Minutes – Project & budget planning meeting, Nepal, 13 March 2014

MAGAART PROJECT: Capacity Building within Research Communication, Dissemination and Networking

NOTICE: *Item 1 contains a summary of all agreements made at the meeting. Item 2-10 contains detailed minutes. Item 11 shows next steps.*

Time: 8.30 – 13.00 **Place**: Summit Hotel, Kathmandu **Chair**: Jens Seeberg	Present: Project coordinators and key persons from the six partner universities within the MAGAART project; Maseno, Aarhus, Gulu, Aalborg, Roskilde & Tribhuvan.	
Item	Summary	Note
1. **OVERVIEW: AGREEMENTS MADE AT THE MEETING**	**The activities/content developed during the 3 days workshop:** ▪ Combined PBL & e-Learning workshop ▪ Proposal development & literature search ▪ Research methods & methodology ▪ Data Analysis ▪ Academic Writing. **OVERVIEW OF AGREEMENTS MADE AT THE MEETING:** ▪ All partners agree to implement a flexible model for sharing expenses (see item 4). ▪ MSU offers to host Moodle platform (version 2.5). **Combined PBL & e-Learning workshop** ▪ Agreement to proceed with a two pronged approach: 1 workshop in Nepal (TU) + 1 workshop in East Africa (MSU + GU). **Proposal development & literature search** ▪ 3 different South workshops will be held: GU + MSU will jointly share experiences; no DK input needed. TU will arrange own workshop; will have to clear if DK input will be necessary.* ▪ Small South working group to be established: GU, MSU and TU should appoint one resource person for a small working group who can contribute to the content and organization of the actual activity. Communication will be through the Moodle system (also making them resource persons in regard to that kind of communication). ▪ PhD supervisor forum will be established.	

Research methods & methodology

- 2 separate workshop activities: MSU & GU jointly. TU makes own plan.
- 2 DK resource persons at each workshop (with complementary qualifications).

Data Analysis

- 3 workshop modules (geographically separate) with F2F at one site and eMode at the others (the F2F site changes).
- 2 DK resource persons x 3 + 1 week preparation.

In total, the activity contains the following 'packages':

- 1 workshop for preparation

- 3 workshops with 3 levels of discussion (theory, data collection, analysis)

A task force will be responsible for the development, including technical involvement from all 3 South universities. The workshop modules to held at a later stage (last part of 2015).

Academic Writing

- All 3 South universities agree to do this activity.

- Martin will remove the word 'article' in the budget/activity plan. Pär-Ola and Betty will plan time and costs (and travel) in detail.

- Should be linked to thematic conference (1.1.1)

Regarding the 1st component of the project ('Knowledge sharing…')

- 1.1.1 (Thematic conference): The Conference activity will be kept in Kenya (e.g. Nov. 2015)
- 1.1.2 (Development of research proposals): Prepare a guideline/policy.
- 1.3.1 (Thematic dissemination WS): South partner universities will decide on small adjustments within this project component.
- 1.4.1 + 1.4.2 (Research dissemination / outreach activities): South partner universities will decide on small adjustments within this project component. GU will

	still be doing radio programmes.	
2. **INTRODUCTION BY JENS SEEBERG & ROUND OF REFLEXION**	Jens: The situation is probably that we cannot do everything that people asked and hoped for during the workshop, so we need to make some decisions and prioritize. **Round of reflexion** *Discussions on pros and cons regarding development and execution of joint courses/content versus specific content development at each South partner university.* RUC: About making savings, it might make sense for MSU and GU to do some activities together. However, if we try to design a different didactic focus it will be costly. And the idea is, of course, that we should do training etc. together, so it is more to find out how we organize it logistically; reg. F2F meetings, communication, etc. Both GU and MSU agree on developing and conducting joint activities - together with TU in the extend that this is feasible (depending on available technology, etc.). Jens: wherever the activity is conducted there is the option of a lager group of participants. Also, there is a ripple effect: activities are typically best embedded at the host institutions (not in the 'travelling institutions'). TU: Regarding eMode activities TU need to make special, empowering, arrangements in collaboration with the Dean's office (both FOE and FHSS), who will be responsible to bringing together the professors. Saved travel costs could be invested in this at all 3 South universities. Jens: The facilitators will always have to move. The question is how many participants are we going to move? This might become clearer when discussing the concrete activities.	
3. **GENERAL COMMENTS TO ACTIVITIES**	AAU: Suggests one common model: that 'everything that needs to be seen' can be seen online (Moodle platform).	

	TU: 1) We could monitor all activities at one centre, e.g. AAU or MSU, with their e-facilities, and then starting and ending activities at all the other centres, so that the programme can be done eBased. Or 2) Bring together faculties in one place. Jens: Let's see what is needed when we move through each activity. There is also a question of coherence.	
4. **A FLEXIBLE MODEL FOR SHARING EXPENCES**	Jens: Proposes a flexible model for sharing expenses with the purpose of allocating more means for actual activities. The general principle would be: • Expenses for 'Venue Costs' (hotel, food): covered by the host* • Per diem: paid by each university's project budget **AGREEMENT** • All partners agree to implement the flexible model for sharing expenses.	*This results in more means for actual activities.*
5. **COMBINED PBL & E-LEARNING WORKSHOP**	Jens to group 1: you proposed a two promoted model with an East African centre of activities and a Nepal centre of activities. Group 1 on the activity proposal: Did consider the North model, and the model of conducting F2F activities at all 3 South Universities, which will make it very costly in regards to facilitators. The group argues for a sustainable approach; having only 1 joint workshop supports the argument of 'Communities of Practice' among all supervisors from all institutions. Necessary with F2F meetings once in a while. Jens about sustainability beyond the project: It is unlikely that we will have resources to bring people from Nepal to East Africa - where this will be much more possible from GU to MSU. So we should think about how the way we organize the project could have an impact beyond the 1 1/2 years timeframe of this project. The concept of 'Community of Practice' might be good to work with; how do we establish communities of practice that can function even without the resources from this project. These are arguments to have this two-pronged approach. Another issue is critical mass; we will need lager groups, e.g. of supervisors, whom we can't fly around the world.	*A budget example with amount of resource persons and costs for the PBL/e-learning course is done in plenum (to be implemented in revised budget)*

	AGREEMENT ▪ To proceed with a two pronged approach: 1 workshop in Nepal (TU) + 1 workshop in East Africa (MSU + GU).	
6. **PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT** **& LITERATURE SEARCH**	Jens stresses the importance of sitting together F2F at the 3 South partner universities; building up a PhD Forum, discussing the necessity of DK input (e.g. regarding e-tools) - with the purpose of fine-tuning the project in relation to milestones, timeframe, supervisor roles/responsibilities. In this workshop we want to bring in the PhD students and use/implement what has been learned in the 1st workshop (PBL/e-Learning). It is for students who are in their initial stage, and they have to work with their supervisors on how to develop their proposals. PhD students and supervisors have to do this jointly. So the activity would be either locally at all 3 south universities, or jointly for MSU and GU, but not jointly for all 3. GU: earlier we talked about possibly 3 workshops; if we combine research proposal, writing, and site methodology. After all one leads to the other, so if we could combine those two and have the activity for approx. one week, and then have it at the 3 sites, this could make sense, rather than having a workshop for each topic. Jens: There are pros and cons for every idea. The argument for this one is cost saving - and more students. The disadvantage is that if your proposal is still at an early stage you don't know which methods you will need to use yet. So, it might be better to have site methods at a later stage when the PhD student knows what he/she needs. It is more expensive, but it might be more in tune with the specific stage of the student. This could be a good opportunity for PhD Students and supervisors to sit and experiment with different pedagogical tools that come out of the first workshop. In that case, is there any need for DK support, for instance e-tools to be introduced for building up a Community of Practice? TU: The supervisors will keep in tough, maybe they don't need to come together for that. Jens: But coming together might be a purpose in itself - to enhance the building of a collaborating PhD forum, so that we get beyond the purely individual supervisor - PhD	

	student relationship. At this stage the PhD students have been registered; it is not for development of an application; they will have to fine-tune and develop their proposal.
	
	AAU: Something like the PhD plan we are using in DK.
	
	Jens: Yes, like: What is the entire PhD project about; What are the components; What is the timeframe and the milestones; What is the supervisor's ability to help the PhD student, etc. Bringing supervisors together can open up for a discussion of the responsibilities of both the PhD student and the supervisor.
	
	AGREEMENT
	  ▪ <u>3 different South workshops will be held</u>: GU + MSU will jointly share experiences; no DK input needed. TU will arrange own workshop; will have to clear if DK input will be necessary.*
	  ▪ <u>Small South working group to be established:</u> GU, MSU and TU should appoint one resource person for a small working group who can contribute to the content and organization of the actual activity/event. Communication will be through the Moodle system (also making them resource persons in regard to that kind of communication).
	  ▪ PhD supervisor forum will be established.
	
	Further comments
	MSU: An online portal should be implemented; orientation to eLearning for both supervisors and students. Costs should be allocated for this.
	
	TU: The focus should be on the blending of pedagogy and ICT. At TU a suited setting/place will be built.
		*GU: Sharing experiences South to South with MSU - and with Makerere University (Kampala). MSU: Agree with GU - could also be a foundation for developing a PhD Forum. TU: Could be important with DK input, but have 2 faculties involved; a suitable resource person will have to be found.

7. **RESEARCH METHODS & METHODOLOGY**	Jens: Should this workshop/course be linked with the Data Analysis activity? Group 3: The idea was that this research methodology training would be for 1st year PhD students – for discussing particular methods and research techniques at an early stage. And then have the Data Analysis at a more advanced level for 2nd and 3rd year PhD students; discussing things more in a thematic context and looking into what happens when	

you apply combined methods, etc. So they should be separate and the 1st should be preparatory for the 2nd.

Jens: Some of us have lots of experience in this field, and we have tons of material that could easily be adapted. Of course, there is a discussion on the direction we want to go, and what kind of methods to prioritize; whether both quantitative and qualitative?
A task force with representatives from each university must look into this. But it has to be tailor made so it is relevant for the particular PhD student (also mentioned by Fredrick/MSU during the workshop). There is no one size fits all here. What are the needs in each project? This could mean that a lager pool of material to pick from will be necessary - and this pool of material could develop over time, if this isn't too ambitious...?

TU: the researcher has to do 'outreach' so some basic idea on empirical research will be required. Some amount of quantitative part should be built in.

Jens: At least we can develop an approach that others can take up and modify into other types of courses, whether they are e.g. quantitative or archival, so we should be focusing on the content and the topic, and think of the pedagogic dimensions.

TU: The qualitative methods/data collection should be highest priority. But how do we organize this?

Jens: The advantage of e-Learning here is that the workshop/course could be stretched: With an early introduction to eMode where certain assignments are given. They have their proposals and know what they are supposed to do; i.e. go out and do pilot versions: interviews; surveys, etc. Afterwards bringing in this material to F2F meetings, so that we can work with it at the workshop. And maybe there can be a follow-up, e.g. with the supervisor, making the PhD student more prepared before the workshop.

AAU: Also possible to pose problems beforehand.

Jens: Yes, Giving a kind of homework in a sense. Ensuring that they will do this well in advance.

	GU: What about the time perspective; Can it all be done in time? Jens: By working with new PhD students and PhD students at a later level we can compress it; i.e. be moving through a series of workshops for a PhD. But we are not having the same PhD students - thereby compressing it within the 1 1/2 years (that is left of the project). This is the only way to do it. But at some point we have to get back to the important question: can we manage all these activities within the timeframe of the project? And again; how to organize it? MSU: Suggests having it separately; MSU and GU together - and bringing in other students at different levels. Jens: Are DK resource persons needed? MSU: Important; it has a high priority. TU: DK should work with TU supervisors for developing the 1st workshop/course. **AGREEMENT** ▪ 2 separate workshop activities: MSU & GU jointly. TU makes own plan* ▪ 2 DK resource persons at each workshop (with complementary qualifications).	*TU has a different situation with 70 PhD candidates, why a separate procedure must be developed. Jens: This project cannot lift this - only smaller groups for PhD students with areas of research in common. TU might replicate the workshop/course, after trying it out the first time, and when more confortable with the eMode. Scale it up, eventually.*
8. **DATA ANALYSIS**	Jens: The suggestion here is a different structure with 3 workshops at each of the 3 South universities, where the PhD students will be hooked up with the workshop somehow, through eMode to the site that hosts the F2F workshop. This means that all participating PhD students will have 1 on-site (F2F) workshop and 2 eMode workshops. Group 4: We talked about 3 in 1, not 3 separate workshops. Jens: Yes, but they are geographically separate. Could be called '3 modules'. GU: Suggests the usage of video conference; multiple locations/geographically separate. Unsustain about TU regarding the usage of video conf.	

	Jens: TU should discuss if they want to invest in a facility/space for eMode (e.g. video conference) to be used in communicating with DK and Africa. There is a small budget for this infrastructure (GU also has a small budget for this, but the facility might be possible to develop within BSU 2 instead).
	
	TU: This facility will be developed and placed in/near the Dean's central office.
	AAU: Necessary to have a working group to plan technical details.
	
	MSU: Should be combined with the online Moodle platform. Technical responsible person should be available at each site.
	
	RUC: Could contain recorded lectures, etc.
	
	AGREEMENT
	  ▪ 3 workshop modules* (geographically separate) with F2F at one site and eMode at the others (the F2F site changes).
	  ▪ 2 DK resource persons x 3 + 1 week preparation
	
	<u>In total, the activity contains the following 'packages':</u>
	
	  ▪ 1 workshop for preparation
	
	  ▪ 3 workshops with 3 levels of discussion (theory, data collection, analysis)
	A task force will be responsible for the development, including technical involvement from all 3 South universities. The workshop modules to held at a later stage (last part of 2015).**
	
	<u>Notice:</u> The same group of PhD students have to be present during all 3 levels.
		The 3 levels contain: 1) theoretical framework research design; 2) data collection and methodological strategy; 3) analysis. PhD students need to be present in all 3, and make assignments in each.
		
		**Related details discussed: It will be necessary with an 'e-coordinator' for 'management of crisis' (not just technical). Furthermore, it is recommended to have a Chair/'recognized expert' present at the F2F site. If the modules will be held synchronous, only half-day sessions in the morning are possible.*

9. **ACADEMIC WRITING**	Jens: This activity (1.2.1) is funded within the 1st component ('Knowledge sharing…'), When the planning was done 1 year ago (in BSU 1) MSU did not prioritize this but now it is a different situation - and we no longer focus on 'article writing', but on how to write academically; all the dimensions of that. The activity could be stretched over a longer period of time. eMode could be a useful tool. Probably some F2F interaction as well, ideally at the beginning and at the end, if it can be	

	afforded. Should it be jointly or separate?
	MSU: Maybe F2F one-two times and then have all the material available online.
	
	Jens: no problem with having it all available online, but it has to be very practically oriented – on writing - for PhD students to learn properly. How to manage this?
	
	TU: maybe 2 WS. Could it be possible to bring all together - or DK persons giving courses online?
	
	Jens: Suggests that Academic Writing workshop could be linked with the thematic PhD conference (1.1.1) in Kenya; enabling the PhD students (and maybe other presenters who want to improve their academic English) to get feedback on their conference papers; and bringing them together at and before the conference (also online). This means that they would work on their papers prior to the conference.
	
	AAU: Will be relatively easy to support online; easy to get feedback on what others have been reading online.
	
	AGREEMENT
	   ▪ All 3 South universities agree to do this activity.
	
	   ▪ Martin will remove the word 'article' in the budget/activity plan. Pär-Ola and Betty will plan time and costs (and travel) in detail.
	
	   ▪ Should be linked to thematic conference (1.1.1)	

10. **REGARDING THE 1ST COMPONENT OF THE PROJECT** *'Knowledge sharing, research dissemination and communication'*	**1.1.1 (Thematic conference)** Jens: Kenya conference, late 2015. Should be good time before X-Mas, including time to follow up on accounting etc. RUC: Now this is a 'stand alone activity' (beyond BSU 1), but it is still an important event. Jens: In the budget Venue Costs is at MSU. And there is an PBL evaluation component which could be another reason for having the conference at MSU; i.e. linking it to eCampus	

	- as a driving force in this project. **AGREEMENT** ▪ The Conference activity will be kept in Kenya (e.g. Nov. 2015) **1.1.2 (Development of research proposals)** Jens: The idea is to enable senior researchers across our 6 universities, and potentially we can include some additional people. Sitting together, maybe one week, in research groups with shared interests, to develop proposals for external funding. E.g. Danida (FFU) grants or any other research grant opportunity. Important to decide who should get the grant to develop a proposal? TU: Very tough decision to make. Deans must be asked. Jens: How do we have an academic procession that is not clouded in politics; how to ensure academic quality? RUC: Earlier there were different interests. We need to plan workshops in details. MSU: Could each university make a local consortium and decide on specific areas. Jens: How do we manage the x amount of applications? E.g. in the case of Danida: the 1st for pre- selection; the later, final stage is more hard. Probably only 1 shot - or 2. RUC: Only 1 shot as 1st deadline is March with answer in December. Nepal has an advantage reg. South Calls. For Kenya and Uganda it is less possible because the only option is North Calls (see e.g. www.dfcentre.com/research), which is to be shared with Health & Natural Science. Therefore, it is necessary to think of other applications and have a clear strategy. Jens: The project already has a Danish Steering Group in place, and the South partners must have a person in charge; making a 'MAGAART Steering Committee' that is responsible for working out a policy on this. GU: Asks if the former SDR themes are fixed?	*Looking into the 1st component of the budget (hand out)*

Jens: We have to stick to our SDR themes where we have or joint expertise, but it is open to other funding agencies.

AAU: Could also wait for the Calls to come out.

Jens: Do you want to put a sealing on what each potential project can apply for. e.g GU have 80.000, would it be ok for one to apply for all and there would be no more?

GU: no, better to spread it out. And look at the types of projects.

RUC: We should leave this for the group to decide.

Jens: The assumption is that the research teams would be GU, MSU and DK researchers, so it is a joint decision to be made.

AAU: Last year Danida gave DKK 20.000 to prepare a full proposal; both for North and South driven.

Jens: That should be taken into consideration. Could increase the number of projects to be supported.

AGREEMENT
- Prepare a guideline/policy.

1.1.3 (Thematic dissemination WS)
Jens: No North involvement: South will have to develop own detailed plans and share them. We might create a website for sharing in addition to the Moodle platform.

GU: What about timing and guidelines?

MSU: It was when we counted on a BSU 2, and it has nothing to do with PhD. Can it be changed now?

Jens: We have good reasons to change it (within the 1st component), good to find out now.

MSU: Would like to move it to 1.1.1 - the conference - e.g. having more participants. Also, some activities could be disseminated locally from the conference, maybe policy briefs, etc.

Jens: for TU you could spend some of the 1.3.1 if you want to translate some of the PhD students' work to nepali or local dissemination on the work to a different audience, etc. Like a Nepali language workshop. Would GU also want to change it?

GU: Yes, would like to increase the number of participants in the conference (1.1.1)

Jens to TU: Do you want to change 1.3.1 (DKK 40.000); keep the whole amount or some for the conference in Kenya?

TU: yes, it can be used here, also for developing website.

Jens: but it is not possible to use it for Moodle - maybe research dissemination in Nepali?

AGREEMENT
- South partner universities will decide on small adjustments within this project component.

1.4.1 + 1.4.2 (Research dissemination / outreach activities)
Jens to GU: broadcasting/radio programmes – is it still relevant?

GU: yes

Jens: There is some fine-tuning to be made between 1.3.1 and 1.4.2.

Jens to TU: maybe you will need to decide if 1.4.2 is dissemination for the policy makers what will then be a good use for 1.3.1 instead of what is here now? And let us know. You could decide to shift it to the development of research proposals (1.1.2) given that you have

	the South Driven, which could be very useful. **AGREEMENT** South partner universities will decide on small adjustments within this project component	
11. **NEXT STEPS**	**All six partner universities should approve modified budget.** - Deadline for sending out budget draft (Jens & Martin): 1 April 2014 **Deadline for approval of final budget: 15 April 2014** - TU, GU, MSU: Develop PhD forum as primary target group/resource base - Keep dialog open regarding research applications - Organize Moodle platform - Identify individual resource persons; setting up small task forces/working groups at partner universities - Deadline for framework/setup: 1 June (i.e. all resource persons identified). **END OF MEETING** /Martin D. Larsen, 20 March 2014	

Capacity Building within Research Communication, Dissemination and Networking