

**UNIVERSITY OF GHANA
OFFICE OF RESEARCH INNOVATION & DEVELOPMENT**

**BSU-GEP:
REPORT ON MEETING HELD ON 7TH MARCH, 2012**

PRESENT

Prof. Robert Hinson	- University of Ghana
Prof. Clement Ahiadeke	- University of Ghana
Prof. George T-M Kwadzo	- University of Ghana
Dr. Kwasi Dartey-Baah	- University of Ghana

Prof. John Rand	- University of Copenhagen
Prof. Niels Fold	- University of Copenhagen
Prof. Klaus Grunert	- Aarhus University
Dr Carl Larsen	- University of Copenhagen

APOLOGIES

ABSENT

Dr. Fred Gockel	- University of Ghana
-----------------	-----------------------

IN ATTENDANCE

Ms. Empi Baryeh	- University of Ghana
-----------------	-----------------------

The meeting began at 08:39AM, chaired by Prof. Robert Hinson.

DISCUSSED AND AGREED

PHD COURSE DEVELOPMENT

The initial conceptualisation was to hold the courses over 3-day periods and 6 days for the more weighty courses. It was suggested that 39 hours (i.e. one semester worth) of coursework could be fitted into a 1-week course.

It was also suggested that if any topics need to be dealt with in detail, that should be built into semester-long courses.

A question was raised about whether proposed BSU-GEP courses were already in place or whether this was the first time they are being planned. The concern was to avoid duplication of efforts.

The UG team explained that different faculties have courses, but there is no structured university-wide coursework programme for PhD. Therefore the quality of supervision, study material, etc. largely determine the timely completion of the PhD programme and the quality of a PhD. An example was given from ISSER that PhD involves some coursework and examinations. It was noted

that PhD students requiring any additional skills or knowledge usually sit in M.Phil classes to shore up lacking skills. There would, therefore, not be duplication of effort.

It was, however, noted that UG is planning to institute PhD coursework, and that the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) had already requested all faculties to submit, by end of April, tentative courses they would like to run. It is intended that PhD coursework would be in place by August 2012.

Action Point: Empi to get template for PhD courses from SGS

PhD Course Teachers

It was indicated that the PhD teachers on the Danish side were already selected.

Action Point: UG PWG to circulate list for University of Ghana.

Dates for holding PhD Courses

August/September was proposed for the running of PhD courses to fit with the beginning of the academic year. It was suggested that the timing of the Initial visit should be known by mid-April as member of the Danish team are already planning their Autumn calendars.

Action Point: UG PWG members will select 2 dates by end of March and circulate to Danish team who will select the preferred date among the two.

Number of Participants

It was agreed that the number of participants in the PhDs courses should not be too much as it was expect that other PhD students not necessarily in the BSU-GEP departments would be interested in the courses. From UGBS alone, an average attendance of 20-30 students was anticipated.

TRAINING OF TRAINERS COURSE (TOT)

The UG team stated that the Danish partners should have an expectation of what should go into the course and should bounce these ideas off their UG counterparts. Once a curriculum is agreed on, both teachers would sign off on course. The Danish partners would work with UG partners to offer the course, since Danish partners would be in Ghana for short periods.

An example from ISSER and University of Bonn was given. In that partnership, the competencies of participating faculty are considered. During the 3 days to 1 week stay of the visiting faculty teaches some courses, while the UG faculty sits in and takes over after visiting faculty returns.

ToT: what is the expectation from UG side?

Faculty expected to participate would be at the minimum, Senior Lecturer, so qualifying people would be senior faculty members. Caution was raised about how training was positioned given the senior status of expected attendees. It was suggested that the platform collaborate with School of Graduate Studies.

A ToT course on Fundraising was suggested to enable UG faculty to to identify sources of funding and also develop winning applications/proposals.

It was suggested that the Danish team would come up with the purpose of ToT. *

REMUNERATION

Budget: DKK 10,000 (approx. GHS 3,000).

It was explained that the project cannot pay individuals directly, but the university will be remunerated (to an amount equal to the individual's remuneration) for the work of individuals. i.e. in Denmark as well as Ghana, the remuneration indicated in the project goes to the department of the participating faculty. The department has the internal prerogative to use the money to benefit the department. The Head of Department can administer bonuses based on performance or elect faculty (supervisors etc) to attend conferences, survey and research grants etc. It was advised that such funds could be reallocated to benefit the persons assisting in the project development.

A professor can be responsible party for a given course, but he or she may not necessarily run the course. Due to budgetary constraints, the use of a more senior faculty translates to fewer months of work. By the same token junior faculty on the project implies more months of work.

Other uses of funds

It was noted that UGBS has labs and PhD students tend to have laptops. However, the UG team felt that part of the budget should fund software, since the cost of multiuser licences is high. The Danish team, however, responded that there was no budget for this.

The budget per PhD course was stated as DKK 25,000 (approx. US\$3000, making a total of about US\$30,000). A suggestion was made that any extra funds remaining from this budget could possibly be used for the suggested purpose. Another suggestion was to set aside two man-months, which will go into the pot for this purpose.

No decision was made regarding this. However, the Danish team advised that the PWG could make recommendations for the Work Packages Phase 2 based on activities and evaluation of Phase 1. E.g. any added costs factors such as computer software that were not added to the budget in Phase One should be put in at proposal development in Phase Two.

ACCREDITATION OF POSTGRADUATE TEACHERS AND CO-SUPERVISORS

It was indicated that Danish partners needed to accreditation in order to co-supervisors UG students, per UG policy. It was suggested that if the process to gain accreditation was cumbersome, one way to simplify the process would be to let the UG person be the responsible person on

Action Point:

- Prof. Hinson to check implications of Danish partners teaching some of the courses.
- Empi to get the Graduate handbook for Carl
- Empi to get Supervision Accreditation Form to Prof. John Rand

REMUNERATION

It was explained that the project pay individuals directly, but the university will be remunerated (to an amount equal to the individual's remuneration) for the work of individuals. i.e. in Denmark as well as Ghana, the remuneration indicated in the project goes to the department of the participating

faculty. The department is expected to use the finds to the benefit of department as a whole. The department has the internal prerogative to use the money to benefit the department. The Head of Department can administer bonuses based on performance or elect staff to attend conferences, survey and research grants etc. It was advised that such funds could be reallocated to benefit the persons assisting in the project development.

Funding: DKK10, 000 (approx. GHS3000).

Junior faculty on the project implies more months of work. *DKK2.5

Challenge: we should decide here how that money is spent here since the faculty involved may not
Suggestion: supervisors benefit: conference grants etc. as benefits from project.

You allocate a Prof to be responsible but he doesn't run the course. Better to adjust the hours.

*Danish PhD teachers are listed; UG list to be circulated.

Access to computer facilities

UGBS has labs and PhD students have laptops. But our thinking was that the project should fund software. (how to fund the way the courses are run). Cost of multiuser licences is high. No budget DKK25K for each PhD course abt \$3000 (total of abt \$30000). See if there are any extras. Set aside two man-months goes into the pot.

Recommendation for Phase two: It was advised that the PWG could make recommendations for the work packages based on activities and evaluation of Phase One. E.g. any added costs factors such as computer software that were not added to the budget in Phase One should be put in at proposal development in Phase Two.

STRENGTHENING OF RESEARCH COLLABORATIONS (WP3)

Budget available: DKK900, 000 (two-thirds of this budget is ear-marked for Ghana)

Three main categories were suggested by the UG team for collaboration:

1. Travel/Conference Grants: Conference registration fees, per diem etc. should be covered. Project support should be acknowledged and paper presented must be submitted to the project.
2. Small research grants: It was mentioned that US\$2500 is given to faculty at UGBS and the same was suggested for BSU-GEP.
3. Remuneration for publishing in internationally recognised journals. Journal listings as indices of quality (as in US/UK etc.) – i.e. researchers get research funding after research assessment. It was proposed that the Danish listing be used for setting a standard.

However, it was indicated that the funding for WP3 was toward collaboration and could, therefore not be use as suggested above. Also, publication awards cannot be covered, unless it is part of a joint research project. Possible outputs could be *joint publications, grant applications leading to bigger research grants (these must be within topics covered by project)*. It was proposed that some of the above-mentioned items could be incorporated into these - e.g. as part of the collaboration there could be travel to present a paper at a conference. Also, if the research remuneration (point #3) can be justified as being an end product of collaborative research, it could be done.

A suggestion was made that collaborative research should address issues linked to National Development, Congestion, Aging and Productivity). Caution was raised that the funds available be kept in mind and that efforts be made to maximise it.

Criteria to get hold of funds:

There are two types of applications:

1. Small research projects (innovative thinking)
2. Proposal writing (must be toward a specific target e.g. responding to a call)

*The modalities of applying under either option should be known.

Process: an official letter needs to be sent from UG to Danish partners with recommendations on how to spend the funds. It was suggested that the recommendation letter could argue the case that doing research goes toward strengthening capacity in research.

Applications need a Danish partner in addition to a Ghanaian partner and must revolve around the themes covered under BSU-GEP (as per scholarship application forms).

It was suggested that collaborative research should be UG-driven: 5 to 6 projects with sub projects and measurable output e.g. 3 proposals submitted for funding; 2 research projects initiated.

Agreed: Set in motion 3 projects (within which we can work in the travel/conference grants etc.)

*System should be similar between the 4 South universities. Understand criteria and use them in our universities.

Action Point: Danish Team to draft the proposal and share with UG team.

RESEARCH DISSEMINATION (WP4)

Budget: DKK 1Million (approx. GHS 350,000)

The meeting was also informed that an additional funding of DKK90 million had been approved by the Danish Government to be used for research dissemination outside the realm of academia, to be evenly distributed among the 4 Southern Partners.

It was indicated that Research Dissemination is defined as dissemination outside the realm of academia (i.e. it excludes publication).

Proposed

- Running policy briefs.
- Quarterly business conference targeting industry stakeholders such as: *Institute of economic affairs, Association of Ghana Industries (AGI), Ghana Export Promo Council* etc.

PHD SCHOLARSHIPS

Number of applicants: 3

It was noted that the number of scholarships available exceeded the number of applicants and the meeting deliberated on the reason for so few applicants? Some reasons that were raised included:

- The stipulation in the scholarship announcement that only faculty of UG were eligible to apply, thus disqualifying Teaching Assistant and other Junior staff who aren't permanent staff of the university. It was also noted that some departments, such as the Dept. of Agric Economic and Agribusiness, had no full-time faculty members who did not have doctoral degrees.
- It was recommended that junior faculty be included in the pool of eligible applicants. Also, it observed that the call had been open only to the Dept. of Agric Economic and Agribusiness, but it was agreed that the entire Faculty of Agriculture should included. It was also determined that the mode of announcement should be revised (expansion of eligibility)It was also suggested that (lack of clear understanding of) thematic constraints may have accounted for the low level of response to call. i.e some potential applicants may not have known where to fit their proposals.
- Neighbouring country honour students could also be included
- It was decided that a new call would be put out to enable the platform to find suitable candidates for the unissued scholarships in the first round for a January start date. It was agreed that the Danish partners would participate in the interview through Skype
 - **New Call Suggestions**
 - Open eligibility: faculty as well as non-permanent staff such as Teaching or Graduate Assistants would qualify.
 - Themes would be changed and made clearer
 - Proposals length would be increased to up to 3000 words excluding references. (Content to be recommend or template provided)
 - Announcement would be placed as a 1-page ad in *The Daily Graphic*.
 - **Action point:** Daily Graphic (Prof. Hinson to speak with CEO of *The Daily Graphic*)

Enrolment of PhD candidates

The terms of the scholarship require Candidates to be enrolled at UG. Candidates must therefore undergo the regular application process for PhDs at UG. It was agreed that there would be co-supervision, and that the UG model would be used in selection of Danish co-supervisors.

Action Point: ORID/Empi to write to SGS to introduce the candidates and terms of scholarship.

REVIEW OF PHD SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATIONS

1. Candidate #1: FUMEY, Abel

It was observed that candidate's research topic seemed relevant and well-argued, and his submitted paper was also fairly decent. It was also observed that the proposal was fairly weak, lacked structure and did not tangibly indicate issues to be investigated or the methodology to be used. It was also noted that Candidate's

Decision: candidate would be given the chance to improve proposal and apply in the next call.

2. Candidate #2: ACHEAMPONG, George

It was observed that Candidate's academic background was good and his proposal was well-written, but needed expansion.

Decision: candidate to receive scholarship conditional upon submission of a detailed research proposal of at least 10 pages with strong methodology and literature review. Interview to guide how candidate redefines proposal.

3. Candidate #3: MENSAH, Justice Tei

It was observed that candidate's research topic was too broad and the proposed data analysis was not the best for the kind of data to be analysed. It was also observed that quality data may not be easily accessible.

Decision: Candidate to revise proposal in terms of methodology and perform a more thorough literature review, and re-apply in the next call

GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT

PROJECT OFFICER

Budget allocation for remuneration of Project Officer: DKK10K p/m (i.e. DKK 120,000 for project period – approx GHS 40,000)

The Project Officer will be paid by the project. However, it was noted that the project cannot pay the Project Officer, if person is on UG payroll. It was proposed that if the budget could not support Project Officer plus an assistant, then get an assistant who would be employed full-time by the project to assist the coordinator provided by the UG Office of Research, Innovation and Development.

Action Point:

- Advertise PO Assistant
- Carl to check if PO (Empi) can be reimbursed for UG salaries
- (List of responsible people to go to all including Carl)

Project Funds:

First instalment amount: DKK 800,000

Action Point: Empi to re-send account detail

Website

A unique website is to be launched by University of Aarhus by the end of March. Also in the pipeline is a web-based intranet expected to be in place around July.

How to establish reliable and effective lines of communication

The following were suggested as means of maintaining effective communication lines to meet project deadlines:

- E-mail list
- Time-table with deadlines
- Closer relation between researchers in WPs. It was suggested that WPs will be split among PWG members.
 - **Action Point:** UG team to send contact details (emails and mobile phone numbers)

BSU Office (less than \$10K for office)

It was suggested that there should be a dedicated BSU-GEP office at UG. However, it was noted that the budget allocation for office was less than US\$10,000. Prof. Hinson indicated that there was an empty office at UGBS that had been set for a past DANIDA project. He proposed that we liaise with the dean to find out if the office could be allocated for use by BSU-GEP. He also suggested that the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (RID) write to the dean to request use of the office for this project.

Action Point: Dr. Dartey-Baah to look into the possibility of using the empty DANIDA office at UGBS for this purpose.

NEXT MEETING:

- **Date:** 8th March, 2012
- **Time:** 4:00PM
- **Venue:** University Guest Centre restaurant