs within them.

Sida agrees with the recommendation. Realistic human resource polices that allow for appropriate salaries, responsibilities and allocation of time for research and supervision is key to strengthening the research capacity of partner universities. Sida and Swedish embassies have a continuous dialogue and work with partner universities to develop and/or sustain such policies. An increased focus on this dialogue might be justified, especially when a new phase of support is prepared.

Measure: Ensure that the assessment of human resource policies are included in appraisal of new or prolonged bilateral research programs, and are part of the follow-up framework.

Responsible: Embassies are responsible for support to partner universities and the assessment of overall programs and subprograms. FORSK is responsible for the method by which the bilateral research partnerships are appraised.

End date: Continuously.

Recommendation 3:

The evaluation recommends that Sida asks collaborating universities and partner universities to, in the proposal, establish quality criteria for the publication of research. Sida should, furthermore, ask collaborating and partner universities to regularly report on the fulfillment of such criteria.

Sida agrees with the recommendation. To have clear criteria for the publication of research would increase transparency in appraisals and in annual follow-up and results reporting. The issue of quality of publications has been discussed for many years, but with the arrival of so-called predatory publishers there is an urgent need to address this issue.

Measure: In general, establishing quality criteria for the publication of research will be included in the revised guidelines for the appraisal process.

Responsible: FORSK is responsible for ensuring that quality criteria are established in the bilateral research cooperation and the embassies follow up in the annual reports.

End date: To be completed by early 2021 and continuously.

Recommendation 4:

The evaluation recommends that Sida should request budgets and financial reporting from the collaborating and partner universities to be results-based for all main components of the proposal (PhD course work, sandwich PhD training, CDI, conferences etc.) and thus clearly linked to the results framework. The result-based budgets should establish the budgeted amounts per outcome and year. The subsequent financial reporting on results will enable all stakeholders to better assess cost-efficiency, monitor actual costs of achieving outcomes and make informed decisions about any modifications necessary.

Sida partly agrees with the recommendation. It might be more efficient and practical to establish more detailed rules and budget lines, as well as lumpsums for Swedish collaborating universities.

Measure: Budget rules for Swedish collaboration partners will be revised. The methods group at FORSK is planning to introduce budget templates, as well as more detailed guidance on allowed budget lines. This will be implemented in new agreements, and in ongoing agreements if appropriate.

Responsible: FORSK and embassies.

End date: End of 2020.

Other observations and actions

The conclusion Sida (FORSK and embassies) draws from the cost-efficiency assessment in the evaluation is that the Career Development Initiative, CDI, is a major challenge. Since the CDI is also problematic from the point of view of ownership by the African universities, Sida has decided that funding of the CDI component will be stopped within all the three programs. It may be re-established only if cost-efficiency and local ownership in accordance with Sida rules can be guaranteed.

Positions and actions country by country

Rwanda-UR

Position: The Management and Economics subprogram with JIBS has been one of the most successful ones during the previous phase (2013-2019) in delivering results in terms of PhD graduation, number of publications and developing local PhD programs. Out of about ten local PhD programs planned to be accredited by the end of the phase only three got accreditation from the Higher Education Council, two (Economics and Management) were developed with the support of JIBS. *Credit is given to JIBS for these results.*

Actions: The Management subprogram will be allowed to continue (most of the quality concerns of the evaluation related to the training in Economics, which is not JIBS' responsibility anymore). However, dialogue should be conducted with JIBS (and UR) on the issues listed in the following points and a more detailed concrete action plan is needed.

In the local PhD training JIBS should gradually decrease its involvement (in terms of courses delivered by Swedish lecturers). They should have a continuous dialogue with the leadership of the School of Business (and not only the UR team leader) on what approach to apply in this gradual withdrawal (e.g monitoring the delivery of the training, giving courses together, co-supervision). It should be UR that leads the discussions to ensure ownership. The gradual withdrawal is also expected to make the collaboration more cost-efficient.

The evaluation found that the cost of the sandwich PhD was considerably higher than the fixed 250 000 SEK per year per student. This is surprising not least because the ToR used for the annual audit of the Swedish universities' financial reports explicitly contains the question whether the financial report meets the relevant cost accounting requirements. This issue will be followed up.

Some of the activities, such as the CDI was too eagerly pushed by JIBS – against the will of the UR management. When negotiating the new program phase, UR made it clear that they do not prioritize CDI (and particularly not if it takes place in Sweden and not in Rwanda). The CDI component will be discontinued as mentioned above.

The subprogram organized quite a number of conferences, but the evaluation did not find evidence of proper quality assurance of them. The budget for organizing conferences UR/JIBS should be cut and instead be allocated to students and staff to attend international conferences that have a high standard. Alternatively, co-organizing conferences with regional actors who have leverage (for example AERC) may be considered.

The coordination of the program needs to be reconsidered at JIBS as well as at UR, in order to find an arrangement where academic issues are more systematically discussed by the academics participating in the project and whereby the collaboration is more integrated into the mainstream activities of the College of Business and Economics at UR.

Ethiopia-AAU

Position: JIBS' management response to the Evaluation Report shows resistance to accepting the findings. The Embassy/Sida would like to see a more constructive approach from JIBS to improve the situation. The collaboration JIBS-AAU may proceed albeit with some modifications. A more concrete action plan addressing the issues below will be needed.

Actions: Scientific quality – The research outputs of the PhD candidates of both programmes (Management and Economics) are limited to the production of manuscripts. Practically, all the publications produced were book chapters, conference and working papers. So far, there were about 12 publications in journals which were of low quality and half of them appeared in predatory journals. These were not the expectations set in the agreement. The embassy will work with AAU and JIBS to ensure that quality criteria are established for the collaboration.

Local ownership – The legal arrangement makes it difficult for AAU to exercise its ownership. JIBS manages each year more than half of the funds allocated to the subprogram

and reports to the Embassy of Sweden directly through ISP without the knowledge of AAU that signed for the whole fund. This is a structural challenge that must be addressed. AAU as the signing partner with Sida on the overall cost of the funding, JIBS through ISP should submit its financial and technical reports to AAU which should be responsible to account for the total budget and outcomes based on result-based budgeting techniques to Sida through the Embassy of Sweden in Addis Ababa.

Cost efficiency – The CDI will be discontinued as will be done in all the collaborations.

Special efforts should be made to get AAU students to complete their work in the budgeted four years. Since late 2019, a new AAU regulation requires students to publish two articles in peer reviewed journals or produce evidence for the same on top of the thesis manuscript. The aim with the new publication requirement is to inject quality into the PhD work and promote the publication profile of the university and increase its visibility. This issue must be addressed in the JIBS subprogram (as well as in all other subprograms) in order to respect AAU regulations and the ownership of AAU.

Mozambique/UEM

In Mozambique the Economics programme of the current phase was in the initial stage of implementation when it stalled, and therefore the conclusions drawn differ from those in Rwanda and Ethiopia.

The evaluation raises a number of concerns relating to the cooperation between JIBS and the Faculty of Education (FE) at UEM. The most important ones are:

- The original proposal was overambitious on the part of JIBS and UEM, and not based on a thorough and joint due diligence of UEM's needs. This resulted in a series of issues at the start of the collaboration necessitating a substantial re-write of the collaboration, activities and budget.

- There was a different focus between FE/UEM and JIBS, where FE/UEM's focus was on building its in-house PhD program and less on capacity building activities in Sweden that would not lead to academic qualifications (for example the CDI).

- There were significant problems enrolling and retaining students for the JIBS PhD program as the capacity and needs analysis at UEM had not been done correctly.

Position: It is the embassy/Sida's view that the evaluation gives an accurate description of the collaboration and the challenges encountered early in the implementation of the programme.

Because of these challenges a revised proposal was presented to the embassy. See Annex 7 of the evaluation report for a description of the changes proposed. As the revised proposal differs significantly from what has been approved a new assessment by an external committee would be required if the sub-programme were to go ahead.

It is the embassy/Sida's view that the management response from JIBS does not address or accept the matters raised in the evaluation.

Actions: Because of the few advances until the programme was halted, and because of the shortcomings identified in the evaluation, the Embassy has decided to discontinue the Economics program in the bilateral program with Mozambique.

Communication of results and learning from the evaluation

This evaluation has been a useful learning experience. The analysis and recommendations are valuable and will guide the future path of the collaboration in the three counties.

The report will be published online on Sida's website and available for downloading through Sida's publication database.

Annex 10 – JIBS management response

Positions and actions in response to the FCG report ” Evaluation of Jönköping International Business School’s (JIBS) collaboration with Sida partner universities in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Mozambique ”

JIBS welcomes external evaluations of our work. We consider such evaluations as valuable opportunities to learn and to improve.

JIBS appreciates that the evaluation report notes how the African partner universities regard their relationship with JIBS, the improved research output from faculty at the partner universities, and results in terms of improved research culture at the partner universities.

The evaluation report also highlights some important issues that need improvement. Those will be addressed in the subsequent parts of this response.

Unfortunately, however, both the achievements and areas for improvement presented in the evaluation report are overshadowed by the shortcomings from which this evaluation suffers, and which we have raised our concerns about since the initial version of the report was circulated. The initial version contained numerous factual errors, misconceptions and speculative comments. Despite several rounds of revisions, including corrections of misunderstandings and objective factual errors from JIBS side, several of these flaws still remain. Our assessment is therefore that, even after revisions, the evaluation report does not provide a fair picture of our collaborations. Instead, the numerous shortcomings of the report and the extended process needed to rectify some of its errors has done severe harm to the projects it was set out to assess. We think this is very unfortunate.

Our reactions to the overarching claims made in the report on the three main aspects under assessment (scientific quality, ownership, and cost efficiency) are presented below, followed by a detailed account of actions that we plan to take to improve in those areas. Our actions are presented in immediate connection to the recommendations presented in the evaluation report.

Scientific Quality

JIBS acknowledges the importance of constantly striving for improvements in scientific quality. This includes an ambition to move towards higher quality publication outlets and to encourage our partner universities to take such steps. When it comes to submitting papers to scientific journals, we always encourage our collaborating partners to consider journals that can be found on established journal ranking lists (ABS, ABDC etc.). However, we do not use these ranking lists to benchmark the quality of PhD students’ thesis chapters, but as encouragement for future development.

JIBS applies a rigorous quality assurance process, where thesis manuscripts (monographs and compilations alike) are scrutinized by an external opponent at the final seminar, some months prior to defense and then discussed by a reputable scholar (Docent or Full Professor) at the defense and evaluated by a three-member independent examination committee. The examination committee members have authority to reject any thesis that does not meet scientific quality standards. This quality assurance process is fully in line with common practice in the Swedish university system.

All JIBS/UR doctoral students' theses have successfully gone through this process in full compliance with our internal rules. For the AAU PhD students, they follow their AAU doctoral program, where it states that an external opponent should read and provide feedback in order to assess the quality before the PhD candidate finalizes the manuscript.

There are formulations in the evaluation report that question the scientific quality of the output resulting from the collaborations which we find misleading and, in many cases, incorrect. For instance, and most importantly, the evaluation has not considered the grades of the individual theses in the evaluation of scientific quality of the research outputs. In JIBS earlier responses on the evaluation draft we suggested that, in judging the quality of JIBS supervision, the evaluation team could have included the evaluation and opinions of the professors taking part in the independent grading committees of each individual thesis and the grades given, but they did not include such information in the final report.

We acknowledge that it can be difficult to fully understand the complexity of managing a locally owned PhD program that is run in collaboration with partner universities in other countries. Such collaborations are few and they bear little resemblance with sandwich programs that are managed in fundamentally different ways. Hence, our ambition to strive for higher quality publication outlets and influence partner universities to improve their scientific quality is an ongoing challenge and we believe that what we have so far achieved is the level one could realistically expect.

Ownership

The final version of the evaluation report states "that ownership of the collaborations has rested with JIBS to a significant extent". At the same time all African partners claim ownership on their part and contests the evaluators conclusion in their feedback. The evaluation report does not elaborate on this contradiction. In the terms of reference for the evaluation it is described how ownership should be assessed "The Evaluation Team will ask department/faculty level and university leadership level at each of the collaborating partners' to define ownership. The definitions will be presented, and evidence gathered to verify the extent to which each collaboration is rated high or low regarding ownership." (Page 63).

The evaluators did not present any such definitions nor any rating of such definitions by partners. Neither do they provide any explanation to why they deviate from the TOR.

Further questioning of the evaluators claim is the fact that the evaluators did not talk to JIBS main collaborators in Rwanda. Therefore, given the testimony from the partner institutions, it is not possible to understand the evaluators claims on JIBS when it comes to ownership. This is particularly notable as the evaluators also link their view on JIBS ownership to other findings in the evaluation report.

JIBS seeks a balanced ownership and to a large extent has succeeded to do so according to its partners. JIBS agrees that the concept of ownership "is an objective that is actively promoted and evolves over time" and have given the evaluators example of inclusive and participatory management practices developed together with partners. JIBS is of course willing to correct mistakes and to learn more about the difficult process to improve ownership in its research partnership.

Cost efficiency

According to the OECD DAC definition of cost efficiency is it is crucial to understand if the desired results were achieved in relation to the input and to compare with alternative activities to possibly reach the same or better results, if cost efficiency should be possible to measure.

Using the OECD DAC definition of cost-efficiency the share of funding to JIBS is irrelevant from a cost-efficiency perspective. Still this is mentioned several times in the report and also in the country reports. The indicators proposed in the TOR can be relevant in relation to the OECD DAC definition. JIBS would have welcomed that the evaluators would have used the indicators described in the TOR to assess the cost efficiency in JIBS partnerships programs.

JIBS agrees that the budget framework limits to some extent the possibility to provide detailed information for cost-efficiency assessment. However, the budget framework is set by Sida, is similar for all Swedish partners, and constitute the legal basis for the agreement between Sida and its partners.

Positions and actions AAU – JIBS collaboration

Recommendations	Position and actions	Responsible	End date
1. JIBS should ensure that appropriate structures are in place for co-teaching and co- supervision with colleagues at partnering universities and that responsibility for teaching coursework is transferred to the partner universities at the earliest viable opportunity.	JIBS is a supplier of well-defined activities in the two AAU doctoral programs. It is the responsibility of AAU to decide on all matters concerning the delivery of the programs, including co-teaching and co-supervision. JIBS will suggest further improvements in organization and delivery of co-teaching and co-supervision to AAU. And we will also suggest a joint follow up to AAU to make sure that agreed activities have been implemented.	At AAU the respective chairmen of departments. At JIBS the team leader is responsible to draft proposals to AAU.	Assessment of outcome to be made on annual basis if accepted by AAU
2. JIBS should re-focus its publishing priorities and policies to ensure that a larger number of research outputs end up published in journals that are well recognized in the field.	JIBS do not see the need to re-focus its publishing priorities and policies in general. The evaluation has highlighted that some stakeholders at our partner universities expect more high-quality publications resulting from academic conferences and Career Development Initiatives. While we agree that publications in reputable academic journals are desirable, it is important to be aware that quite a few CDI and conference participants have had very limited prior research experience. The aim of the CDI and in particular the conferences has been to reach	At AAU the respective chairmen of departments. At JIBS the team leader is responsible to draft proposals to AAU. Decisions on JIBS publishing priorities and policies are taken by JIBS associate dean of research.	Assessment of outcome to be made on annual basis if accepted by AAU

	out to faculty at the partner universities in an inclusive manner and to give many colleagues the opportunity of engaging in research. Given the prior experience of the participants and the research time they have at their disposal, expectations for publications in reputable journals are in many cases unrealistic. Therefore, using the internal benchmarks of a reputed European business school as a target, would be counterproductive in this context. For the upcoming conference at AAU, we will aim for a smaller number of participants, also meaning a higher rejection rate. While this implies that we cannot reach out to partner university faculty as broadly as before, we hope we can provide feedback with higher quality to those eventually participating.		
3. JIBS should carefully communicate any special features of the PhD programs that impact on when and where PhD students take their courses.	While clear communication with PhD students is important, this recommendation is based on an interview with one individual PhD student from University of Rwanda who incorrectly claims that the cost for taking PhD courses at other Swedish universities is covered by money aimed for the student's international conferences. We will try to even further clarify our communication to avoid such misconceptions in the future. Where and when	At JIBS the team leader is responsible to communicate relevant information to CBE/AAU.	Ongoing

	PhD students are taking PhD courses, is discussed between the supervisory team and the PhD student.		
4. Budgets should take into account such limitations (PhD students taking PhD courses outside of JIBS) so that other aspects of collaborations are not subsequently undermined.	The evaluation report includes an interview with an individual at University of Rwanda claiming that JIBS spends money on courses outside of JIBS that where to be used for international conferences. This is not true, and we do not understand why the evaluators did not check these facts with JIBS.	No action taken	-
5. JIBS must ensure that PhD students and academic staff at partner universities are properly guided on how to identify predatory journals and how to choose appropriate publication outlets.	While JIBS faculty have not been involved in the decisions to submit to such journals, we realize that we have underestimated the need to train our partners in identifying and avoiding predatory outlets. We will offer our partners training workshops addressing publication strategies with a special emphasis on identifying and avoiding predatory journals. At AAU, this will happen through workshops in before July 2020, as part of our ongoing research ethics training. The training will target doctoral students involved in our collaborations as well as supervisors and other faculty.	At AAU the respective chairmen of departments will decide on proposed trainings. At JIBS the team leader is responsible to draft proposals of training to AAU.	July 2020
6. JIBS and the partner university should agree at the outset of the collaboration on a supervisory	JIBS have been aware of delays in thesis processes even before the evaluation and these have been an ongoing concern, particularly in	At AAU the respective chairmen of departments are responsible for decisions. At	Assessment of outcome to be made on annual

process to include: • Swedish and National supervisors appointed at the same time (preferably upon acceptance of the PhD candidate), • Clear roles and responsibilities of JIBS and national supervisors, • Training and monitoring of the national supervisors, • Communication of the supervision process and responsibilities to PhD students, • Documented tools to be used to guide and measure progression of the PhD graduate (examples of this are the AAU Student Progress Reports).	the collaboration with AAU. Having said this, there is a trade-off between (a) having doctoral students in Sweden for extended periods (sandwich models), meaning that they often finalize rather quickly, and (b) having them in their home country (local-/semi-local program) where they struggle with poor infrastructure and are easily overwhelmed by teaching duties. We strongly believe that local programs are better for the sustainable development of capacity at the partner universities. To some extent, delays in processes may be a price that has to be paid. Having said this, we will continue our efforts to minimize such delays in collaboration with our partners. At AAU, a decision on individual study plans for doctoral students, allowing a better follow-up has recently been made. We will also encourage AAU doctoral students and supervisors to use visits to Sweden for more engagement with the local research environment, including research seminars. It will however be difficult to arrange for all the recommended actions at the outset of a new collaboration, although JIBS will strive for their implementation as soon as this can be	JIBS the team leader is responsible to draft and suggest improvements to AAU.	basis if accepted by AAU.

	managed.		
7. JIBS should pay closer attention to the needs of partner universities and tailor its proposals to meet them more closely.	To correctly assess the capacity of a new partner institution is difficult given the short time that normally is available for such an assessment. To some extent JIBS must trust the partner institutions on its self-assessment when new collaborations are initiated. For collaborations to be continued, like in Rwanda 2019-24 and AAU in 2018-23 JIBS has together with partners developed accurate and realistic proposals. Still, JIBS will improve its assessment of new partner institutions capacity by putting more time into the assessment of a new partner institution. JIBS has always agreed with partners on the proposal submitted and rejects, together with our partner institutions, the claim that JIBS should have an agenda of its own, different from the needs of the partner university. This does however not imply that JIBS can meet all needs expressed by partners.	JIBS team leader	When new collaborations are initiated
8. To facilitate this, JIBS should involve its own academic staff in the coordination of all aspects of the collaboration: due diligence or needs analysis, proposal drafting, negotiations with partners and Sida,	Accepted and already implemented. JIBS reorganized its management of the development collaborations in Africa, in Autumn 2018, i.e. more than half a year before the evaluation started. This means that the shortcomings regarding the involvement of	JIBS team leader and JIBS steering group	Already implemented

monitoring of the collaboration and evaluation.	academic staff in the day-to-day management of the collaborations were already addressed prior to the evaluation. Unfortunately, this change is not acknowledged in the evaluation report. JIBS created positions for Academic Directors for Economics (40% of a full-time position) and Management (40% of a full-time position) to manage the academic aspects of all three collaborations. The Academic Directors visit the partner universities several times a year and are in regular contact with their local counterparts. This change has significantly increased academic involvement from JIBS' side. In addition to the Academic Directors, JIBS project coordinator handles administrative (not academic) issues, such as budgeting, reporting etc. This ensures that the Academic Directors have time and focus for addressing the academic core of the collaborations.		
9. JIBS and partner universities should ensure that realistic outputs and outcomes are established for each initiative. Given the time and limited human resources dedicated to the CDI, to generate publications in international journals may not have	JIBS make continuous efforts to plan together with partners for realistic outputs and outcomes. As documented in the evaluation JIBS was the most successful partner to UR to implement planned activities. The contextual challenges in development cooperation research partnerships are similar for all	At CBE/AAU PI and the dean of the CBE will decide on ongoing planning. At JIBS the team leader is responsible to draft proposals of improved planning and actions to CBE/AAU.	Assessment of outcome to be made on annual basis if accepted by AAU.

been a realistic objective.	partners and makes sometimes planned programs difficult to implement. Given these challenges partners need sometimes to learn from experience and amend programs. This learning was amended into the CDI program in Rwanda from 2017 and the expected outcome from this time to result in conference presentations. At the introduction of CDI to AAU and UEM it was already from the very start expected to result in conference presentations.		

Positions and actions UR – JIBS collaboration

Recommendations	Position and actions	Responsible	End date
1. JIBS should ensure that appropriate structures are in place for co-teaching and co- supervision with colleagues at partnering universities and that responsibility for teaching coursework is transferred to the partner universities at the earliest viable opportunity.	JIBS is a planned supplier of well-defined activities in the CBE/UR doctoral program in management. It is the responsibility of UR to decide on all matters concerning the delivery of the programs, including co-teaching and co-supervision. JIBS will suggest improvements in organization and delivery of co-teaching and co-supervision to CBE/UR. And we will also suggest a joint follow up to CBE/UR to make sure that agreed activities have been	At UR the team leader and the principal at the College of Business and Economics (CBE) at UR. At JIBS the team leader is responsible to draft proposals to CBE/UR.	Assessment of outcome to be made on annual basis if accepted by CBE/UR

	implemented.		
2. JIBS should re-focus its publishing priorities and policies to ensure that a larger number of research outputs end up published in journals that are well recognized in the field.	JIBS do not see the need to re-focus its publishing priorities and policies in general. The evaluation has highlighted that some stakeholders at our partner universities expect more high-quality publications resulting from academic conferences and Career Development Initiatives. While we agree that publications in reputable academic journals are desirable, it is important to be aware that quite a few CDI and conference participants have had very limited prior research experience. The aim of the CDI and the conferences has been to reach out to faculty at the partner universities in an inclusive manner and to give many colleagues the opportunity of engaging in research. Given the prior experience of the participants and the research time they have at their disposal, expectations for publications in reputable journals are in many cases unrealistic. Therefore, using the internal benchmarks of a reputed European business school as a target, would be counterproductive in this context.	At CBE/UR the team leader and the principal at the College of Business and Economics (CBE) at UR. At JIBS the team leader is responsible to draft proposals to CBE/UR. Decisions on JIBS publishing priorities and policies are taken by JIBS associate dean of research.	Assessment of outcome to be made on annual basis if accepted by UR
3. JIBS should carefully communicate	While clear communication with PhD	At JIBS the team leader is	Ongoing

any special features of the PhD programs that impact on when and where PhD students take their courses.	students is important, this recommendation is based on an interview with one individual PhD student who incorrectly claims that the cost for taking PhD courses at other Swedish universities is covered by money aimed for the student's international conferences. We will try to even further clarify our communication to avoid such misconceptions in the future. Where and when PhD students are taking PhD courses, is discussed between the supervisory team and the PhD student.	responsible to communicate relevant information to CBE/UR.	
4. Budgets should take into account such limitations (PhD students taking PhD courses outside of JIBS) so that other aspects of collaborations are not subsequently undermined.	The evaluation report includes an interview with an individual claiming that JIBS spends money on courses outside of JIBS that where to be used for international conferences. This is not true, and we do not understand why the evaluators did not check these facts with JIBS.	No action taken	-
5. JIBS must ensure that PhD students and academic staff at partner universities are properly guided on how to identify predatory journals and how to choose appropriate publication outlets.	While JIBS faculty have not been involved in the decisions to submit to such journals, we realize that we have underestimated the need to train our partners in identifying and avoiding predatory outlets. We will offer our partners training workshops addressing publication strategies with a special emphasis on identifying and avoiding	At CBE/UR the team leader and the principal of the CBE will decide on proposed trainings. At JIBS the team leader is responsible to draft proposals of training to CBE/UR.	December 2020

	predatory journals. At CBE/UR, this will happen through workshops in before December 2020, as part of our ongoing research ethics training. The training will target doctoral students involved in our collaborations as well as supervisors and other faculty.		
6. JIBS and the partner university should agree at the outset of the collaboration on a supervisory process to include: • Swedish and National supervisors appointed at the same time (preferably upon acceptance of the PhD candidate), • Clear roles and responsibilities of JIBS and national supervisors, • Training and monitoring of the national supervisors, • Communication of the supervision process and responsibilities to PhD students, • Documented tools to be used to guide and measure progression of the PhD graduate (examples of this are the UR Student Progress Reports).	JIBS is entering a planned collaboration with CBE/UR in 2019 that includes the start of the CBE/UR PhD program in management. Training of PhDs with partners in Africa, includes a trade-off between (a) having doctoral students in Sweden for extended periods (sandwich models), meaning that they often finalize rather quickly, and (b) having them in their home country (local-/semi-local program) where they struggle with poor infrastructure and are easily overwhelmed by teaching duties. We strongly believe that local programs are better for the sustainable development of capacity at the partner universities. To some extent, delays in processes may be a price that has to be paid. Having said this, we will continue our efforts to minimize such delays in collaboration with our partners.	At CBE/UR the team leader and the principal of the CBE will decide on proposed activities. At JIBS the team leader is responsible to draft proposals of activities and actions to CBE/UR.	Assessment of outcome to be made on annual basis if accepted by UR.

	At CBE/UR, a decision on individual study plans for doctoral students, allowing a better follow-up will be proposed. We will also encourage CBE/UR doctoral students and supervisors to use visits to Sweden for more engagement with the local research environment, including research seminars. It will however be difficult to arrange for all the recommended actions at the outset of a new collaboration, although JIBS will strive for their implementation as soon as this can be managed.		
7. JIBS should pay closer attention to the needs of partner universities and tailor its proposals to meet them more closely.	To correctly assess the capacity of a new partner institution is difficult given the short time that normally is available for such an assessment. To some extent JIBS must trust the partner institutions on its self-assessment when new collaborations are initiated. For collaborations to be continued, like in Rwanda 2019-24 and AAU in 2018-23 JIBS has together with partners developed accurate and realistic proposals. Still, JIBS will improve its assessment of new partner institutions capacity by putting more time into the assessment of a new partner institution. JIBS has always agreed with partners on the proposal submitted and	JIBS team leader	When new collaborations are initiated

	rejects, together with our partner institutions, the claim that JIBS should have an agenda of its own, different from the needs of the partner university. This does however not imply that JIBS can meet all needs expressed by partners.		
8. To facilitate this, JIBS should involve its own academic staff in the coordination of all aspects of the collaboration: due diligence or needs analysis, proposal drafting, negotiations with partners and Sida, monitoring of the collaboration and evaluation.	JIBS reorganized its management of the development collaborations in Africa, in Autumn 2018, i.e. more than half a year before the evaluation started. This means that the shortcomings regarding the involvement of academic staff in the day-to-day management of the collaborations were already addressed prior to the evaluation. Unfortunately, this change is not acknowledged in the evaluation report. JIBS created positions for Academic Directors for Economics (40% of a full-time position) and Management (40% of a full-time position) to manage the academic aspects of all three collaborations. The Academic Directors visit the partner universities several times a year and are in regular contact with their local counterparts. This change has significantly increased academic involvement from JIBS' side. In addition to the Academic Directors, JIBS project	JIBS team leader and JIBS steering group	Already implemented

	coordinator handles administrative (not academic) issues, such as budgeting, reporting etc. This ensures that the Academic Directors have time and focus for addressing the academic core of the collaborations.		
9. JIBS and partner universities should ensure that realistic outputs and outcomes are established for each initiative. Given the time and limited human resources dedicated to the CDI, to generate publications in international journals may not have been a realistic objective.	JIBS make continuous efforts to plan together with partners for realistic outputs and outcomes. As documented in the evaluation JIBS was the most successful partner to UR to implement planned activities. The contextual challenges in development cooperation research partnerships are similar for all partners and makes sometimes planned programs difficult to implement. Given these challenges partners need sometimes to learn from experience and amend programs. This learning was amended into the CDI program in Rwanda from 2017 and the expected outcome from this time to result in conference presentations. At the introduction of CDI to AAU and UEM it was already from the very start expected to result in conference presentations.	At CBE/UR the team leader and the principal of the CBE will decide on ongoing planning. At JIBS the team leader is responsible to draft proposals of improved planning and actions to CBE/UR.	Assessment of outcome to be made on annual basis if accepted by UR.

Positions and actions UEM – JIBS collaboration

Recommendations	Position and actions	Responsible	End date
1. JIBS should ensure that appropriate structures are in place for co-teaching and co- supervision with colleagues at partnering universities and that responsibility for teaching coursework is transferred to the partner universities at the earliest viable opportunity.	JIBS is a planned supplier of well-defined and proposed activities in the partnership with UEM. It is the responsibility of UEM to decide on all matters concerning the delivery of the programs at UEM, including co-teaching and co-supervision. JIBS will suggest improvements in organization and delivery of co-teaching and co-supervision to UEM. And we will also suggest a joint follow up to UEM to make sure that agreed activities have been implemented.	At UEM the PI and the dean at the faculty of economics at UEM. At JIBS the team leader is responsible to draft proposals to UEM.	Assessment of outcome to be made on annual basis if accepted by UEM
2. JIBS should re-focus its publishing priorities and policies to ensure that a larger number of research outputs end up published in journals that are well recognized in the field.	JIBS do not see the need to re-focus its publishing priorities and policies in general. The evaluation has highlighted that some stakeholders at our partner universities expect more high-quality publications resulting from academic conferences and Career Development Initiatives. While we agree that publications in reputable academic journals are desirable, it is important to be aware that quite a few CDI and conference participants have had very limited prior research experience. The aim of the CDI and the conferences has been to reach out to faculty at	At UEM the PI and the dean at the faculty of economics at UEM. At JIBS the team leader is responsible to draft proposals to UEM. Decisions on JIBS publishing priorities and policies are taken by JIBS associate dean of research.	Assessment of outcome to be made on annual basis if accepted by UEM

	the partner universities in an inclusive manner and to give many colleagues the opportunity of engaging in research. Given the prior experience of the participants and the research time they have at their disposal, expectations for publications in reputable journals are in many cases unrealistic. Therefore, using the internal benchmarks of a reputed European business school as a target, would be counterproductive in this context.		
3. JIBS should carefully communicate any special features of the PhD programs that impact on when and where PhD students take their courses.	While clear communication with PhD students is important, this recommendation is based on an interview with one individual PhD student who incorrectly claims that the cost for taking PhD courses at other Swedish universities is covered by money aimed for the student's international conferences. We will try to even further clarify our communication to avoid such misconceptions in the future. Where and when PhD students are taking PhD courses, is discussed between the supervisory team and the PhD student.	At UEM the PI and the dean at the faculty of economics at UEM. At JIBS the team leader is responsible.	Ongoing
4. Budgets should take into account such limitations (PhD students taking PhD courses outside of JIBS) so that other aspects of collaborations are not subsequently undermined.	The evaluation report includes an interview with an individual at UR claiming that JIBS spends money on courses outside of JIBS that where to be used for international conferences. This is not true, and we do not	No action taken	-

	understand why the evaluators did not check these facts with JIBS.		
5. JIBS must ensure that PhD students and academic staff at partner universities are properly guided on how to identify predatory journals and how to choose appropriate publication outlets.	Doctoral students and faculty from UEM are at risk to publish their research in predatory journals. We will offer our partners training workshops addressing publication strategies with a special emphasis on identifying and avoiding predatory journals. At UEM, this will happen through workshops in before December 2020, as part of our ongoing research ethics training. The training will target doctoral students involved in our collaborations as well as supervisors and other faculty.	At UEM the PI and the dean at the faculty of economics at UEM. At JIBS the team leader is responsible to propose trainings to UEM.	December 2020
6. JIBS and the partner university should agree at the outset of the collaboration on a supervisory process to include: • Swedish and National supervisors appointed at the same time (preferably upon acceptance of the PhD candidate), • Clear roles and responsibilities of JIBS and national supervisors, • Training and monitoring of the national supervisors, • Communication of the supervision process and responsibilities to PhD	JIBS is entered a collaboration with UEM in 2018 that included among other things the start of the UEM PhD programs in management and economics. Training of PhDs with partners in Africa, includes a trade-off between (a) having doctoral students in Sweden for extended periods (sandwich models), meaning that they often finalize rather quickly, and (b) having them in their home country (local-/semi-local program) where they struggle with poor infrastructure and are easily overwhelmed by teaching duties. We strongly believe that local	At UEM the PI and the dean at the faculty of economics at UEM. At JIBS the team leader is responsible to propose trainings and relevant further action to UEM.	Assessment of outcome to be made on annual basis if accepted by UEM.

students, • Documented tools to be used to guide and measure progression of the PhD graduate (examples of this are the UR Student Progress Reports).	programs are better for the sustainable development of capacity at the partner universities. To some extent, delays in processes may be a price that has to be paid. Having said this, we will continue our efforts to minimize such delays in collaboration with our partners. At UEM, a decision on individual study plans for doctoral students, allowing a better follow-up will be proposed. We will also encourage UEM doctoral students and supervisors to use visits to Sweden for more engagement with the local research environment, including research seminars. It will however be difficult to arrange for all the recommended actions at the outset of a new collaboration, although JIBS will strive for their implementation as soon as this can be managed.		
7. JIBS should pay closer attention to the needs of partner universities and tailor its proposals to meet them more closely.	To correctly assess the capacity of a new partner institution is difficult given the short time that normally is available for such an assessment. To some extent JIBS must trust the partner institutions on its self-assessment when new collaborations are initiated. For collaborations to be continued, like in Rwanda 2019-24 and UR in 2018-23 JIBS	JIBS team leader	When new collaborations are initiated

	has together with partners developed accurate and realistic proposals. Still, JIBS will improve its assessment of new partner institutions capacity by putting more time into the assessment of a new partner institution. In addition, JIBS will together with partners continuously assess outputs and outcomes and – if deemed necessary – further amend activities and actions to reach to expected results. JIBS has always agreed with partners on the proposal submitted and rejects, together with our partner institutions, the claim that JIBS should have an agenda of its own, different from the needs of the partner university. This does however not imply that JIBS can meet all needs expressed by partners.		
8. To facilitate this, JIBS should involve its own academic staff in the coordination of all aspects of the collaboration: due diligence or needs analysis, proposal drafting, negotiations with partners and Sida, monitoring of the collaboration and evaluation.	JIBS reorganized its management of the development collaborations in Africa, in Autumn 2018, i.e. more than half a year before the evaluation started. This means that the shortcomings regarding the involvement of academic staff in the day-to-day management of the collaborations were already addressed prior to the evaluation. Unfortunately, this change is not acknowledged in the evaluation report. JIBS	JIBS team leader and JIBS steering group	Already implemented

	created positions for Academic Directors for Economics (40% of a full-time position) and Management (40% of a full-time position) to manage the academic aspects of all three collaborations. The Academic Directors visit the partner universities several times a year and are in regular contact with their local counterparts. This change has significantly increased academic involvement from JIBS' side. In addition to the Academic Directors, JIBS project coordinator handles administrative (not academic) issues, such as budgeting, reporting etc. This ensures that the Academic Directors have time and focus for addressing the academic core of the collaborations.		
9. JIBS and partner universities should ensure that realistic outputs and outcomes are established for each initiative. Given the time and limited human resources dedicated to the CDI, to generate publications in international journals may not have been a realistic objective.	JIBS make continuous efforts to plan together with partners for realistic outputs and outcomes as documented in the evaluation. The contextual challenges in development cooperation research partnerships are similar for all partners and makes sometimes planned programs difficult to implement. Given these challenges partners need sometimes to learn from experience and amend programs. This learning was amended into the CDI program in Rwanda from 2017 and the expected	At UEM the PI and the dean at the faculty of economics at UEM. At JIBS the team leader is responsible to propose trainings and relevant further action to UEM.	Assessment of outcome to be made on annual basis if accepted by UEM.

	outcome from this time to result in conference presentations. At the introduction of CDI to AAU and UEM it was already from the very start expected to result in conference presentations.		

Jönköping. 3 march 2020

Daniel Pittino
Associate Dean of Research
Team coordinator for the Sida cooperation projects at JIBS

Evaluation of Jönköping International Business School's (JIBS) collaboration with Sida partner universities in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Mozambique

The objective of this evaluation was to increase the understanding of if and how the collaborations between Jönköping International Business School (JIBS), and the Addis Ababa University (AAU), the University of Rwanda (UR), and the Universidade Eduardo Mondlane (UEM) in Mozambique, contribute to the objectives and modalities outlined in Sida's policy and strategies for support to research cooperation. The Evaluation Team found that JIBS' collaboration with AAU and UR were successful in increasing the amount of research generated by the partner universities, supporting PhD students, and the development of in-house PhD programs. An assessment of all the evidence collected leads the Evaluation Team to conclude that ownership of the collaborations has rested with JIBS to a significant extent. Recommendations focus on instituting a results-based approach to reporting to Sida at the proposal stage, as well as forming a proposal that is tailored to the partner universities' needs and what JIBS can offer. Realistic outputs and outcomes should be established based on thorough due diligence and needs analysis.

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: http://www.sida.se

Sida