Tracer Study of Awards Programs Supported by IDRC:

Internships, Professional Development Awards,

Young Canadian Researchers Awards, Doctoral Research Awards, and

Canadian Window on International Development Awards

Michael Graham

2422 Fairmile Road, RR4 Kemptville, ON, Canada, K0G 1J0

mikegraham@lincsat.com; www.mgedit.com

March 2007

Acknowledgements

I want to thank all the awardees and IDRC staff who took the time to reply to the email surveys. They were generous with their ideas and insights. Without their cooperation and interest, this study would have been impossible. Thanks also to the staff of the Centre Training and Awards Program for their support and encouragement both before and during this study.

Introduction

This study was undertaken to determine how Centre-funded training programs have contributed to the careers of awardees in international development. The research sought to answer such questions as: Where have they gone? What have they done? What do they remember of their IDRC experience? And what has been the effect of their IDRC experience on both their professional and personal lives? As well, input was sought on what could be improved by the Training and Awards Program and how this could be achieved.

The Centre Training and Awards Program (CTAP) is the focal point of training within IDRC. By supporting academic study and offering opportunities for hands-on experience, IDRC helps countries of the South gain a critical mass of trained and experienced researchers to promote sustainable and equitable development in their regions, and gives a new generation of Canadians an opportunity to participate actively in international development issues and to consider careers in this field.

Internships and PDAs provide hands-on experience (at one of IDRC's offices) in the formulation and management of development research projects. At the same time, the award holders undertake research on a topic of interest to them and the Program Initiative. IDRAs, YCRAs, Canadian Window awardees carry out research at arm's length from IDRC. Most of these awardees never come to IDRC, and the funding they receive only covers their field research in a developing country. Normally, award holders do not know who reviewed their application and program staff do not have contact with these award holders.

Interns divide their time between undertaking individual research and being trained in the techniques of research management through hands-on work experience with their chosen program's programming and practices. They work under the mentorship of a Program Officer(s). Internships last between 4 and 12 months and are tenable at IDRC headquarters in Ottawa or in a Regional

Office. Developing-country nationals residing in their home country (or another country) must hold their internships in the appropriate Regional Office.

Professional Development Awards are given to individuals (both Canadians and citizens of developing countries) who have had some career experience. The awards provide an opportunity to develop expertise in a particular professional capacity by working with IDRC staff on program and research issues. These awardees have had several years of work experience and are therefore able to share their knowledge and skills with IDRC's program staff while honing their expertise and widening their own experiences. In the past, very senior level researchers have held Professional Development Awards. The program has evolved to currently include award holders at a more junior level.

The ***Young Canadian Researchers Awards*** (YCRA) were established in 1982 to assisted Canadian graduate students to undertake their thesis research on issues related to international development. The awards were intended to promote the growth of Canadian capacity in research on sustainable and equitable development on areas corresponding to IDRC's research priorities. Normally, the research was to be conducted in Latin America, Africa, or Asia. Applicants had to be registered at a Canadian university, hold Canadian citizenship or permanent residency status, and the proposed research had to be for a doctoral or a master's thesis. This competition was restricted to doctoral students in October 1996 and the YCRAs were offered for the last time in March 1997.

The ***IDRC Doctoral Research Awards*** (IDRA) were offered for the first time in December 1997 to Canadian citizens and permanent residents of Canada. The IDRAs were opened to developing country nationals studying in Canada in November 2004. These awards are intended to promote the growth of Canadian capacity in research on sustainable and equitable development from an international perspective. The award covers the cost of justifiable field research

expenses in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, or Asia for a period of 3–12 months.

The ***Canadian Window on International Development Awards*** were offered for the first time in June 1997 to Canadian citizens and permanent residents of Canada for doctoral field research on the link between Canada's policy on foreign affairs and a current and pressing domestic problem. In 2002, a second award was granted for doctoral or master's research into a problem that is common to First Nations or Inuit communities in Canada and a developing region of the world. Proposals must include comparative research in Canada and a developing region of the world to better understand the common, interrelated problem or issue identified for in-depth study. In April 2005, these awards were opened to developing country nationals studying in Canada.

Research Methods

The research was undertaken in the last quarter of 2006 and the first quarter of 2007. The study benefitted from earlier work by Esther Matharu to identify previous awardees and to try to confirm their contact details. As well, draft questionnaires had been prepared to help identify the issues that needed to be addressed to answer the main research questions. The sample for the survey included awardees who had received their awards since 1995 and current IDRC staff who had served as mentors or evaluated research proposals since 1997.

Preliminary discussions were held with IDRC staff from both the CTAP and the Evaluation Unit to define the purpose of the research and agree on the range of questions that would be addressed and the methods that would be used. An email-based survey was chosen for data acquisition, and three separate survey instruments were developed and pretested for each of the main target groups: (1) awardees who had received Internship Awards and Professional Development (PDA) Awards; (2) awardees who had received Young Canadian

Researchers Awards (YCRA), Doctoral Research Awards (IDRA), or Canadian Window on International Development Awards; and (3) IDRC staff who had been involved with both mentoring and reviewing awardee proposals. Following pretesting, all questionnaires were translated into French. Appendices 1–3 present copies of all surveys.

Following revision and pretesting, 383 questionnaires were sent by individual emails on 2 December 2006. This included 110 surveys sent to interns and PDA awardees; 192 sent to YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees; and 81 sent to IDRC staff. Of the 383 questionnaires that were sent, there were very few bad email addresses. Only 9 in the interns and PDA, 10 in the YCRA, IDRA, and Window, and 2 in the IDRC categories bounced. Therefore, 362 questionnaires can be assumed to have been delivered (101 to interns and PDA; 182 to YCRA, IDRA, Window; and 79 to IDRC staff).

On 2 January 2007, reminders were sent to all awardees and IDRC staff who had not yet replied to the questionnaires (Appendix 4). Following the reminder, responses were received from 30 interns and professional development awardees; 70 YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees; and 20 IDRC staff. Responses after the reminder accounted for 45% of total replies. All replies were acknowledged by email and respondents were thanked for their contribution to the study (Appendix 4).

As of the cut-off date of 19 January 2007, responses had been received from 76 Interns and PDAs; 140 YCRAs, IDRAs, and Window awardees; and 51 IDRC staff. The response rates were excellent in all three categories of respondents: 76 of 101 (75%) for interns and PDAs; 140 of 182 (77%) for YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees; and 51 of 79 (65%) for IDRC staff.

Following data entry, the raw data were provided to CTAP staff. All data were consolidated and individual responses were compiled in a manner that ensured their confidentiality. The purpose of this step was to lay the ground work for a

meeting to discuss the results of the survey and to review preliminary findings. This meeting allowed the analysis and interpretation of the findings to benefit from the broader perspectives of CTAP and Evaluation Unit staff who were involved in the development of the study and have ongoing responsibility for the awards programs under review. Their comments and suggestions were incorporated into the final draft of this report.

Summary of Findings

This section summarizes the main findings of the study. Details on the survey results are found later in the report. Many suggestions are made throughout this report. Not all of them may be practical or affordable. It will be important to consider the pros and cons of these suggestions in the context of staff resources and IDRC priorities. Hopefully they will present a good starting point for discussion among CTAP staff and between CTAP and program staff with regard to further refinement of these awards programs.

Overall Impact of Awards

Influence on Professional and Personal Careers — There is no question that the awardees who were part of this review felt that their IDRC award had a very positive influence on both their professional and personal interests in international development. Association with IDRC was an important aspect of enhancing their professional development and credibility.

For all awardees, the opportunity to expand their experience to include international development was rated within the top two most satisfying aspects of the award. For those who had the opportunity to conduct research overseas, broadening views on international development was rated just ahead of changing their views on the value attributed to research. In terms of contributions to the professional development of YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees, the awards were rated highly for contributing to research skills, broadening views on international development, enhanced analytical skills, providing better contacts with other professionals, and improved management skills.

Field of Study and Employment —IDRC awardees are currently engaged in development-related activities or are continuing their studies. The vast majority have pursued professional interests in international development and social sciences. Very few of these people altered their field of study as a result of their

award, and those who changed most often further refined their interests to be more focused on development issues. The awardees have also been highly successful in finding employment in their chosen fields and credit IDRC for playing an important role in this success. By and large, the awardees continue to live and work in Canada and are committed to international development in both their professional and personal lives.

Interns and PDAs are most often employed in government departments and nongovernmental agencies or at universities or colleges. Many are continuing their studies toward a PhD. Most often they are researchers or program and project officers who have responsibility for policy analysis or project management. The YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees most often work at universities and colleges or are continuing their studies. The majority are teachers, professors, or researchers who report their primary responsibilities as conducting scientific research and teaching.

Benefits of Awards Program to IDRC — For IDRC as a whole, the benefits of the awards program include: making a contribution to overall Centre objectives; providing support to programs at a substantive level; giving visibility to IDRC in Canada; creating links between IDRC and the Canadian academic community; offering an opportunity for Canadians to build a career in international development; and providing a source of candidates for job openings within the Centre.

IDRC staff derive personal satisfaction from helping colleagues, develop better supervisory and leadership skills, and are exposed to fresh ideas and approaches. Some staff rate the provision of administrative support to the PI quite highly. Although they have less direct involvement with the YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees, staff do feel that review of proposals offers the opportunity to obtain a broader perspective on particular areas of research.

IDRC Staff Considerations

Interactions between CTAP and Program Staff — Suggestions were made by program staff of the need for closer interactions with CTAP staff. These suggestions related to such factors as the need for better correlation between awards and program priorities, better development of guidelines for research proposals, and communication with regard to issues or problems that arise. Input from both IDRC staff and the awardees noted that the awards were most rewarding (especially for interns) when the research topics were closely allied with future program interests of the PIs. This ensures that the work being undertaken is of "value" to IDRC and more fully engages the intern in the professional discussions within the PI. This alignment of award topics with PI priorities is ongoing. This is clearly worthwhile and interactions among PI and CTAP staff to discuss future program needs and directions should be continued to more tightly structure the call for proposals to reflect these needs.

To encourage such collaboration, perhaps this report could be shared with Ottawa and Regional Office staff to invite comment. To be truly effective, CTAP should be proactive in seeking feedback by holding meetings with PIs to discuss and comment on the report; following up on recommendations and suggestions; and reporting back on what has been done.

Mentoring by Program Staff — Although mentorship is relevant only to interns, as noted earlier many other awardees would like to have more opportunity to benefit from the programming expertise and experience of IDRC staff. Current efforts to align the research interests of interns with future priorities of the PI have been successful. The relationship between the awardee and the mentor is also critical to a successful experience. Experiences in such personal relationships are sure to vary and depend on: the expectations of IDRC and awardees; the travel and time constraints faced by staff; lack of formal recognition of contributions to awardees in performance reviews; and

differences in interpersonal skills and management styles. The fact that mentoring was relatively lower rated than other aspects of program-related aspects of PDA and internship awards may point to the need to look for new ways to provide better guidance to mentors on their responsibilities, to better define the duties of interns (to them and the PIs), and for IDRC to recognize time and effort it takes to mentor.

Links of Awardees with IDRC Staff — Among the YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees a significant number (57%) noted that they would have liked to have increased interaction with IDRC staff. Primarily, awardees are looking for more opportunities to benefit from the expertise and experience they recognize exists within IDRC and for a chance to formally present their research to IDRC and obtain peer review and opportunities to further their work or make it more relevant to real development needs. In their opinion, the key attributes of this interaction would be: better sharing of experiences and dissemination of results; the establishment of a network of like-minded researchers; input on research methodologies; a better understanding of development issues and challenges; and to feel part of the larger IDRC research community. Currently, some interns and IDRAs make presentations at IDRC, but perhaps presentations and discussions could be part of staff meetings, or PI think tanks, or there could be an annual CTAP forum that arranged short presentation of research findings by theme and was followed by a posting of summary reports or full papers on the CTAP website. IDRC program staff could be invited as chairs or discussants of the work.

Formal Recognition of Staff Contributions — Responsibilities for mentoring (and also for proposal review) add to the workload of already busy program staff. Staff who are good mentors dedicate considerable time to these responsibilities — predominantly, they create learning opportunities for awardees and provide professional advice and guidance. This requires that they make time for awardees (primarily interns) and have good interpersonal skills.

However, they note that there is no formal recognition of these inputs in the appraisal of their performance. IDRC may need to look at job descriptions and performance assessments of program staff to formalize and recognize these relationships and responsibilities.

Program Aspects of Awards

Overall — All program aspects of the awards were highly rated by the awardees. In particular, for PDAs and Interns, the awards were very useful in broadening experience in international development and for increasing interactions with IDRC and others outside Canada. For YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees, the opportunity to travel to a developing country and meet other researchers was most highly rated. More than half of the YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees would have liked more interactions with IDRC staff. Program staff suggested that more opportunities might be presented to developing country nationals — perhaps one Canadian intern in Ottawa and one intern from the region in a Regional Office. Any expansion to ROs would have significant implications for RO staff and resources.

Feedback on Proposals — Among YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees, 80% felt that the feedback they had received on their research proposals had been useful. Those who wanted more feedback generally wanted more professional interactions with IDRC staff and input on additional sources of information. A few respondents noted that nonacademic-oriented feedback from IDRC staff on academic research programs can be extremely difficult for students, because IDRC's directives and objectives differ considerably from the directives and objectives of the university's academic program. While IDRC staff mentioned the need to improve and clarify the research methods section of the applications to improve the overall quality of submissions. University supervisors have responsibility for thesis supervision, and these comments may point to the need to review the guidelines for IDRC feedback on proposals.

There was also a staff suggestion that feedback on rejected proposals should be provided to all applicants to ensure that the same proposals are not resubmitted without modification in following years (currently awardees are asked to indicate if a proposal is a resubmission).

Technical Reports — Some respondents (both IDRC staff and awardees) questioned the usefulness of these reports. Given the broad range of awardees their different experiences and level of support from IDRC, perhaps more thought needs to go into reporting requirements. Reporting on research is an important consideration and should be encouraged and reinforced. The reporting requirement could be used as an opportunity to develop additional skills and awareness among awardees. If reports are simply a necessary part of Centre "accountability," this administrative aspect could perhaps be reduced to a checklist that is signed by the awardee.

It might be interesting to experiment with other forms of reporting [e.g., scientific papers (following the format for a journal submission in the awardees area of expertise); a policy brief; a popular style magazine article or feature article for a newspaper; or a video production]. In some cases, IDRC media contacts could be used to try to "place" good articles in newspapers or magazines. Efforts could also be made to link science and development journalists with these researchers [perhaps through the World Federation of Science Journalists (WFSJ), also supported by IDRC]. IDRC could also consider helping some of the awardees to submit papers to journals, or at least suggest good journal possibilities (perhaps in collaboration with the library or the WFSJ). It would be particularly useful to place an emphasis on submission to regional journals and media outlets in geographic areas where the research took place.

This dissemination "product" could be part of the award proposal and budget and be tailored to the project's specific objectives. Not only would this provide

good experience in preparing material to more broadly disseminate their findings, the products could also be potentially useful for IDRC in promoting the CTAP and the awardees it supports. Certainly, if reports are requested as a contract requirement, they should at a minimum be "publicized" by IDRC, perhaps by listing on the CTAP website or working with the library to make all reports easily accessible electronically.

Feedback on Reports and Presentation of Results — IDRC may wish to offer opportunities for presentation of the results of the work undertaken by awardees. Awardees (particularly, YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees) would like an opportunity to present their results to IDRC and to other awardees. Without this interaction, they have a sense that their work is not appreciated or valued by IDRC. However, IDRC staff report that the work undertaken by awardees has often introduced them to, or gave them a broader perspective, on particular areas of research. Better interaction could therefore be mutually beneficial. Perhaps the opportunity could be given to those who present the "best" projects each year in a CTAP-sponsored seminar (either at IDRC or perhaps at a rotating basis in different universities across Canada).

All awardees (but interns and PDAs, especially) suggested that they would like to receive feedback on reports. For IDRC staff, providing detailed comments on reports would be time consuming and presumably not feasible. Presentations at seminars held at universities would provide opportunities for peer review by other awardees, university faculty and students, and perhaps IDRC staff (as well as having potential Public Affairs benefits for the CTAP and IDRC).

Access to IDRC Resources — YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees would have liked more access to the IDRC library and other resources. Many YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees were unaware that there was an IDRC library (although information on library access is included in current contracts). Perhaps this was an inappropriate question to ask given the "arms length" interaction IDRC

has with these awardees, but it seems a shame that the IDRC library is not well known to these professionals working in international development in Canada. Any consideration of increasing the public profile of the library would require significant discussion with library staff to define the levels of support that might be provided. However, there may be potential to establish on-going links through the library to young Canadian researchers. The challenge is for IDRC to find a balance between being an "administrative funding body" and providing "a broader support network for research."

Administrative Aspects of Awards

Overall Administration — The awardees are generally happy with all of the aspects of their interactions with CTAP staff. Suggested improvements focused on the desire for more feedback on reports and on-going or enhanced contact with other awardees. With regard to comments on the technical aspects of reports, primary responsibility should rest with faculty supervisors as the technical reports are presumably part of degree requirements. Perhaps this needs to be clarified with both supervisors and awardees. However, this does not discount the desire by awardees for some sort of "validation" of their work by IDRC.

Promotion of Awardees and Program — IDRC staff feel that a concerted effort is needed to ensure that young people from across the country are engaged. There is a feeling now that too many awardees are from Ontario and Quebec and from the same schools and departments. This suggests the need to examine how that awards program is promoted and look at ways to attract students from a broader range of universities. Feedback from awardees and staff also suggests the desirability of publicizing the work of awardees. At a minimum, steps could be taken to establish an organized space on the public website (either via CTAP or the library) to give access to those reports that are submitted (these discussions could consider the possibility and usefulness of requesting different types of reports).

Promotion of the Awards Program — For interns and PDAs, IDRC staff and the website are the most important points of contact, followed by supervisors. For YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees, supervisors and the website are the most important points of contact, followed by other award holders and departments of graduate studies. Respondents noted that university professors who are supervising thesis work (rather than chairs of departments) should be the main targets of promotional efforts. The CTAP website is also a key source of information and efforts must be made to ensure that all information is clear and complete. Promotional efforts might need to be expanded to focus on "underrepresented" Canadian Universities to expand the range of applicants beyond those schools with which the Centre has on-going relationships. Perhaps some new promotional activities or items could be considered (e.g., bookmarks that promote IDRC in general on one side and the CTAP and its website on the other). Not a single awardee reported that they had heard of IDRC through a career fair, so that form of promotion was not effective for engaging potential awardees.

Additional Funding — Three quarters of the YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees were successful in obtaining additional funding for their research. Most often these additional funds were used to cover study and living expenses and tuition costs. Predominant among the additional sources of funds were the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and various Canadian universities. About two-thirds of these respondents felt that IDRC funding had made it easier for them to secure additional resources.

Linkages

Including Past Awardees in the IDRC Family — Many of the awardees expressed interest in maintaining an on-going relationship with IDRC. They suggested that it would be good to be part of an electronic community that would keep them in touch and inform them of job openings and awards.

Although the IDRC Alumni Association indicated they would not be willing to create a special membership category for past IDRC awardees, perhaps such a possibility might be feasible if limited financial support could be provided for list management. The Alumni Newsletter could provide a mechanism for ongoing communication with IDRC and one form of contact among these individuals (perhaps start with something like a "who is where" by year of award). If the Alumni Association is unwilling to reconsider such a role, perhaps a past awardee might be willing to organize and manage an electronic space for interactions and information sharing (see below).

Links Among Awardees — Many awardees expressed interest in continuing to stay in contact with each other and with IDRC. They would like to remain part of a broad "community of interest." Some suggested that a listserv might be a useful vehicle for interaction, but this would require someone who would moderate the list. Obviously, care is needed when considering any such mechanisms. They require staff resources and considerable energy to succeed. Perhaps mechanisms, such as a listserv, could be instituted if past awardees would like to volunteer to run the initiative. Of course, it may not be necessary to start something new. A listserv may already exists that could be expanded to include a new area of discussion.

Other options such as posting reports and promoting these resources among awardees may be more practical. Other potential mechanisms might be a yearly IDRC-sponsored awardee forum, or links to meetings sponsored by other groups or organizations with an interest in international development.

Help After the Award — Some awardees are looking for help with information on other awards or job openings after they complete their IDRC award. Although IDRC has no real responsibility in this regard, perhaps CTAP could compile a list of other research awards in international development that are offered in Canada or elsewhere and make these publically available to

awardees. Some other agencies offer specific funding opportunities for young researchers [e.g., Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) has an "international opportunities fund" for young people]. There may well be others. Reciprocal "promotional" arrangements with other granting agencies might be beneficial to both organizations in expanding their reach across Canada. Tracking job openings would be more problematic and may not be necessary as most awardees have been successful in finding employment in their fields. It was also suggested that IDRC might consider creating a special fund for past awardees to pursue further development research in a developing country.

Administration of Questionnaires

This survey suggests three things that are important in the administration of email questionnaires. First, it is essential to clearly indicate to the recipients that they will be surveyed about their experiences by a clearly identified individual. This is the only survey I have undertaken in the last 10 years in which recipients questioned the legitimacy of the questionnaire. Perhaps people are now much more wary of unsolicited email, especially if it requests personal information. Although detailed interactions had been undertaken by CTAP staff to acquire contact information for the survey and to inform them that a survey was being done, a formal announcement of the survey was not undertaken. That did not seem necessary given the history of recent contact with awardees, but it clearly should have been done.

Second, it would be useful to include in the introductory portion of the questionnaire a "verification" contact name of an IDRC staff person who could answer any further questions about the purpose or validity of the survey.

Third, a reminder email can produce a significant increase in the numbers of responses. A reminder email was sent individually to all non-respondents close

to the deadline stipulated in the initial email. Given the concerns about legitimacy raised earlier, it included contact information for CTAP staff should the person wish to verify the legitimacy and purpose of the survey. Responses after the reminder accounted for 45% of total replies.

Results

The results are reported according to the three categories of respondents: Interns and PDAs; YCRA, IDRA, and Window Awardees; and IDRC staff. All data were combined in an Excel spreadsheet to ease data collation and analysis. The raw data from the survey responses were provided to CTAP staff; however, care was taken to protect the confidentiality of respondents. A separate Access database was created to capture updated contact information for all awardees who replied to the surveys.

Interns and PDAs

Reponses were received from 60 Interns and 34 PDAs (15 people reported having won both types of awards, giving a total of 79 respondents). These people most often first heard of the IDRC Awards program from the IDRC website (Table 1). Other very important sources of first contact include IDRC staff and university supervisors. IDRC publications and brochures were reported to be of limited use. Among "other" means, publications and other forms of communication were noted as being important (e.g., newsletters and listservs) and these may have used information from IDRC publications. Career fairs did not result in any new contacts among the respondents.

Table 1. Source of first awareness of intern and PDA awards programs (*n* = 79).[a]

First Contact	Number
IDRC website	21
IDRC staff	17
University supervisor	14
Another awardee	5
IDRC publication or brochure	4
IDRC regional office	1
University Career Fair	0
Other	20

[a] Although asked for "first" contact, a few respondents gave more than one reply.

The awardees were also asked how important the award was in changing or reinforcing their personal and professional interests in international development. The rating system used for this question, and all others in the survey, asked for a rating in which 1 represented "not at all important" and 4 represented "very important." The

average of 70 responses with regard to personal interest was 3.2, and the average for 74 responses for professional interest was 3.5. Clearly, the awards had a strong influence on the awardees.

With regard to the most satisfying parts of the award experience, responses were once again very favourable (Table 2). Broadening of experience in international development was the most highly rated choice, although fewer respondents rated this aspect. Interactions with IDRC staff and others working outside Canada were also important. Interactions with other award holders and others working in international development in Canada were ranked lowest (although still positive).

Table 2. Rating of most satisfying aspects of Internships and Professional Development Awards.

	Number of respondents	Average rating
Opportunity to broaden experience to international development	61	3.4
Interactions with IDRC staff	72	3.3
Interactions with others in international development outside Canada	70	3.3
The opportunity and time to pursue own professional interests	70	3.2
The opportunity to network with other researchers in my field	68	3.1
Interactions with other award holders	66	2.7
Interactions with others in international development in Canada	66	2.6
Other	13	3.7

Within the "other" category (which if not rated was assigned a high rating because people took the time to provide additional information), importance was attached to such factors as: the flexibility provided by the award; the professional experience and training gained with a highly reputable international organization; opportunities to explore new areas of international development; the opportunity to do field research in a developing country; the development of knowledge and skill in evaluation; and gaining a comprehensive understanding of IDRC.

Respondent ratings of the administrative aspects of the CTAP are shown in Table 3. Clearly, the awardees are pleased with most administrative aspects of the awards programs and their interactions with staff. However, they are not satisfied with the feedback they receive on the reports they write and the links and contacts they have among each other.

Table 3. Ratings of administrative aspects of awards.

	Number of respondents	Average rating
Frequency and timeliness of payments	75	3.9
Duration of award	76	3.6
Support/assistance provided by staff	76	3.3
Feedback provided on interim and final reports	72	2.6
Links/contacts to other awardees (current and past)	71	2.3
Other	5	2.0

In the "other" category were suggestions on the need to help awardees to consider what to do after the award, and a note that the self assessment forms were a useful way to set and meet goals and to keep track of positive professional experiences and opportunities.

Respondents were asked to elaborate on how the awards program could be improved (specifically, how to improve those aspects to which they had given ratings of either 1 or 2). Most people who offered suggestions noted that they had received little or no feedback on the technical aspects of their interim or final reports. As a result, some awardees reported that they felt that their work was little valued and that IDRC had failed to capitalize on their efforts. This resulted in a sense of disappointment. Others noted that substantive feedback on their work was a matter that rested more with their faculty supervisor, and that it might be possible to supplement reviews by using some form of peer review among awardees. In the responses, the awardees recognize that IDRC staff are very busy and that working with interns and awardees is not necessarily a priority. One person noted that this is not likely to change unless

mentoring is integrated into job descriptions and time is specifically allocated for such activities.

In terms of links with current and past awardees, the most common comment was that there was no contact beyond what individuals made on their own initiative. Others talked of conducting their internship in "a vacuum relative to other awardees," said that there "was no contact between awardees," and that they "didn't meet a single award holder." Many advocated that much more needs to be done to create a sense of "community" among IDRC awardees. However, some awardees do not see this isolation as being an issue and see no need for change. Those who felt the need for more networking would have liked more links during their awards and also after its conclusion. For these people, there is a desire for some common vehicle for communication such as a listserv. However, there were no suggestions as to how this would be moderated or stimulated to succeed. Others specifically stated that they did not want an electronic discussion group and noted that links and contacts were the responsibility of the awardees themselves. Some suggestions were made with respect to including past awardees in the IDRC "family" in terms of making these individuals aware of job openings that might arise in Ottawa or the Regional Offices (they could take the initiative themselves to monitor the IDRC website).

Respondents also rated the program-related aspects of their awards (Table 4). The opportunity afforded by the award to travel to a developing country and interact with other researchers was rated as most valuable, followed closely by having access to the IDRC library and other resources. Interactions with IDRC program staff and others outside IDRC were just slightly more highly rated than mentoring by program staff and interactions with other awardees.

Table 4. Ratings of program aspects of awards.

	Number of respondents	Average rating
Opportunity to travel to a developing country, meet researchers	63	3.7
Access to IDRC library and other resources	75	3.6
Interactions with other IDRC program staff	74	3.2
Interactions with others outside IDRC	73	3.2
Mentoring by IDRC program staff	74	3.1
Interactions with other awardees	69	3.0
Other	3	3.3

However, it should be noted that all of these program aspects were rated highly. One person noted that the rating of mentoring was highly dependent on the mentor. Those who offered other comments noted that they did not have to go to a developing country, that they were not mentored, and that the flexibility of the program allows awardees to get out of it what they put into the program.

When asked how the poorer aspects of their program experiences could be improved, the respondents took the opportunity to address deficiencies they perceived in mentoring, feedback on reports, and interactions among awardees. One person noted that these programs were not geared for mid-career professionals and that they should be limited to current students.

Suggestions were made with regard to holding a meeting or conference of awardees at the beginning or middle of the award to facilitate interactions and the discussion of their projects. Several awardees noted that mentoring was extremely variable. They had encountered isolation and little or no input into their activities and stressed that the success of the program is highly dependent on the personality and style of the mentor and the priority given to mentoring by program staff. They also noted that some PIs are more strategic in their use of awardees, and that these are the programs that offer the most rewarding experiences. For example, those that involve awardees in developing a research project around a new area of interest for the PI, and that assign

Table 5. Ratings of importance of award to professional development.

	Number of respondents	Average rating
Broader view of development issues	75	3.5
Contacts with other professionals	73	3.4
Analytical skills	75	3.3
Research skills	75	3.2
Management skills	74	3.2
Writing skills	74	3.0
Cultural sensitivities	73	3.0
Other	5	4.0

tasks such as organizing a workshop or participating in a project monitoring visit, are creating very rewarding experiences.

One person also noted that interactions with program staff in Regional Offices were more useful than the mentor. The desire for more feedback on reports was once again noted, but no specific suggestions were made on how to improve this situation. Finally, one respondent indicated that their experience had been unique and that responsibility for a successful experience really rested with the awardee.

In terms of their professional development, ratings of the importance of the IDRC awards were all positive (Table 5). Highest ratings were afforded providing a broader view of development issues and developing contacts with other professionals. Development of skills in analysis, research, and management were rated next in importance, followed by improvement of writing skills and development of cultural sensitivities.

Those who suggested other areas of importance noted that their association with IDRC had been the most significant factor in their professional development, and that they had gained a better understanding of evaluation and research methodologies, concrete knowledge pertaining to their specific areas of interest, and developed very specific skills such as use of the Internet, and negotiation, facilitation, and organizational skills.

Table 6. Primary field of study of interns and PDAs before IDRC award (*n* = 76).

	Number
International Development Studies (not including Social Sciences)	28
Social Sciences (not including International Development Studies)	25
Arts/Humanities	9
Natural/Physical Sciences	7
Health	4
Law	2
Engineering	0
Other	12

The vast majority of interns and PDA awardees were studying international development and social sciences (Table 6) before winning the IDRC award. Although the other category is relatively large, it includes mostly those who provided detail on their field of study — broadly international development and social sciences (e.g., international affairs, social science approaches to development, urban planning, management, and rural extension studies). Three noted that they were in business or finance.

Few of the awardees (17%, 13 of 76) changed their field of specialization as a result of the IDRC award. Those who indicated that they changed their interests appear most often to have refined their interests to be more specific to development issues (e.g., development evaluation, environmental governance and policy, international development, international environmental policy, information and communication technologies for development, health and environment, sustainable development, urban gardening and ecosystem health). Others decided to pursue communications, study the history of medicine, and specialize in theoretical ecology. One person became an entrepreneur importing products from developing countries.

A large proportion of these awardees (89%, 63 of 71 who replied to this question) have also been successful in finding employment in their chosen fields, and they rated the importance of IDRC in contributing to their success at 3.3. As well, many of these people (87%, 65 of 75 of responses) report that they have maintained a personal interest in international development in their personal lives (e.g., volunteer and community work), and rated IDRC at 3.0 in

Table 7. Where interns and PDA awardees are employed (*n* = 76).

	Number
Government department or agency (includes IDRC)	26
Nongovernment organization	13
University or college	13
Student	12
International organization	9
Research institution	6
Private sector	3
Library	0
Other	8

contributing to this ongoing interest. The somewhat lower rating in their personal interests appears to be due to the fact that many of these people already had an interest in such activities before they won the IDRC award ... for example, *I remain committed to the same things, with or without the award; I was already very interested; and this is a personal interest that has been there before IDRC and will continue in my life!*

Many awardees have found employment in government departments and agencies and nongovernmental organizations (Table 7). A significant number are also employed at universities or colleges or have chosen to continue their studies. International organizations and research institutions have also hired these awardees. Among the "other" category some people noted they were currently seeking employment, were on study leave, and were writing a book for which IDRC had given the award.

Table 8. Type of work undertaken by interns and PDA awardees (*n* = 76).

	Number
Researcher	24
Program/project officer	21
Student	15
Teacher/professor	9
Administrator or manager	9
Journalist	1
Librarian	0
Other	22

Asked to categorize the type of work they now undertook, the largest number reported that they are employed in research positions (Table 8). A considerable number also reported that they are program or project officers. Students and teachers and professors combine to form another significant group. Within the "other" category were: head of economic policy unit in the president's office; policy analyst and policy work; evaluator and evaluations coordinator; legislative advisor; Foreign Service Officer; consultant; importer,

wholesaler, and distributor of fair-wage and fair-trade healthy products; and records and information management analyst.

Table 9. Primary area of responsibility of interns and PDA awardees (*n* = 76).

	Number
Policy analysis	24
Project management	22
Consultancy	15
Program development	13
Scientific research	12
General administration and management	8
Teaching	7
Other	11

Many of the past interns and PDA awardees are involved in policy analysis and project management (Table 9). In addition, consultancy work, project development, and research account for important areas of responsibility. Teaching is of relatively little importance for this category of awardee. Within the "other" category, responsibilities reflected the types of "other" work noted in Table 8: evaluation; report and thesis writing and editing; theoretical analysis; marketing and product development; records management; and studying.

Table 10. Place of work and residence of interns and PDA awardees (*n* = 76).

	Number
North America	52*
Africa	6
Europe	3
Asia	2
Australia/New Zealand	1
Central America and the Caribbean	1
South America	1

*Includes 4 in United States and 1 in Mexico, remainder are in Canada.

In almost all cases (91%, 67 of 74), the awardees felt that the IDRC award had enhanced their professional reputation or credibility. Academically, 50 of these awardees had earned a Masters degree and 21 a Doctorate (or were currently enrolled in a doctoral program). Among the four people who cited other professional qualifications were a law degree, professional editor, and a bachelor's degree. Almost three-quarters of these awardees continue to work and live in Canada (Table 10). Africa (South Africa, Kenya, Cameroon, Namibia, Senegal, and Nigeria) and Europe (all in London) were the next most common locations of work and employment.

When given the opportunity to add any other comments about their awards, these awardees tended to express how important the experience had been to their professional development. In their own words: *I owe a great deal to the experience I had as an IDRC intern ... one of the most formative experiences of my career ... the internship substantially enhanced my insight and experience in program management, program development, donor/funder relations, client and partner relations, program/project evaluation; one of the more challenging and useful periods of my life so far ... the largest portion of my positive experience was due to my supervisor who I really felt had my personal, academic and organizational development firmly in mind; the award was to me a gift from God, a great encouragement, and a wonderful opportunity ... I could not have managed on my own resources without the support of the IDRC ... I remain eternally grateful for the help; our group received four different IDRC awards over the past 17 years ... the experience provided by the IDRC fellowship was exceptionally valuable to their careers; it changed my life; provided a springboard for my further work/studies in the area of international development research; and my work at IDRC has been a career defining experience.*

Others noted the critical role that mentoring plays in the program's success: *the mentorship aspect of the internship award is by far the most valuable of the program — hence why the internship program depends on good mentorship with mentors who actually have an interest in their mentees' work and professional development ... I was quite fortunate along the way to get multiple mentors; staff work loads are very high and they cannot necessarily give that much time to interns and PDAs; and I think IDRC's internship program has to be one of the best in the field of international development ... However, the experiences of interns vary depending on the mentor and how well they are integrated in the team ... Every Program Officer and every team has its own style, which can lead to much inconsistency and often can be less beneficial to the intern and the Program Initiative ... Developing some basic guidelines and providing POs with training on 'how to mentor' may help elevate the program to the level of*

excellence it deserves. (This is now done by CTAP, but perhaps the guidelines need review.)

One respondent suggested that IDRC might consider creating a special fund for its ex-interns to pursue development research in developing countries ... *My experiences in Bangladesh suggest that international organizations in developing world (such as UNDP, UNICEF, and IDRC) rely mainly on a few chosen researchers to conduct research. Unfortunately, this monopoly deprives many young researchers from getting funds and opportunity despite their skills and ability. I think it impedes young researchers' potential and enthusiasm to contribute in development research.*

YCRA, IDRA, and Window on International Development

 Similar questions were asked of these awardees, but more detail was requested. A major difference between the two broad categories of awardees is that Interns and PDAs are provided with hands on experience at one of IDRC's offices and have the opportunity to be involved in assisting in the formulation and management of development research projects. At the same time, the award holders get time to do research on a topic of interest to them and the Program Initiative. IDRAs, YCRAs, Canadian Window Awardees carry out research "long-distance" from IDRC. Most of them never come to IDRC. Funding is provided to cover their field research in a developing country. Normally, award holders do not know who reviewed their application — unless the Program Officer indicates that he/she can be contacted by the award holder. Normally, program staff do not have contact with these award holders.

Responses were received 140 respondents in this category. There were overlaps as several awardees had received more than one award type; therefore, the 140 responses cover 156 awards. Included in the responses were 34 YCRA awardees (20 of whom indicated it was for a Doctorate, 2 for a Masters; and 6

Table 11. Source of first awareness of YCRA, IDRA, and Window awards programs (*n* = 140).

	Number
University supervisor	38
IDRC website	38
Another award holder	24
Department of graduate studies	20
IDRC publication or brochure	16
IDRC staff	11
University career fair	0
IDRC Regional Office	0
Other	13

indicated they received an award for both degrees); 112 IDRA awardees; and 10 Window on International Development awardees. University supervisors and the IDRC website were the most commonly cited points of first contact with these awards programs (Table 11). Other important sources of information included other award holders, departments of graduate studies, IDRC publications, and IDRC staff.

Career fairs and regional offices were not identified by any awardees as the first source of information about the awards. Among the "other" category were: announcements posted on bulletin boards; faculty members (not necessarily supervisors); and existing knowledge of IDRC programs and opportunities. These awardees also rated their experiences as having an important impact on both their personal (136 respondent gave average rating of 3.5) and professional (139 respondents gave average rating of 3.6) interests in international development. The few "other" comments noted that interests were high both before and after receiving the award.

In terms of the most satisfying or rewarding aspects of the award, awardees

Table 12. Rating of most satisfying aspects of YCRA, IDRA, and Window Awards.

	Number of respondents	Average rating
Opportunity and time to pursue my own research interests	138	3.9
Opportunity to broaden my experience to include international development	129	3.5
Interactions with others involved in international development outside Canada	135	3.1
Interactions with others involved in international development in Canada	126	2.0
Other	20	3.8

rated the opportunity and time to pursue their own research interests and broadening their own experiences to include international development as the most important (Table 12). These responses reflect the importance the awards have in allowing individuals to conduct research directly related to international development and to interact with development practitioners outside Canada. Interactions with others in Canada were a less important aspect of these awards. Among the "other" category, 8 of the 20 respondents noted how important access to financial resources had been to being able to undertake research. Five more people noted the opportunity that was provided to interact with developing country researchers and community members and to legitimize their work. In the words of one awardee, the most important aspect was: *the opportunity to work closely and collaboratively with research participants, research assistants, and other community members in a development context and learn from them about their needs and priorities as well as ways in which they believed 'development' could best be integrated into their communities. I was also able to establish relationships with some university faculty and government officials in the country in which I conducted my research, and this provided me with a great deal of insight into various programs and policies.* The awards were also credited with allowing researchers to return to their roots (e.g., Somalia and aboriginal communities) to conduct research and development activities.

The respondents were also asked if they would have liked to have had more interaction with IDRC staff. Of the 140 people who answered this question 57% (80 awardees) would have like more interaction, and 43% (60 awardees) did not want additional contact. Those who would have liked more interaction were asked to indicate the types of interaction that would have been useful and what the benefits would have been.

A wide range of comments were provided on the types of interactions that would have been useful. Primarily, awardees are looking for more opportunities

to benefit from the expertise and experience they recognize exists within IDRC and for a chance to formally present their research to IDRC and obtain peer review and opportunities to further their work or make it more relevant to real development needs. Once again, they recognize that IDRC staff have the contacts and experience to provide guidance in these areas. Here is a small sample of the range of suggestions for areas of interaction: *how to build new partnerships; how to translate our research into action; receive feedback on substantive matters and share results with others; obtain information on 'pre-field' readiness; receive input from both Ottawa and Regional Office program staff, as well as with other affiliated organizations; have interactions with other awardees; learn what IDRC resources are available and how to access them; encourage broader dissemination of results via IDRC website, seminars, and conferences; organize a yearly event to share experiences; present work at IDRC; group sessions to discuss outcomes, experiences, and opportunities with award recipients and IDRC staff; feedback on reports; exchange information and experiences with other doctoral awardees; career linkages; and have an IDRC staff mentor who could act as a contact with whom I could discuss my research experiences and get feedback.*

Asked about the benefits of such interactions, the key attributes are better sharing and dissemination of results; the establishment of a networks of like-minded researchers; input on research methodologies; an opportunity to formally present results to IDRC and obtain feedback; the sharing of field experience and learning for colleagues who had similar opportunities and challenges; a better understanding of development issues and challenges in different countries and different areas of research; guidance in my research; to feel part of the larger IDRC research community; to showcase what IDRC is supporting, and an opportunity to increase the efficiency of funding and administration.

One awardee summed up the general feeling very well: *most of the time we conduct research ... publish in scientific journals and this type of research outcome is completely irrelevant for partners abroad; scientific culture is not the same, no access or use of scientific publication for decision-making ... awardees must be guided to conduct research ... with the ethic of giving access to research information to all partners and translating the research into action (therefore) ... I would have appreciated (the opportunity to come to Ottawa) for a workshop before we started our research as well as a workshop or symposium after our field work to share and learn from each other's experiences.*

In terms of rating the administration of the awards program, the respondents were positive about the main administrative aspects of the awards (Table 13); however, their ratings of the level of feedback they received and the frequency and level of interaction they had with other awardees mirror the comments that were made above. There is a strong desire for feedback on reports that are written and for opportunities to interact with others. One person suggested the potential to: *create a web community of awardees ... it could be based on the country where the researchers is undertaken ... that way you create your network and you can build a lot of information on a specific country.* (If such an option was pursued it would likely make more sense to organize according to IDRC program areas.)

Table 13. Ratings of administrative aspects of awards by YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees.

	Number of respondents	Average rating
Frequency and timeliness of payments	137	3.8
Duration of award	139	3.5
Support/assistance provided by staff	135	3.4
Feedback provided on research proposal	134	3.0
Links/contacts to other researchers	132	2.0
Other	14	3.0

When asked to further expand on how some of these aspects could be improved, more suggestions were forthcoming on the need for feedback on reports and the desirability of sharing results and experiences with other

awardees and IDRC staff (including the possibility of adding a short (3–4 week) internship at IDRC at the start of the award to facilitate IDRC input and interaction). One person noted that it would be useful to expand the program: *I was extremely satisfied with the doctoral research award amount/payment, etc. I was, however, very disappointed to learn that there are no postdoctoral awards. I believe that the most effective and valuable research in international development is longitudinal, and a postdoctoral award would enable PhD graduates to continue/extend/expand their research enormously. I think this would make an immense contribution to international development in general.*

Table 14. Ways in which additional funds were used to support research by YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees (*n* = 140).

	Total
Study and living expenses	72
Tuition	62
Field research	39
Travel	36
Publications	16
Other	17

Three quarters of these awardees (102 of 137 who replied) were able to secure additional funding for their research. Table 14 shows the uses of this supplemental funding. Funds were most often used to cover the cost of study and living expenses and tuition. The other category was predominantly used for presenting papers at, or attending, conferences and meetings and for paying for research assistants.

The awardees were successful in tapping a broad array of sources of new resources. The main contributors were: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) (34 awards) and various Canadian universities (24 awards, principally Laval, McGill, Toronto, Alberta, and MacMaster). The Canadian sources mentioned several times included: Canadian Institutes of Health Research; Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA); Fonds pour la Formation de Chercheurs et l'Aide à la Recherche (FCAR); Fondation Desjardins; Fonds québécois de la recherche sur la nature et les technologies (FQRNT); Fonds québécois de la recherche sur la société et la culture (FQRSC); National Science Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC); and Ontario Graduate Scholarship. In addition, international sources included

such organizations as: Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN); Government of Mexico; Ford Foundation; Harry Guggenheim Foundation; International Tropical Timber Organization; National Geographic Society; Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute; and Wenner-Gren Foundation. About two-thirds of the respondents (62 of 97 who replied) felt that the IDRC award had made it easier to obtain additional funding.

Almost none of the awardees (7 of 140) obtained an orientation session before they left on their field work. Those who had some form of orientation received it from their university. Because the sample is so small, little can be gleaned from the responses, but these ratings were provided to the three areas addressed in the questionnaire: review of travel and health issues (3.0); review of security issues (2.8); and review of cultural issues and sensitivity (2.8). In a follow-up question, 3 respondents indicated that they would have liked an orientation session (and 2 of these said it would have been useful for more input on methodology).

Turning to the program aspects of the awards, the awardees were asked to assess the feedback they had received on their proposals. In general, the comments were rated as being useful (80%, 107 of 134 who replied), although several people noted that they really could no longer remember (this included people who answered both yes and no to this question). Those who said that the feedback was not useful were asked to indicate where they wanted or needed more support (Table 15). Once again the desire for more interactions with IDRC staff concerning research methods is evident, as is the desire to get more sources of information. These were amplified in some of the suggestions given in the other category: *technical aspects of doing scientific research and how to resolve technical challenges related to research while in*

Table 15. Type of additional feedback on proposals requested by YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees.

	Total
Methodology	19
Bibliography	8
Ethical considerations	5
Gender issues	4
Feasibility	7
Other	6

Africa; theoretical contributions, suggestions on incorporating locally-available relevant literature; strategies for more effectively applying the research findings; and suggestions of staff to contact during fieldwork, networks to explore, and additional research to explore. One caution was expressed concerning the form of feedback: *nonacademic-oriented feedback on academic research programs can be extremely difficult for students, because IDRC's directives and objectives differ considerably from the directives and objectives of the university's academic program.*

Table 16. Changes in personal views as a result of field experience gained by YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees.

	Number of respondents	Average rating
Broadened views on development issues	132	3.6
Change the value attributed to research	128	3.5
Enhanced level of respect for other cultures	127	3.3
Other	22	3.9

Respondents were asked how their field experience had altered their views on different aspects of international development (Table 16). There were positive impacts on all of the categories of enquiry, but the largest change reported was in the broadening of the awardees' views on development issues. Several people noted that they already had an appreciation for development issues and a respect for other cultures and they felt that these attributes had contributed to their success in winning an award. Among the other category were such comments as: *provided me with enough experience in that particular country to feel more confident planning and seeking funding for another research project in that country; enabled me to build enduring working relationships with a number of people in a developing country and, in the process, to understand the critical importance of long-term collaboration, partnership and information-sharing at various levels (grassroots, academic, government, and nongovernment) for truly meaningful and sustainable development; gave me an appreciation of how special IDRC is in really focusing on getting on the ground and getting to work as opposed to endless meetings and paperwork about what may happen and then about what should have*

happened; cannot emphasize more the need for field research to grasp the social and political complexity in which development issues take place; and it solidified my commitment to continuing the work, particularly through capacity building, advocacy, and project evaluation.

The awardees were also asked to assess their satisfaction with specific aspects of their awards (Table 17). The opportunity to travel to a developing country was by far the most satisfactory part of the award. Once again interactions with IDRC staff could have been better and access to the IDRC library and other Centre resources were less than satisfactory. In fact, many of the awardees were unaware of the existence of the library and other

Table 17. Satisfaction with aspects of awards expressed by YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees.

	Number of respondents	Average rating
Opportunity to travel to a developing country and meet other researchers	134	3.6
Interactions with IDRC program staff	132	2.5
Access to IDRC library and other resources	123	2.2
Other	3	4.0

Centre resources (although such information is included in their contracts) and made comments such as: was not aware of this resource, and is there a library? The other category included comments about the overall impact the award had had on the awardee, and the level of satisfaction that the award experience had given.

Awardees were then asked how these aspects of the awards program could be improved. The most common message was that the awardees were unaware of the existence of the IDRC library, were too far away to use the library, or they were unaware that they could make use of this resource or interact with IDRC staff. Asked about these aspects, the awardees took the opportunity to express their support for being able to access library resources and if possible to interact with IDRC staff. These interactions with staff were most often focused on obtaining feedback from similar minded professionals, getting suggestions on various aspects of their research, and being provided with contacts or

introductions to other researchers working on IDRC projects or in related subjects in the field. To facilitate access to resources and to make preliminary contact with staff, several respondents suggested that a visit to IDRC should be made part of the award. Others went further to suggest that this might take the form of a short internship before the field work. Secondary interactions with IDRC were suggested for the conclusion of the award, when the awardees might have the opportunity to present the findings of their research to other awardees and IDRC staff. IDRC's current level of interaction with these awardees was summed up rather well by one respondent: *I assumed that the IDRC acted simply as an administrative funding body rather than a broader support network for research.*

Table 18. Ratings of importance of award to professional development of YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees.

	Number of respondents	Average rating
Research skills	138	3.6
Broader view of development issues	138	3.6
Analytical skills	136	3.2
Contacts with other professionals	135	3.1
Management skills	131	3.0
Writing skills	133	2.5
Other	4	na

In terms of their professional development, the awardees were positive in their assessment of the importance of the contributions made by the awards (Table 18). The most important contributions were felt to have been made to improvement of research skills and providing awardees with a broader view of development issues. Positive influences were also reported for analytical skills, contact with other professionals, and development of management skills. Development of writing skills was least affected. No ratings were provided for the few other comments provided, which were expressions of the general value of the award. In such a rating of benefit it would be difficult to attribute specific influence to the IDRC award as compared with the whole PhD process, of which the award is a subset.

Table 19. Primary field of study of YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees before IDRC award (*n* = 140).

	Number
Social Sciences (not including International Development Studies)	71
International Development Studies (not including Social Sciences)	23
Natural/Physical Sciences	18
Health	8
Arts/Humanities	6
Engineering	5
Law	3
Other	17

In terms of careers and research interests, the majority of these awardees were pursuing their interests in the social sciences (Table 19). Those enrolled in the study of international development and the natural and physical sciences were much less common. Few of the awardees were pursuing studies in health, arts, engineering, or law. Among the other category, education was the most commonly mentioned. The "others" mentioned tended to be subfields of the other choices such as: conservation and natural resource management; natural resources and environmental management; rural sociology; medical anthropology; urban and environmental planning; management; environmental studies; and nutrition.

Very few of these awardees changed their field as a result of their award (14 of 140). Some mentioned they had broadened their horizons by, for example, expanding their interest in education to include international development and including women's issues in their research. Those that changed did so to fields that were more closely focused on international issues or that allowed them to broaden their skill set to deal with development issues. For example: *encouraged me to pay closer attention to gender and livelihood issues. This has motivated me to seek further training in the social sciences to strengthen the interdisciplinary aspects of my research; broadened my perspective of planning to two related fields — political science and international development; (the) limitations and frustrations of an engineer with a purely technocratic approach to development; and (I realized that) you can't manage fish, only the fishers to assist local communities with marine management plans.*

About two thirds of these awardees have been able to find employment in their chosen area of specialization (88 of 134 who replied to this question), and they rated IDRC as being important in their success in finding such employment (average rating 3.4 from 83 respondents). Many of these who had not yet found employment noted that they were not yet in the job market because they were still involved in completing their thesis. These same awardees remain committed to international development in their personal lives (126 of 139) and they indicated that IDRC was important in supporting this lasting interest (average rating of 3.2 from 109 respondents). In terms of continuing to work in international development, the majority has continued to do so (109 of 139). Several of those who were not working in international development once again noted that they were still in school.

Table 20. Where YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees are employed (*n* = 140).

	Number
University or college	72
Student	38
Government department or agency	13
Nongovernment organization	9
Research institution	6
Private sector	3
International organization	3
Library	0
Other	12

Table 20 shows where the awardees are employed. By far, most are either working at a university or college or are continuing their education. Other sources of employment include government departments, nongovernmental agencies, research institutions, the private sector, and a few international organizations. In the "other" category, most of the awardees indicated that they were either working as consultants or working on a freelance basis. A few indicated that they were completing their studies.

Most of these awardees are pursuing an academic career. More than 85% (163 of 191 responses) are involved in either teaching or research (mostly at universities) or are still students. A small number indicated that they were working as either program or project officers or managers of administrators. There are no librarians or journalists among these awardees. The "other"

Table 21. Type of work performed by YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees (*n* = 140).

	Number
Teacher/professor	68
Researcher	57
Student	38
Program/project officer	9
Administrator or manager	3
Librarian	0
Journalist	0
Other	16

Table 22. Primary responsibility of YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees in their work (*n* = 140).

	Number
Scientific research	81
Teaching	73
Program development	27
Project management	26
Policy analysis	25
Consultancy	25
General administration and management	18
Other	17

category included: senior development specialist; legal advisor to the Minister of Justice; health care professional; water engineer; and several consultants in different fields.

The information in Table 21 is supported by the additional details provided in Table 22, which shows the primary responsibilities of the awardees in their work (respondents selected more than one category). Scientific research and teaching account for 53% (154 of 292) of the total responses. Program development and management and policy analysis account for a further 27% of all replies. The "other" category included: community outreach; studying and writing; education coordinator; cultural and philosophical research; social science research; study of pharmacy; study law; research on development issues; and providing advice to the Minister of Justice on judicial affairs in Canada. In virtually all cases (96%, 131 of 137), the awardees felt that IDRC had enhanced their professional reputation or credibility.

Very few of the respondents indicated their area of specialization; however, those that did, indicated that they have retained their interests in areas of importance to IDRC work: ethnobotany; education; environmental engineering; anthropology; environmental studies and urban geography; international development studies; gender and development; global citizenship and youth participation; indigenous land rights and conservation; rehabilitation science;

occupational therapy; political science; science curriculum development with a focus on health sciences; geography; environmental anthropology; community development and natural resource management; global environmental policy-making; environmental engineering and anthropology; adult education; education; environmental chemistry; and environmental and political anthropology. Almost 80% (108 of 138) of the awardees have already obtained their doctoral degree, and of those with a Masters, about 25% indicated they were currently working on their PhD. In addition, three respondents noted that they were undertaking post-doctoral work.

Table 23. Where YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees reside and work (*n* = 140).

	Number
North America	127[a]
Africa	5
Asia	5
Europe	4
Central America	4
Australia/New Zealand	1
South America	0

[a] 118 in Canada.

Most of these awardees (87%) have remained in North America (Table 23), and the majority of these (118 of 127) are in Canada. Three of those residing in Canada noted that they work in developing countries as well (in Asia and Central America. The program is definitely contributing to Canada's stock of researchers and teachers with an interest in international development.

In the final question of the survey, the awardees were asked if there was anything else they wanted to add. Many of the respondents took the opportunity to indicate how important and useful the IDRC award had been to the success of their research, how the award had been crucial to their ability to undertake research in a developing country, and how important it was to continue these opportunities for others. These points were accompanied with comments such as: extremely useful; critical; crucial; greatly appreciated; very important; deeply grateful; absolutely critical; vital; very thankful; and wonderful.

Here are some of the comments that were made: *allowed me to undertake extensive research, which enriched my thesis and has made a meaningful*

contribution to my career; the most important thing about the experience I had with the IDRC award was the kind of future possibilities it opens up for me; without IDRC support, my field work would not have happened; as a result (of the award), I have a standing invitation to return to east Africa to carry on our collaborations, and I have research programs in Argentina and China, as well as Canada; the type of opportunities that IDRC provides is truly invaluable in training a new generation of international development studies researchers and teachers in Canada; the experience has inspired me to continue doing research work with the Filipino youth; I appreciated being highlighted on the IDRC front webpage for a few months in 2005! Many people and professional contacts have noted my profile on the IDRC website. This is terrific exposure for students; IDRC award was ... crucial to engage in collaborative research with universities and research institutions ... (and) was also helpful to establish working relationships with governmental and nongovernmental agencies and with international institutions; I was able to connect with on-going projects (IDRC supported, and other) and link my research into an on-the-ground program; contributed greatly to the quality of my research and my commitment to continue to work in international development; and the study design fostered a participatory and collaborative approach to addressing the study objectives.

Among the comments were also some suggestions for improvements or enhancements. One awardee suggested that IDRC could get more mileage from the work it supports. For example: *IDRC had funded some universities to undertake analytical work in decentralization just prior to my award. It might have been useful to IDRC to continue the linkage with these universities by making use of my research output in some way, seeking to increase the capacity of these partners in the field of decentralization. This is just one opportunity that was missed. There does not seem to be an organizational strategy to get full mileage from the awards.*

A few people noted the importance of dissemination of results and the need to ensure that the results of the research were delivered to the locations where the research had been undertaken. They encouraged IDRC to include allowances for this work in the award structure: *(it is) important to organize a support system to disseminate the knowledge generated by the research — could include financing to return in the field to present the findings and help with publication (of results); I would strongly recommend ... including research dissemination explicitly into funding programs. That is to say ... they should require researchers to include in their proposal and budget consideration of how results will be disseminated to research partners and stakeholders ... Funding may need to be increased to include this stage explicitly in research programs, but I think it is a necessary component of research, consistent with the IDRC mandate, and not explicitly integrated into the current programming; and (it is) important to ask how an awardee maintains ties with the local communities after award duration. How (has the) award has been useful in establishing continuing relationship between the researcher and local communities.*

Other suggestions related to making closer links between the awardees and IDRC and also among awardees: *It will be great if researchers are required to be affiliated with IDRC upon their return from field work for at least a couple of months to learn from more experienced researchers for example, how to analyze their data and also for exchange of ideas; tie a bunch of mentoring opportunities to the award. A tour of IDRC, an annual conference of award winners, anything to help the student become more familiar with what being a professional in development work entails; organize annual meetings between the researchers in social sciences and other discipline to discuss disorder of development aid in various fields of intervention in the countries of the South; I wish there were more opportunities to meet them (IDRC staff). I also believe IDRC could be more active in creating opportunities for award recipients to keep in touch on a regular basis; links could be strengthened with Canadian academic institutions to encourage*

greater South–North exchange along with the emphasis on South–South exchange.

In terms of overall administration, a few other comments were made: *I also strongly support their (IDRC) policy of insisting that recipients have the proper research visas for the host countries, as well as the depositing of their research in the host country archives (my PhD is with the University of Namibia and the Namibian National Archives); and the program is excellent and support of the staff in the awards unit was also excellent. They have been very responsive to the problems and delays that doctorate students might face doing this kind of research (e.g., from visa delays).*

Finally, one person took the opportunity to praise IDRC in general: *My own feeling is that IDRC is head and shoulders above most organizations in terms of admin, project selection, and effectiveness. So, I find it discouraging that IDRC does not have a larger slice of the Canadian development pie ... we would be much further ahead of the game if it did!*

IDRC Staff

The questionnaire to IDRC staff included two sections that matched the award categories (Interns and PDAs — Part A, and YCRA, IDRA, and Window — Part B). Staff were asked to answer the section (or sections) that were appropriate to their interactions with the Awards Program. Of the total of 51 IDRC employees who replied, more (45) had been involved with the Interns and PDAs than with the YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees (18). Twelve indicted that they had been involved with both groups of awardees. Several others (6) noted their involvement with other programs such as: the Ecohealth and Agropolis awards; sabaticants; and awards developed through projects such as the award fellowship granted by AIT (Asian Institute of Technology) for gender, environment, and development. These employees often answered part B of the

questionnaire related to YCRA, IDRA, and Window awardees meaning that the total number of responses exceeded 18 in several cases. The second part of the questionnaire was identical for IDRC staff irrespective of the type of awardees with which they had interacted.

Part A — Interns and PDAs

As shown in Table 24, most of the 45 staff who had been involved with Interns and awardees had evaluated or offered advice on a proposal, read and evaluated reports prepared by awardees, and acted as a mentor. Slightly fewer had offered advice to an awardee from time to time or maintained ongoing contact. Among the "other" responses that were given, staff mentioned that: the level of interaction varies with the awardee and the relationship that is developed; they had acted as referee in awardees'

Table 24. Types of interactions IDRC staff had with Interns and PDAs (*n* = 45).

	Number
Evaluated or offered advice on a proposal	40
Read and evaluated reports prepared by an awardee	39
Acted as a mentor (direct supervisor) for an awardee	38
Offered advice to an awardee from time to time	35
Have maintained ongoing contact with an awardee	31
Other	5

applications for employment, acted as member of awardees' dissertation committee, and acted as editor of awardees' publications on their research; and that they had provide research guidance (e.g., methods, theories, and data analysis).

Table 25. Most important contributions staff can make to interns and PDAs (note: some staff responded to this question although they had not supervised interns or PDAs) .

	Number of respondents	Average rating
Create learning opportunities for the awardee	47	3.6
Provide professional advice and guidance on the awardee's research	46	3.5
Help the awardee understand IDRC's corporate culture	44	3.0
Help them to define or re-evaluate their career goals	43	2.8
Provide advice on employment and research opportunities	44	2.5
Other (please specify):	6	3.7

Staff were asked to rate the importance of different contributions they can make to the awardees (Table 25). They rated the creation of learning opportunities and the provision of advice and guidance on research as the most important inputs they can make. Least importance was accorded to helping the awardees with future employment or research opportunities.

Table 26. Most important characteristics of a mentor or supervisor (note: some staff responded to this question although they had not supervised interns or PDAs).

	Number of respondents	Average rating
Having (or making) sufficient time for meaningful interactions with awardees	46	3.8
Good interpersonal skills	46	3.3
Subject matter expertise directly related to the awardee's interests	46	3.1
Amount of experience in international development in general	45	3.0
Amount of experience with IDRC	45	2.5
Previous teaching or mentoring experience	47	2.5
Other (please specify):	6	3.7

In terms of the most important characteristics of a mentor or supervisor, having (or making) sufficient time for meaningful interactions with awardees was by far the most important (Table 26). This was followed by good interpersonal skills, subject matter expertise, and experience in international development. In the "other" category, IDRC staff noted some other important characteristics: the relationship built with the intern is perhaps the most important, particularly being there to provide support and guidance. Time is always a big factor for program staff who travel a lot and are unable to be there to give them appropriate guidance. Previous experience in mentoring can help prioritize what is important; not only have time available but be ready to listen to what the intern has to say and create a welcoming environment for his/her ideas; and to have an open mind and be respectful of awardee's priorities and views.

Staff were also asked what benefits they had derived from their experiences as mentors or supervisors (Table 27). Personal satisfaction in helping a colleague was cited most often, followed closely with improved supervisory and leadership skills and the introduction of fresh ideas and approaches by the interns and PDAs. The responses in the "other"

Table 27. Benefits staff derive from their experiences with interns and PDA awardees (*n* = 45).

	Number
Achieved personal satisfaction by helping a colleague improve research and administration skills	40
Improved my supervisory and leadership skills	38
Awardee introduced fresh ideas or approaches	37
Built a lasting and ongoing professional relationship with awardee	30
Other	3

category reinforced these views: received valuable assistance in my own work; if the awardee's research is directly related to your program's objectives, then his/her research will be quite valuable; and fresh energy, critical thinking, and independent capacity (i.e., requiring less supervision than PAs for example) to help in critical tasks in the life of the Program Initiative.

Part B — IDRAs, YCRAs, and Canadian Window Awardees

Table 28. Types of interactions staff have with IDRA, YCRA, and Window awardees (*n* = 20).

	Number
Evaluated an application for one of the awards	20
Provided professional advice (bibliographic support, etc.)	11
Made myself available for interactions with the awardee	9
Other (please specify):	2

Most of the IDRC who responded to the survey had interacted with IDRAs, YCRAs, and Canadian Window Awardees by evaluating applications for one of the awards (Table 28). Only roughly half of the staff had provided professional advice or made themselves available to these awardees for future consultations. Within the other category the program staff noted that they had provided contact information for other organizations in developing countries and recommended other partners who might be useful.

Table 29. Most important contributions staff can make to IDRA, YCRA, and Window awardees (*n* = 20).

	Number of respondents	Average rating
Provide professional opinions on the quality and relevance of their research	20	3.4
Provide advice on research methods	19	3.1
Provide a sounding board to the awardee	17	2.9
Provide advice on information sources	18	2.8
Other (please specify):	3	3.7

IDRC staff believe that the most important contribution they can make to these awardees is to provide professional opinions on the quality and relevance of the research proposal and on the research methods that are proposed (Table 29). Somewhat less importance was assigned to providing a sounding board to the awardees and providing advice on sources of information.

Table 30 indicates the types of benefits that IDRC staff believe they receive from their interaction with the awardees. The two most common benefits are being introduced to, or acquiring a broader perspective, on a particular area of research, and building a lasting and on-going relationship with an awardee. Staff have also been able to use the results of the research in their own work.

Table 30. Benefits derived by IDRC staff from their interactions with IDRA, YCRA, and Window awardees (*n* = 20).

	Number
Introduced me to, or gave me broader perspective, on a particular area of research	13
Built a lasting and ongoing professional relationship with awardee	11
Was able to use the final report in my own work	8
Other	5

In the "other" comments by staff related to this question were a few other benefits: *getting to know the research and professional development interest of young students and professionals; building expertise on graduate degree proposal evaluation, learning about academic research in the context of graduate degrees, and following up changes in the academic context.* Some program staff also noted some of the potential downsides of these experiences: *again, this (the benefit) really varies depending on the awardee; and there is a whole downside that needs to be captured here — not all mentoring and guiding*

works out well and in some cases the awardee has all kinds of problems and one has also to learn when you use one's time elsewhere.

Common Questions for all IDRC staff

Several benefits accrue to Program Initiatives (PI) from their interactions with awardees. These most often take the form of exposing the PI to fresh ideas and perspectives and providing the opportunity to address issues or undertake research that program staff do not have the time of opportunity to pursue (Table 31). Although not specifically one of the areas in which awardees are supposed to interact while at IDRC a fairly significant number of program staff see these awardees as providing

Table 31. Benefits that Program Initiatives can derive from association with awardees ($n = 51$).

	Number
Offers opportunity to expose program to fresh ideas and perspectives	40
Provides opportunity to address issues or undertake research that program staff do not have time or opportunity to undertake	40
Provides important program and administrative support to the team	33
Offers an opportunity to identify promising candidates for consulting work or full-time positions	31
Provides an opportunity to explain and demonstrate IDRC approach to research for development	29
Other	4

important program and administrative support to the team. Somewhat fewer staff see these awards as providing opportunities to identify promising candidates for consulting work or full-time positions at IDRC, although several of the respondents were in fact previous award holders. Demonstrating IDRC's approach to research for development was least cited as a potential benefit. In the "other" category were the possibilities of helping awardees get a "leg up" on their careers and getting exposed to the ideas and interests of the new generation of development professionals.

IDRC program staff were also asked to rate the Awards Program in several areas (Table 32). Staff believe that the awards program contributes to the achievement of overall Centre's objectives and that it is responsive to program needs. However, they suggest that there could be better communication with

program staff regarding specific training opportunities, improvements in communication with program staff about awardees and their needs while at IDRC, and more attention paid to the review and dissemination of progress and final reports and to addressing recommendations made by awardees.

Table 32. Rating of Awards Program by IDRC program staff (*n* = 51).

	Number of respondents	Average rating
Contribution it makes to overall Centre objectives	49	3.2
Responsiveness to our program needs	47	2.9
Communication with program staff regarding specific opportunities	48	2.6
Liaison with program staff about awardees and their needs while at IDRC	48	2.6
Review and dissemination of progress and final reports	47	2.6
Follow up on recommendations made by awardees	35	2.3

Staff were also asked to provide examples of ways in which awardees had helped their programs. Most of the examples of contributions to the programs were attributed to work done by interns. These awardees had made a range of contributions: researching and writing synthesis papers; representing programs at external meetings; reviewing project proposals; conducting project evaluations; generating knowledge related to emerging program interests; helped improve team skills and approaches to project design and management; providing critical thinking on various aspects of programs; undertaking literature reviews and scoping studies; undertaking research that was of direct interest to both programs and research partners; introducing new programming and research streams to the Program Initiative; developing new project ideas; and in several cases going on to become full-time IDRC staff members.

In addition, interns have contributed to many administrative tasks such as: helping to organize workshops, conferences, and other major events; providing support in securing donor funding; undertaking some communications activities such as editing reports, updating websites, helping to manage

program communication; and sorting resumes, taking care of contract and salary details, and advertising award opportunities.

Each year the Program Initiatives select a theme or topic for which to request internship proposals based on a thematic priority that is foreseen for that year. This ensures that the intern has a well defined niche within the program area and also that the work produced by the intern is addressing a need with the program. Within the Ecohealth Awards program it was mentioned that funds are provided for a week of training with experts in the field as well as funds for presenting results at international conferences.

Program staff were then asked for their opinions on the best aspects of the Awards Program and also for their suggestions on how the program could be improved. The most commonly mentioned positive aspect of the program was the opportunity it provides to young Canadians to start to build careers in international development. Different aspects of this opportunity were mentioned: involving and immersing young people in programs and Regional Offices; providing learning opportunities and hands-on experience; encouragement to conduct field research in the South; providing students with mentors outside their academic advisors; offering a first opportunity to work in development; exposing students to those with a deeper understanding of analytical and development issues; allowing students the freedom to define and pursue a research project; integrating students into the delivery of development research support; and providing an environment in which to develop skills and expand experience.

Many benefits of these opportunities were noted: the provision of support to programs at a substantive level; injecting new research ideas and perspectives into Program Initiatives; offering the opportunity for young people to do interesting work outside of what IDRC staff normally have the time or opportunity to pursue; bringing "new blood" into IDRC; encouraging close

interaction with young professionals, both for IDRC staff and partners abroad; broadening the dissemination of IDRC mandate and the use of participatory approaches in research; creating links between the programs and universities and institutions; and acting as a "farm system" for new program staff in some program areas.

Other positive aspects of the Awards Program that were noted include: the support that is provided to programs at substantive levels; the visibility it gives to IDRC in Canada; the management of the program and the selection of quality candidates; the variety and flexibility of the awards; and the fact that it exists within IDRC and is able to do the work it does behind the scenes.

In terms of possible ways to improve the Awards Program, one of the most common suggestions was to ensure that young people from across the country are engaged. IDRC staff noted that students were predominantly from Ontario and Quebec, and that often it was the same schools and departments that were tapped. For example: *I often find the awards are not well advertised and the number of quality applicants that our program receives is rarely more than two per year. Also, it appears that students from universities such Carleton, Guelph, Laval, and Sherbrooke tend to dominate, but there are many, many more universities in Canada to whom the awards would be of interest.*

It was also suggested that more efforts should go toward providing awards for developing country nationals. One respondent noted: *The demand for more and different types of awards would seem to be the main future need, but whether this is best managed within IDRC program areas or by the Awards Program needs more discussion. We need to look at better ways to ensure that developing country nationals get the opportunities they need to pursue not only their research, but also in many cases, their graduate-level education. This is challenging, because the needs are so great.*

Several issues were raised with regard to the submission and review process for proposals. Some suggested that there was a need to improve the matching of selection criteria with the needs of programs and to add clarity and simplicity to the research budget submissions. In terms of program needs, it was suggested that there is a need for strategic links to the program areas to allow better planning with respect to annual work plans and related human resource needs — the *Awards Program is too generic … (there should be) better matching of candidates with programs.* The need for clarity in application process suggested the need for more careful communication of relevant guidelines and administrative details. As an example: *I have found that different applicants have a different understanding of what is expected of them on the application. It might be useful to re-visit the guidelines that the applicants receive to ensure that there is a common understanding of what the guidelines actually require of the applicants.*

This sometimes seems to create some frustration among program staff: *… in some cases the applications are extremely poor with poorly framed research proposals and budgets that are often over the stipulated amount. It is not useful to spend time reviewing such applications and evaluating them, it would be more efficient if such poor quality applicants could just be cut in the first round of screening by CTAP.*

With regard to proposal review, one person noted that: *Specific comments about rejected applications should be shared with applicants, to avoid them coming back with the same proposal, without knowing what needs to be changed. The special section for comments that are meant to be shared with applicants should be considered for rejected applications.*

The role of IDRC mentors was also addressed. On a Centre-wide basis it was suggested that more recognition of the role of mentors (and the time and effort

it requires) in the performance review process. Also related to relationships between IDRC program staff and awardees, were comments on ways to improve links between evaluators and awardees, and to improve communication between program staff and the Awards Program staff, particularly when awardees face some difficulties. There were a couple of aspects of this need for improved communication. One area was support provided to awardees while in the field and then later. *Many recipients of the awards have expressed the need for more support, feedback, and monitoring when they are in the field (although this should primarily be the responsibility of their advisors). Several also expressed interest for maintaining contacts with the Centre after the completion of their research.* Another person noted *... the Awards Program needs to reinforce the ties between the awardee and the evaluators and ... reinforce (the links between) the awardees' educational institution and the specific IDRC program initiative.*

Others noted that sometimes the experience is not necessarily always positive if the correct environment is not created. *Using students ... to do fairly low-level process work probably under-utilizes their capacity and may frustrate them. For the interns, the learning about IDRC's way of working usually does not totally achieve their expectations, due to the time limitations, as well as PO's heavy workload and frequent travels. The awardees come in with high qualifications and high expectations but often not much experience and therefore they feel dissatisfied if they're not given high calibre work. But they require a high amount of supervision when they are given more challenging tasks. I often find the summer students better to work with as they have better attitudes, work harder, and don't have a fixed idea of what they want to do so it's easier to work with them and find work that's appropriate and can increase their level incrementally. I've found working with interns a very draining experience as I feel I end up putting many hours into the person but don't receive much support*

in return, and supervisors often don't recognize this contribution of your time to this person.

Suggestions were also made with regard to the reports that are part of the award process. Suggestions were made on the need to improve the review and dissemination of progress and final reports as well as to follow-up on recommendations in final reports. One program person noted: *The reporting mechanisms might be more creative and useful to programs. I have filled in mid-term and end-of-year reports for the two interns that I have managed — but the structure of the reports was quite basic. I get the sense the reports are primarily for accountability purposes.* The use of reports was more bluntly addressed by another staff member *... solving the 'control' tension of asking awardees to prepare a lot of extra reports that: (1) other donors do not require; and (2) no one at IDRC reads.*

Other suggestions included: giving the awardees more profile as young researchers; giving more publicity to the doctoral awardees; providing assistance with post-internship employment; increasing the level of funding available for field research; insisting that awardees get practical field experience; and only providing awards to bilingual candidates.

Staff were also asked to suggest why it was important to address these shortcomings and how they might be overcome. The suggestions and remedial actions fell into the following categories.

Broader representation — because IDRC is a national agency it should *offer awards in a manner that reflects regional diversity.* It was noted as well that it appears that: *applicants come from the same few institutions, and we need to be careful we are not being captured by a small and not necessarily broadly representative (sample of) Canadian academic programs.* As well, it was

pointed out that it was important to increase the range of qualified candidates. To address this need to broaden the representation, it was suggested that: *IDRC should take a proactive approach to promote opportunities (travel to other regions and give presentations at universities) and possibly offer special opportunities to ensure that awards better reflect all regions (including relocation grants).* It was also suggested that alternative publicity mechanisms be explored and that consideration be given to producing a newsletter on awardees perspectives, emerging research ideas, and outputs from the Awards Program. In general, staff suggested the need for enhanced publicity for internship program (advertising the awards program to international development, political science, sociology, geography, and economics departments and professors in all Canadian universities), for reaching out to academic institutions to understand the reasons for lack of applications, and for more communication about the direction of academic programs possibly relevant to Centre programs so that IDRC could reach out to target applicants. One person noted the importance of professors receiving knowledge of such opportunities because if the advertisement is done at a level of Vice President or Dean, often the information does not get filtered down to the students.

More opportunities for developing country awardees — it was noted that: *IDRC used to give substantial support to developing country nationals for graduate studies — many of whom now are in senior posts in government and research institutions and remember that support fondly, and actually credit this support as being key to facilitating their positions today. A small investment with large payoff.* To address this situation, it was suggested that more support was needed for those in developing countries. One way to address this need was suggested. Consider the establishment: *in the regional offices a scholarship opportunity for a few developing country nationals to pursue graduate level education. It would be a tremendous way to give back to the countries hosting IDRC offices, and encourage local education.*

Better quality applicants — Some staff feel that the quality of applicants (particularly for doctoral awards) is quite low. As well, it was suggested that: *the proportion of potentially suitable candidates/proposals is very low in relation to the number of proposals. The call for proposals does not give a sufficient indication of what is required in terms of the methodology section of the proposal; and for most proposals submitted in the latest round this section was either deficient or absent altogether.* Partly, this issue could be addressed by broader advertising of the availability of the awards. However, it was also noted that application procedure could be improved: *the internship advertising, proposal submission, and review process should be reviewed to introduce new procedures for the call for proposals (including the formulation of the call for proposals and evaluation forms) that can help lead to a greater number of suitable candidates who can potentially meet with internship requirements/expectations (i.e., assist with program management tasks and undertake a research project that relates to the work of the program).*

Improved internal communication — Some staff suggested that communication between program staff and the Awards Program needed improvement. To address this concern and some other general concerns about procedural aspects of the awards suggestions were made for the need to improve communication and interactions with Regional Offices, to clarify some procedural aspects of the awards and ensure that clear advice and messages are sent to awardees, and to ensure that there is a true "partnership" between program staff and CTAP staff in all aspects of the award process.

Reports, reporting, and feedback — Three related issues were addressed by staff. There was a suggestion that the required reports were unnecessary because: "No one at IDRC reads those reports. While there could be a good report once in a while, the cost of that control is not worth the benefit." Others suggested that more "value" could be obtained from the reports. For example, there was a call for enhanced "dissemination of awardees' research carried out

(while at the Centre, for interns and PDAs; while working under an IDRC grant, for field awardees). Selecting the best studies and editing them can be laborious, yet the pool of completed studies is now considerable and books could be organized around particular themes, with Canadian experts (possibly one of the awardees' supervisors on that particular topic) acting as editors." It was also suggested that "seminars at IDRC are a good idea ... (to lean) what is being done outside of IDRC." "Electronic factsheets on awardees' research" was also suggested as a way to publicize their results. A related issue was feedback to awardees on both reports (and proposals). Regarding proposals, one person noted that: "I have experienced reading the same proposal for the second time without any changes, since comments were not shared with applicant." For reports, it was suggested that "recommendations are made in final reports and are not addressed" and also that "moreover there is no mandatory feedback from the awardee to the evaluator nor the program.

To address these feedback issues, staff made several suggestions: *not incorporating a contractual requirement to report. By changing the job description and monitoring of SID's Awards Officer ... to follow-up on technical work, where this is useful to the Centre and where we do wish to assess 'value-for-money.' That job, and the way in which it is executed, is currently perceived as not adding value to the award process.*" The need for more "innovation" within the Awards Program was suggested. To provide more feedback to awardees, it was suggested that a box be added to the provide comments that could be shared with applicants whose ideas are rejected. Regarding feedback to awardees on their reports, it was suggested that these be made available to a more general IDRC audience by the Awards Program and *not left up to the individual PIs to arrange.* At the same time, it was noted that the issue of providing feedback was difficult to address because: *POs do not have much spare time to monitor or support individual awardees in a meaningful way, due*

to workload issues. There was also a suggestion that the Awards Program focus *less on administration and more on technical feedback.*

Provision of additional support to awardees — It was noted that: *in the case of the Ecohealth awards, students go to the field after a week of training with members of the Ecohealth program. However, they (the awardees) feel that this is sometimes insufficient and that they should be able to contact POs for feedback and advice while on the field.* This would require additional resources for awardees to spend a short period of orientation and training with Centre staff (either in Ottawa or a Regional Office) and would also place additional burdens and responsibilities on program staff. It was suggested that: *periodic (quarterly perhaps) work progress meeting between the awardee, supervisor, and award division staff* might be useful in this regard. If increased interactions and support to awardees are contemplated, it is important to ensure that there is corporate recognition: *that awardee mentorship or responsibility goes above and beyond the call of duty and (it should be) rewarded accordingly in the PRA, alternately POs have less incentive to take on the role.*

Finally, IDRC staff were asked if they had any other comments about how the Awards Program interacts with, and contributes to, their program interests. Most of the comments mirrored and reinforced the suggestions and comments made earlier. For example, regarding closer interactions: *the IDRAs and YCRAs obviously do not have the same relationship as interns or PDAs. However, I think they can be encouraged to have more interaction with IDRC staff ... (opportunity to liaise with appropriate people and organizations; and share their work with wider audience at IDRC). We always try to encourage IDRAs to visit us at the regional office and to share their work ... I think this has been useful both from IDRC's side, as well as from the IDRA's side in the past.*

The workload of staff and the time requirements for close interactions with awardees was once again noted: *interns take a lot of time of the responsible officers, either in their adjustment to the program's requirements and sometimes because they can be very demanding in the review and guidance of their research activities.* However, the positive role that interns can play in contributing to reflections on program directions (that staff do not often have time for) was noted. Also noted was the quite different levels of involvement that staff have with the different types of awardees. Good mentoring and quality reporting were suggested to be the main challenges facing the Awards Program.

Two other suggestions were made regarding improved communication with awardees and award opportunities for developing country candidates. *Create and maintain an awardee network by establishing a list and once or twice per year, formalize a communication with them ... The first one to help share news about IDRC activities and, the second one, for updating information about the awardees and their further development.* With regard to expanded award opportunities: (the creation of) s*eparate internship opportunities for PI interns based at regional offices could be helpful to IDRC programs and also provide more opportunity to developing country internship candidates. It seems that most programs opt for an Intern in Ottawa, and developing country nationals are rarely selected for internships in regional offices, although they apply. Perhaps the one intern requirement might be relaxed so that a PI could have one Ottawa-based intern (a Canadian resident) and one regionally-based intern (a developing country national).*

Appendix 1: Questionnaire sent to awardees who had received Internship Awards and Professional Development (PDA) Awards

I am conducting a review of several awards programs of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). The purposes of this review are: to better understand how the awards affected the careers and interests of the recipients; and to learn how the awards program can be improved.

I hope you will take the time to share your experiences and insights with me. The questionnaire should take you about 10 minutes to complete, and all replies are confidential.

For your convenience, the questionnaire can be answered by return email — simply click on reply, respond to the questions directly within the email, and click send. Please return the completed questionnaire to me by 20 December 2006.

Si vous souhaitez remplir le questionnaire en français, veuillez m'en faire la demande par courriel.

Thank you.

Michael Graham
mikegraham@lincsat.com

▪▪

QUESTIONNAIRE:

1. What type of award did you receive? Please place an "x" in the () to indicate your answer.
() Internship Award
() Professional Development Award

2. How did you first hear about the IDRC Awards Program? Please place an "x" in the () to indicate your answer.
() University supervisor
() Another awardee
() University Career Fair
() IDRC publication or brochure
() IDRC website
() IDRC regional office
() IDRC staff
() Other (please specify):

3. How important was the award in changing or reinforcing your personal and professional interests in international development? Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all important" and 4 representing "very important."
() Personal interest
() Professional interest

4. What do you consider to be the most satisfying or important aspects of your award? Please rank each factor that is applicable on a scale of 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all important" and 4 representing "very important."
() interactions with IDRC staff
() interactions with other award holders
() interactions with others involved in international development in Canada
() interactions with others involved in international development outside Canada
() the opportunity to network with other researchers in my field
() the opportunity and time to pursue own professional interests
() opportunity to broaden my experience to include international development
() other (please specify):

Administrative Aspects:

5. Overall, how would you rate these administrative aspects of your award? Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all satisfactory" and 4 representing "very satisfactory."
() support/assistance provided by staff in the Training and Awards Program
() frequency and timeliness of payments
() duration of award
() feedback provided on interim and final reports
() links/contacts to other awardees (current and past)
() other (please specify):

6. If you provided a rating of 1 or 2 to any of the choices in Question 5, please provide examples and suggest how these aspects can be improved.

Program Aspects:

7. Overall, how would you rate the program aspects of your award? Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all satisfactory" and 4 representing "very satisfactory."
() mentoring by IDRC Program Staff
() interactions with other IDRC program staff in your area of interest
() access to IDRC library and other resources
() interactions with others outside IDRC
() interactions with other awardees
() opportunity to travel to a developing country and meet other researchers
() other (please specify):

8. If you provided a rating of 1 or 2 to any of the choices in Question 7, please provide examples and suggest how these aspects can be improved.

9. In terms of your professional development, how important was your IDRC award to each of these aspects? Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all important" and 4 representing "very important."
() writing skills
() research skills
() analytical skills
() management skills
() cultural sensitivities
() broader view of development issues
() contacts with other professionals
() other (please specify):

Career:

10. What was your primary field of study before your IDRC award?
() Arts/Humanities
() Social Sciences (not including International Development Studies)
() International Development Studies (not including Social Sciences)
() Health
() Natural/Physical Sciences
() Engineering
() Law
() Other (please specify):

11. Did support from IDRC lead you to change your primary field of study?
() no
() yes
If you answered yes, what field did you decide to pursue and why did you make this change?
New field:
Reason for change:

12. Were you able to obtain employment in your area of primary interest?
() no
() yes
If you answered yes, how important would you say that support from IDRC was to your success in finding relevant employment? Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all important" and 4 representing "very important."
Rating: ()

13. Have you maintained your interest in international development in your personal life (e.g., volunteer and community work)?
() no

() yes
If you answered yes, how important was IDRC support to this lasting interest. Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all important" and 4 representing "very important."
Rating: ()

14. Where are your currently employed?
() government department or agency
() nongovernment organization
() private sector
() international organization
() university or college
() research institution
() library
() student
() other (please specify):

15. What sort of work do you do now?
() researcher
() teacher/professor
() administrator or manager
() program/project officer
() librarian
() student
() journalist
() other (please specify):

16. What is your primary area of responsibility in your work?
() scientific research
() general administration and management
() program development
() project management
() teaching
() policy Analysis
() consultancy
() other (please specify):

17. In your opinion, did support from IDRC enhance your professional reputation or credibility?
() no
() yes

18. Academically what is your field of specialization and what is the most advanced academic degree you have obtained?
Field of Specialization:
() Masters

() Doctorate
() Other (please specify):

19. Where do you currently reside and work?
() Africa, if so, where:
() Asia, if so, where:
() Australia, if so, where:
() Europe, if so, where:
() North America, if so, where:
() Central America, if so, where:
() South America, if so, where

20. Please update your contact information:
() Mr (full name):
() Mrs (full name):
() Ms (full name):

Complete Mailing Address (with postal code):

Email Address:

Phone Number (with area code):

21. Do you have anything else you would like to add to help me understand your experiences during and after the IDRC award?

Thank you for taking the time to share your ideas and opinions with me.

Michael Graham
mikegraham@lincsat.com

Je passe actuellement en revue plusieurs des programmes de bourses du Centre de recherches pour le développement international (CRDI). Cette étude a pour objet de mieux comprendre la façon dont les bourses ont influencé la carrière et les intérêts des récipiendaires et de déterminer comment le programme de bourses pourrait être amélioré.

J'espère que vous prendrez le temps de me faire part de votre expérience et de vos commentaires. Il vous faudra environ 10 minutes pour remplir le questionnaire, et toutes les réponses demeureront confidentielles.

Vous pouvez facilement remplir le questionnaire directement dans un courriel de réponse — il suffit de cliquer sur « répondre » ou « reply », de répondre aux questions directement dans le courriel et de cliquer sur « envoyer » ou « send ». Veuillez retourner le questionnaire rempli au plus tard le 20 décembre 2006.

Merci.

Michael Graham
mikegraham@lincsat.com

· ·

QUESTIONNAIRE :
Le masculin est employé dans le présent questionnaire uniquement pour alléger le texte.

1. Quel type de bourse avez-vous reçue ? Veuillez inscrire un « x » entre les parenthèses () pour indiquer votre réponse.
() Bourse de stage
() Bourse de perfectionnement professionnel

2. Comment avez-vous entendu parler pour la première fois du Programme de bourses du CRDI ? Veuillez inscrire un « x » entre les parenthèses () pour indiquer votre réponse.
() par mon superviseur à l'université
() par un autre boursier
() à l'occasion d'une foire des carrières à l'université
() par une publication ou un dépliant du CRDI
() sur le site web du CRDI
() par un bureau régional du CRDI
() par un membre du personnel du CRDI
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

3. Quelle importance la bourse a-t-elle eue pour modifier ou renforcer votre intérêt personnel et professionnel à l'égard du développement international ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4, où 1 signifie « aucune importance » et 4 signifie « énormément d'importance ».
() Intérêt personnel
() Intérêt professionnel

4. Quels aspects de votre bourse ont été pour vous les plus satisfaisants ou les plus importants ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4 à chacun des aspects pertinents, où 1 signifie « pas important du tout » et 4 signifie « très important ».
() interactions avec le personnel du CRDI
() interactions avec d'autres boursiers
() interactions avec d'autres intervenants en développement international au Canada
() interactions avec d'autres intervenants en développement international à l'extérieur du Canada
() possibilité d'établir un réseau avec d'autres chercheurs dans mon domaine
() possibilité de poursuivre mes propres intérêts professionnels et temps pour le faire
() possibilité d'étendre mon expérience au développement international
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

Aspects administratifs :

5. Dans l'ensemble, comment évaluez-vous les aspects administratifs de votre bourse ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4 aux aspects suivants, où 1 signifie « pas satisfaisant du tout » et 4 signifie « très satisfaisant ».
() soutien et aide fournis par le personnel du Programme de formation et des bourses
() fréquence et calendrier des paiements
() durée de la bourse
() commentaires reçus au sujet des rapports provisoire et final
() liens et contacts avec les autres boursiers (actuels et antérieurs)
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

6. Si vous avez attribué la cote 1 ou 2 à un des énoncés de la Question 5, veuillez donner des exemples et suggérer des moyens d'amélioration possible.

Éléments relatifs au programme :

7. Dans l'ensemble, comment évaluez-vous les éléments relatifs au programme en ce qui concerne votre bourse ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4 aux éléments suivants, où 1 signifie « pas satisfaisant du tout » et 4 signifie « très satisfaisant ».
() mentorat par le personnel de programme du CRDI
() interactions avec les autres membres du personnel du CRDI dans votre domaine d'intérêt
() accès à la bibliothèque du CRDI et aux autres ressources
() interactions avec d'autres personnes à l'extérieur du CRDI
() interactions avec d'autres boursiers
() possibilité de voyager dans le pays en développement et de rencontrer d'autres chercheurs
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

8. Si vous avez attribué la cote 1 ou 2 à l'un des énoncés de la Question 7, veuillez donner des exemples et suggérer des moyens d'amélioration possible.

9. En ce qui concerne votre perfectionnement professionnel, quelle a été l'importance de votre bourse du CRDI par rapport à chacun des aspects suivants ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4, où 1 signifie « pas important du tout » et 4 signifie « très important ».
() compétences de rédaction
() compétences de recherche
() compétences analytiques
() compétences de gestion
() sensibilité culturelle
() perspective élargie des enjeux du développement
() contacts avec d'autres professionnels
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

Carrière :

10. Quel était votre principal domaine d'études avant votre bourse du CRDI ?
() Arts et sciences humaines
() Sciences sociales (à l'exclusion des études en développement international)
() Études en développement international (à l'exclusion des sciences sociales)
() Santé
() Sciences naturelles et physiques
() Génie
() Droit
() Autre (veuillez préciser) :

11. Le soutien du CRDI vous a-t-il incité à changer de domaine d'études principal ?
() non
() oui
Si vous avez répondu oui, dans quel domaine avez-vous décidé de vous diriger et pourquoi avez-vous fait ce changement ?
Nouveau domaine :
Raison du changement :

12. Avez-vous été capable d'obtenir du travail dans votre domaine d'intérêt principal ?
() non
() oui
Si vous avez répondu oui, quelle a été selon vous l'importance du soutien du CRDI pour vous aider à trouver un travail pertinent ? Veuillez répondre par une cote de 1 à 4, où 1 signifie « pas important du tout » et 4 signifie « très important »
Cote : ()

13. Avez-vous continué à vous intéresser au développement international dans votre vie personnelle (p. ex., bénévolat et travail communautaire) ?

() non
() oui
Si vous avez répondu oui, quelle a été l'importance du soutien du CRDI pour maintenir cet intérêt durable ? Veuillez répondre par une cote de 1 à 4, où 1 signifie « pas important du tout » et 4 signifie « très important »
Cote : ()

14. Où travaillez-vous actuellement ?
() ministère ou agence du gouvernement
() organisme non gouvernemental
() secteur privé
() organisme international
() université ou collège
() établissement de recherche
() bibliothèque
() étudiant
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

15. Quelle type de travail faites-vous actuellement ?
() chercheur
() enseignant ou professeur
() administrateur ou gestionnaire
() agent de programme ou de projet
() bibliothécaire
() étudiant
() journaliste
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

16. Quel est votre principal domaine de responsabilité dans votre travail ?
() recherche scientifique
() administration et gestion générales
() développement de programme
() gestion de projets
() enseignement
() analyse de politiques
() consultation
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

17. À votre avis, le soutien du CRDI a-t-il rehaussé votre réputation professionnelle ou votre crédibilité ?
() non
() oui

18. Quel est le domaine de spécialisation de vos études universitaires et quel est le plus haut grade universitaire que vous ayez obtenu ?
Domaine de spécialisation :

() Maîtrise
() Doctorat
() Autre (veuillez préciser) :

19. Où résidez-vous et travaillez-vous actuellement ?
() En Afrique – précisez l'endroit :
() En Asie – précisez l'endroit :
() En Australie – précisez l'endroit :
() En Europe – précisez l'endroit :
() En Amérique du Nord – précisez l'endroit :
() En Amérique centrale – précisez l'endroit :
() En Amérique du Sud – précisez l'endroit :

20. Veuillez mettre à jour vos coordonnées :
() M. (nom au complet) :
() Mme (nom au complet) :
() Mlle (nom au complet) :

Adresse postale complète (incluant le code postal) :

Adresse électronique (courriel) :

Numéro de téléphone (avec l'indicatif régional) :

21. Auriez-vous autre chose à ajouter pour m'aider à comprendre vos expériences pendant et après votre bourse du CRDI ?

Merci d'avoir pris le temps de me faire connaître vos idées et vos opinions.

Michael Graham
mikegraham@lincsat.com

Appendix 2: Questionnaire sent to awardees who had received Young Canadian Researchers (YCR) Awards, Doctoral Research Awards (IDRA), and Canadian Window on International Development Awards

I am conducting a review of several awards programs of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). The purposes of this review are: to better understand how the awards affected the careers and interests of the recipients; and to learn how the awards program can be improved.

I hope you will take the time to share your experiences and insights with me. The questionnaire should take you about 10 minutes to complete, and all replies are confidential.

For your convenience, the questionnaire can be answered by return email — simply click on reply, respond to the questions directly within the email, and click send. Please return the completed questionnaire to me by 20 December 2006.

Si vous souhaitez remplir le questionnaire en français, veuillez m'en faire la demande par courriel.

Thank you.

Michael Graham
mikegraham@lincsat.com

QUESTIONNAIRE:

1. What type of award did you receive? Please place an "x" in the () to indicate your answer.
() Young Canadian Researchers (YCR) Award
If you received a YCR award was it () Doctoral or () Master's
() Doctoral Research Award
() Canadian Window on International Development Award

2. How did you first hear about the IDRC Awards Program? Please place an "x" in the () to indicate your answer.
() University supervisor
() Another award holder
() University Career Fair
() Department of Graduate Studies
() IDRC publication or brochure
() IDRC website
() IDRC regional office

() IDRC staff
() Other (please specify):

3. How important was the award in changing or reinforcing your personal and professional interests in international development? Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all important" and 4 representing "very important."
() Personal interest
() Professional interest

4. What do you consider to be the most satisfying or important aspects of your award? Please rank each factor that is applicable on a scale of 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all important" and 4 representing "very important."
() interactions with others involved in international development in Canada
() interactions with others involved in international development outside Canada
() the opportunity and time to pursue my own research interests
() opportunity to broaden my experience to include international development
() other (please specify):

5. Would you have liked more interaction with IDRC program staff?
() no
() yes
If you answered yes, please indicate the type of interaction you would have wanted and what benefit this would have provided:
Type of interaction:
Benefit:

Administrative Aspects:

6. Overall, how would you rate these administrative aspects of your award? Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all satisfactory" and 4 representing "very satisfactory."
() support/assistance provided by staff in the Training and Awards Program
() frequency and timeliness of payments
() duration of award
() feedback provided on research proposal
() links/contacts to other researchers
() other (please specify):

7. If you provided a rating of 1 or 2 to any of the choices in Question 5, please provide examples and suggest how these aspects could be improved.

8. Did any other organizations provide funding during your study or research?
() no (please skip to question 9)
() yes (please answer questions 8a, b, and c)

8a. Please provide the name of the organization(s):

8b. What were these additional funds used for?
() study and living expenses
() tuition
() field research
() travel
() publications
() other (please specify):

8c. Do you think that IDRC funding made it easier to obtain additional funds?
() no
() yes

9. Did you receive an orientation session before you left for your field research?
() no
() yes, if so from where/whom?

If you answered yes, what was the most useful aspect of this orientation session?
Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all useful" and 4
representing "very useful."
() review of security issues
() discussion of cultural issues/sensitivity
() review of travel arrangements and health issues
() other (please specify):

10. Are there other aspects that could have been included in the orientation?
() no
() yes
If you answered yes, please provide specify:

Program Aspects:

11. Were the reviewers' evaluations and comments on your research proposal useful?
() no
() yes
If you answered no, in what areas would you have wanted to receive feedback?
() methodology
() bibliography
() ethical considerations
() gender issues
() feasibility
() other (please specify):

12. How do you feel that your field research experiences change your personal views?
Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all" and 4 representing "a
great deal."

() broaden your views on development issues
() enhance your level of respect for other cultures
() change the value you attribute to research
() other (please specify):

13. Overall, how would you rate these program aspects of your award? Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all satisfactory" and 4 representing "very satisfactory."
() access to IDRC library and other resources
() interactions with IDRC program staff
() opportunity to travel to a developing country and meet other researchers
() other (please specify):

14. If you provided a rating of 1 or 2 to any of the choices in Question 14, please provide examples and suggest how these aspects could be improved.

15. In terms of your professional development, how important was your IDRC award to each of these aspects? Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all important" and 4 representing "very important."
() writing skills
() research skills
() analytical skills
() management skills
() broader view of development issues
() contacts with other professionals
() other (please specify):

Career:

16. What was your primary field of study before your IDRC award?
() Arts/Humanities
() Social Sciences (not including International Development Studies)
() International Development Studies (not including Social Sciences)
() Health
() Natural/Physical Sciences
() Engineering
() Law
() Other (please specify):

17. Did support from IDRC lead you to change your primary field of study?
() no
() yes
If you answered yes, what field did you decide to pursue and why did you make this change?
New field:
Reason for change:

18. Were you able to obtain employment in your area of primary interest?
() no
() yes
If you answered yes, how important would you say that support from IDRC was to your success in finding relevant employment? Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all important" and 4 representing "very important."
Rating: ()

19. Have you maintained your interest in international development in your personal life (e.g., volunteer and community work)?
() no
() yes
If you answered yes, how important was IDRC support to this lasting interest. Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all important" and 4 representing "very important."
Rating: ()

20. Are you still working in International Development?
() no
() yes

21. Where are your currently employed?
() government department or agency
() nongovernment organization
() private sector
() international organization
() university or college
() research institution
() library
() student
() other (please specify):

22. What sort of work do you do now?
() researcher
() teacher/professor
() administrator or manager
() program/project officer
() librarian
() student
() journalist
() other (please specify):

23. What is your primary responsibility in your work? Please note that you may select more than one responsibility, if applicable.
() scientific research
() general administration and management

() program development
() project management
() teaching
() policy Analysis
() consultancy
() other (please specify):

24. In your opinion, did support from IDRC enhance your professional reputation or credibility?
() no
() yes

25. Academically what is your field of specialization and what is the most advanced academic degree you have obtained?
Field of Specialization:
() Masters
() Doctorate
() Other (please specify):

26. Where do you currently reside and work?
() Africa, if so, where:
() Asia, if so, where:
() Australia, if so, where:
() Europe, if so, where:
() North America, if so, where:
() Central America, if so, where:
() South America, if so, where

27. Please update your contact information:
() Mr (full name):
() Mrs (full name):
() Ms (full name):

Complete Mailing Address (with postal code):

Email Address:

Phone Number (with area code):

29. Do you have anything else you would like to add to help me understand your experiences during and after the IDRC award?

Thank you for taking the time to share your ideas and opinions with me.

Michael Graham
mikegraham@lincsat.com

Je passe actuellement en revue plusieurs des programmes de bourses du Centre de recherches pour le développement international (CRDI). Cette étude a pour objet de mieux comprendre la façon dont les bourses ont influencé la carrière et les intérêts des récipiendaires et de déterminer comment le programme de bourses pourrait être amélioré.

J'espère que vous prendrez le temps de me faire part de votre expérience et de vos commentaires. Il vous faudra environ 10 minutes pour remplir le questionnaire, et toutes les réponses demeureront confidentielles.

Vous pouvez facilement remplir le questionnaire directement dans un courriel de réponse — il suffit de cliquer sur « répondre » ou « reply », de répondre aux questions directement dans le courriel et de cliquer sur « envoyer » ou « send ». Veuillez retourner le questionnaire rempli au plus tard le 20 décembre 2006.

Merci.

Michael Graham
mikegraham@lincsat.com

QUESTIONNAIRE:
Le masculin est employé dans le présent questionnaire uniquement pour alléger le texte.

1. Quel type de bourse avez-vous reçue ? Veuillez inscrire un « x » entre les parenthèses () pour indiquer votre réponse.
() Bourse aux jeunes chercheurs canadiens (YCRA)
Si vous avez reçu une bourse YCRA, était-ce une bourse () de doctorat ou () de maîtrise ?
() Bourse aux chercheurs candidats au doctorat
() Bourse regard canadien sur le développement international

2. Comment avez-vous entendu parler pour la première fois du Programme de bourses du CRDI ? Veuillez inscrire un « x » entre les parenthèses () pour indiquer votre réponse.
() par mon superviseur à l'université
() par un autre boursier
() à l'occasion d'une foire des carrières à l'université
() par la Faculté des études supérieures
() par une publication ou un dépliant du CRDI
() sur le site web du CRDI
() par un bureau régional du CRDI
() par un membre du personnel du CRDI
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

3. Quelle importance la bourse a-t-elle eue pour modifier ou renforcer votre intérêt personnel et professionnel à l'égard du développement international ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4, où 1 signifie « aucune importance » et 4 signifie « énormément d'importance ».
() Intérêt personnel
() Intérêt professionnel

4. Quels aspects de votre bourse ont été pour vous les plus satisfaisants ou les plus importants ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4 à chacun des aspects pertinents, où 1 signifie « pas important du tout » et 4 signifie « très important ».
() interactions avec d'autres intervenants en développement international au Canada
() interactions avec d'autres intervenants en développement international à l'extérieur du Canada
() possibilité de poursuivre mes propres intérêts de recherche et temps pour le faire
() possibilité d'étendre mon expérience au développement international
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

5. Auriez-vous aimé avoir plus d'interactions avec le personnel de programme du CRDI ?
() non
() oui
Si vous avez répondu oui, veuillez indiquer le type d'interaction que vous auriez souhaité et l'avantage qui en aurait résulté :
Type d'interaction :
Avantage :

Aspects administratifs :

6. Dans l'ensemble, comment évaluez-vous les aspects administratifs de votre bourse ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4 aux aspects suivants, où 1 signifie « pas satisfaisant du tout » et 4 signifie « très satisfaisant »
() soutien et aide fournis par le personnel du Programme de formation et des bourses
() fréquence et calendrier des paiements
() durée de la bourse
() commentaires reçus au sujet de la proposition de recherche finale
() liens et contacts avec d'autres chercheurs
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

7. Si vous avez attribué une cote de 1 ou 2 à l'un des énoncés de la Question 6, veuillez donner des exemples et suggérer des moyens d'amélioration possible.

8. Avez-vous reçu du financement d'autres organisations durant vos études ou votre recherche ?
() non (veuillez passer à la Question 9)
() oui (veuillez passer aux Questions 8a, b et c)

8a. Veuillez donner le nom de l'organisation ou des organisations :

8b. À quoi ces fonds supplémentaires ont-ils servi ?
() études et subsistance
() frais de scolarité
() recherche sur le terrain
() voyage
() publications
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

8c. Estimez-vous que le fait d'avoir reçu du financement du CRDI vous a permis d'obtenir plus facilement des fonds supplémentaires ?
() non
() oui

9. Avez-vous eu une séance d'orientation avant de partir pour votre recherche sur le terrain ?
() non
() oui, auquel cas, où et de qui ?

Si vous avez répondu oui, quel a été l'aspect le plus utile de cette séance d'orientation ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4 aux aspects suivants, où 1 signifie « pas utile du tout » et 4 signifie « très utile ».
() revue des questions de sécurité
() discussion des sensibilités et des enjeux culturels
() revue des arrangements de voyage et des questions de santé
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

10. Y a-t-il d'autres aspects qui pourraient avoir été inclus dans l'orientation ?
() non
() oui
Si vous avez répondu oui, veuillez préciser :

Éléments relatifs au programme :

11. Les évaluations et les commentaires des examinateurs au sujet de votre proposition de recherche ont-ils été utiles ?
() non
() oui
Si vous avez répondu non, sur quels aspects auriez-vous aimé recevoir des commentaires ?
() méthodologie
() bibliographie
() dimensions éthiques

() questions relatives aux sexes
() faisabilité
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

12. Comment estimez-vous que vos expériences de recherche sur le terrain ont changé vos points de vue personnels ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4 aux éléments suivants, où 1 signifie « pas du tout » et 4 signifie « énormément ».
() élargir votre perspective des enjeux du développement
() rehausser votre respect à l'égard des autres cultures
() modifier la valeur que vous attribuez à la recherche
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

13. Dans l'ensemble, comment évaluez-vous les éléments relatifs au programme concernant votre bourse ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4, où 1 signifie « pas satisfaisant du tout » et 4 signifie « très satisfaisant »
() accès à la bibliothèque du CRDI et aux autres ressources
() interactions avec les membres du personnel du programme du CRDI
() possibilité de voyager dans le pays en développement et de rencontrer d'autres chercheurs
() autre (veuillez préciser)

14. Si vous avez attribué une cote de 1 ou 2 à l'un des énoncés de la Question 13, veuillez donner des exemples et suggérer des moyens d'amélioration possible.

15. En ce qui concerne votre perfectionnement professionnel, quelle a été l'importance de votre bourse du CRDI par rapport à chacun des aspects suivants ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4, où 1 signifie « aucune importance » et 4 signifie « énormément d'importance ».
() compétences de rédaction
() compétences de recherche
() compétences analytiques
() compétences de gestion
() perspective élargie des enjeux du développement
() contacts avec d'autres professionnels
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

Carrière :

16. Quel était votre principal domaine d'études avant votre bourse du CRDI ?
() Arts et sciences humaines
() Sciences sociales (à l'exclusion des études en développement international)
() Études en développement international (à l'exclusion des sciences sociales)
() Santé
() Sciences naturelles et physiques
() Génie

() Droit
() Autre (veuillez préciser) :

17. Le soutien du CRDI vous a-t-il incité à changer de domaine d'études principal ?
() non
() oui
Si vous avez répondu oui, dans quel domaine avez-vous décidé de vous diriger et pourquoi avez-vous fait ce changement ?
Nouveau domaine :
Raison du changement :

18. Avez-vous été capable d'obtenir du travail dans votre domaine d'intérêt principal ?
() non
() oui
Si vous avez répondu oui, quelle a été selon vous l'importance du soutien du CRDI pour vous aider à trouver un travail pertinent ? Veuillez répondre par une cote de 1 à 4, où 1 signifie « aucune importance » et 4 signifie « énormément d'importance ».
Cote : ()

19. Avez-vous continué à vous intéresser au développement international dans votre vie personnelle (p. ex., bénévolat et travail communautaire) ?
() non
() oui
Si vous avez répondu oui, quelle a été l'importance du soutien du CRDI pour maintenir cet intérêt durable ? Veuillez répondre par une cote de 1 à 4, où 1 signifie « aucune importance » et 4 signifie « énormément d'importance ».
Cote : ()

20. Travaillez-vous toujours en développement international ?
() non
() oui

21. Où travaillez-vous actuellement ?
() ministère ou agence du gouvernement
() organisme non gouvernemental
() secteur privé
() organisme international
() université ou collège
() établissement de recherche
() bibliothèque
() étudiant
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

22. Quelle type de travail faites-vous actuellement ?
() chercheur
() enseignant ou professeur
() administrateur ou gestionnaire
() agent de programme ou de projet
() bibliothécaire
() étudiant
() journaliste
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

23. Quel est votre principal domaine de responsabilité dans votre travail ? Veuillez noter que vous pouvez choisir plus d'une responsabilité, le cas échéant.
() recherche scientifique
() administration et gestion générales
() développement de programme
() gestion de projets
() enseignement
() analyse de politiques
() consultation
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

24. À votre avis, le soutien du CRDI a-t-il rehaussé votre réputation professionnelle ou votre crédibilité ?
() non
() oui

25. Quel est le domaine de spécialisation de vos études universitaires et quel est le plus haut grade universitaire que vous ayez obtenu ?
Domaine de spécialisation :
() Maîtrise
() Doctorat
() Autre (veuillez préciser) :

26. Où résidez-vous et travaillez-vous actuellement ?
() En Afrique – précisez l'endroit :
() En Asie – précisez l'endroit :
() En Australie – précisez l'endroit :
() En Europe – précisez l'endroit :
() En Amérique du Nord – précisez l'endroit :
() En Amérique centrale – précisez l'endroit :
() En Amérique du Sud – précisez l'endroit :

27. Veuillez mettre à jour vos coordonnées :
() M. (nom au complet) :
() Mme (nom au complet) :
() Mlle (nom au complet) :

Adresse postale complète (incluant le code postal) :

Adresse électronique (courriel) :

Numéro de téléphone (avec l'indicatif régional) :

28. Auriez-vous autre chose à ajouter pour m'aider à comprendre vos expériences pendant et après votre bourse du CRDI ?

Merci d'avoir pris le temps de me faire connaître vos idées et vos opinions.

Michael Graham
mikegraham@lincsat.com

Appendix 3: Questionnaire sent to IDRC staff who had been involved both with both mentoring and reviewing awardee proposals

I am conducting a review of several Centre awards programs. The purposes of this review are: to better understand how the awards affected the careers and interests of the recipients; and to learn how the Awards Program can be improved.

You have been selected to receive this questionnaire because you have served as a mentor for an awardee. I hope you will take the time to share your experiences and insights with me. The questionnaire should take you about 10 minutes to complete, and all replies are confidential.

For your convenience, the questionnaire can be answered by return email — simply click on reply, respond to the questions directly within the email, and click send. Please return the completed questionnaire to me by 22 December 2006.

Si vous souhaitez remplir le questionnaire en français, veuillez m'en faire la demande par courriel.

Thank you.

Michael Graham
mikegraham@lincsat.com

∎∎

QUESTIONNAIRE:
In all cases, please place an "x" in the () to indicate your answer.

1. Which of the following types of awardees have you been involved with? Please select all that apply. If you have been involved with both categories of awardees please complete both Part A and Part B.
() Internships and Professional Development Awards (if so, please skip to **PART A**)
() IDRAs, YCRAs, and Canadian Window Awardees (if so, please skip to **PART B**)
() other (please specify):

If you have been involved with both categories of awardees please complete both Part A and Part B.

PART A: Internships and Professional Development Awardees

A1. In which capacities have you interacted with awardees? Please select all that apply.
() evaluated or offered advice on a proposal
() acted as a mentor (direct supervisor) for an awardee
() offered advice to an awardee from time to time
() read and evaluated reports prepared by an awardee

() have maintained ongoing contact with an awardee
() other (please specify):

A2. In your opinion, what are the most important contributions program staff can make to interns and awardees? Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all important" and 4 representing "very important."
() help them to define or re-evaluate their career goals
() create learning opportunities for the awardee
() provide professional advice and guidance on the awardee's research
() provide advise on employment and research opportunities
() help the awardee understand IDRC's corporate culture
() other (please specify):

A3. What do you think are the most important characteristics of a mentor or supervisor? Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all important" and 4 representing "very important."
() having (or making) sufficient time for meaningful interactions with awardees
() amount of experience with IDRC
() amount of experience in international development in general
() subject matter expertise directly related to the awardee's interests
() previous teaching or mentoring experience
() good interpersonal skills
() other (please specify):

A4. What benefits do you feel you acquired from your experiences as a mentor or supervisor? Please select all that apply.
() built a lasting and ongoing professional relationship with awardee
() improved my supervisory and leadership skills
() achieved personal satisfaction by helping a colleague improve research and administration skills
() awardee introduced fresh ideas or approaches
() other (please specify):

Please skip to question 6.

PART B: IDRAs, YCRAs, and Canadian Window Awardees

B1. How did you interact with these awardees? Please select all that apply.
() evaluated an application for one of the awards
() made myself available for interactions with the awardee
() provided professional advice (bibliographic support, etc.)
() other (please specify):

B2. What do you think are the most important contributions that program staff can make to these awardees? Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all important" and 4 representing "very important."

() provide advice on research methods
() provide advice on information sources
() provide a sounding board to the awardee
() provide professional opinions on the quality and relevance of their research
() other (please specify):

B3. What benefits do you feel you acquired from your experiences with these awardees? Please select all that apply.
() built a lasting and ongoing professional relationship with awardee
() introduced me to, or gave me broader perspective, on a particular area of research
() was able to use the final report in my own work
() other (please specify):

Please skip to question 6.

For completion by all respondents.

6. What benefits do you feel your Program Initiative has acquired from its association with various awardees? Please select all that apply.
() offers an opportunity to identify promising candidates for consulting work or full-time positions
() offers opportunity to expose program to fresh ideas and perspectives
() provides opportunity to address issues or undertake research that program staff do not have time or opportunity to undertake
() provides an opportunity to explain and demonstrate IDRC approach to research for development
() provides important program and administrative support to the team
() other (please specify):

7. How would you rate the Awards Program in each of these areas? Please provide a rating from 1 to 4 with 1 representing "not at all good" and 4 representing "very good."
() responsiveness to our program needs
() contribution it makes to overall Centre objectives
() communication with program staff regarding specific opportunities
() liaison with program staff about awardees and their needs while at IDRC
() review and dissemination of progress and final reports
() follow up on recommendations made by awardees

8. Can you please provide specific examples of how the Awards Program has contributed to your program?

9. In your opinion, what is the best aspect of the Awards Program?

Why?

10. In your opinion, what aspect of the Awards Program most needs improvement?

Why?
How could this shortcoming best be addressed?

11. Do you have anything else to add that would help me better understand how the Awards Program interacts and contributes to your program interests?

Thank you for taking the time to share your ideas and opinions with me.

Michael Graham
mikegraham@lincsat.com

Je passe actuellement en revue plusieurs des programmes de bourses du Centre. Cette étude a pour objet de mieux comprendre la façon dont les bourses ont influencé la carrière et les intérêts des récipiendaires et de déterminer comment les programmes de bourses pourraient être améliorés.

Vous recevez ce questionnaire parce que vous avez fait office de mentor pour un boursier. J'espère que vous prendrez le temps de me faire part de votre expérience et de vos commentaires. Il vous faudra environ 10 minutes pour remplir le questionnaire, et toutes les réponses demeureront confidentielles.

Vous pouvez facilement remplir le questionnaire directement dans un courriel de réponse — il suffit de cliquer sur « répondre » ou « reply », de répondre aux questions directement dans le courriel et de cliquer sur « envoyer » ou « send ». Veuillez retourner le questionnaire rempli au plus tard le 22 décembre 2006.

Merci.

Michael Graham
mikegraham@lincsat.com

▪▪▪

QUESTIONNAIRE
Le masculin est employé dans le présent questionnaire uniquement pour alléger le texte.

Dans tout les cas, veuillez inscrire un « x » entre les parenthèses () pour indiquer votre réponse.

1. Avec quels types de boursiers avez-vous interagi ? Veuillez sélectionner toutes les réponses pertinentes. Si vous avez eu des échanges avec les boursiers des deux catégories, veuillez alors remplir les Parties A et B du questionnaire.
() Stages et Bourses de perfectionnement professionnel (si vous choisissez cette réponse, veuillez passer à **la PARTIE A**).
() Bourses aux chercheurs candidats au doctorat (IDRA), Bourses aux jeunes chercheurs (YCRA), Bourse regard canadien (si vous choisissez cette réponse, veuillez passer à **la PARTIE B**).
() Autre (veuillez préciser) :

Si vous avez eu des échanges avec les boursiers des deux catégories, veuillez alors remplir les Parties A et B du questionnaire.

PARTIE A : Stages et Bourses de perfectionnement professionnel

A1. En quelles capacités avez-vous interagi avec les boursiers ? Veuillez choisir toutes les réponses pertinentes.
() j'ai évalué ou commenté une proposition

() j'ai agi à titre de mentor (supervision directe) pour un boursier
() j'ai offert des conseils à un boursier de temps à autre
() j'ai lu et évalué les rapports préparés par un boursier
() j'ai eu des échanges suivis avec un boursier
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

A2. À votre avis, quelles sont les contributions les plus importantes que le personnel de programme puisse apporter aux stagiaires et aux boursiers ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4 aux énoncés suivants, où 1 signifie « aucune importance » et 4 signifie « beaucoup d'importance ».
() les aider à définir ou à réévaluer leurs objectifs de carrière
() créer des possibilités d'apprentissage pour les boursiers
() offrir des conseils professionnels et une orientation au sujet de la recherche du boursier
() offrir des conseils au sujet des possibilités d'emploi et de recherche
() aider le boursier à comprendre la culture organisationnelle du CRDI
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

A3. Quelles sont à votre avis les caractéristiques les plus importantes d'un mentor ou superviseur ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4 aux énoncés suivants, où 1 signifie « aucune importance » et 4 signifie « beaucoup d'importance ».
() avoir suffisamment de temps (ou s'organiser pour en avoir) pour des interactions significatives avec les boursiers
() degré d'expérience au CRDI
() degré d'expérience en développement international en général
() connaissance experte du sujet directement relié aux intérêts du boursier
() expérience antérieure d'enseignement ou de mentorat
() bonnes habileté de communication interpersonnelle
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

A4. Quels avantages jugez-vous avoir retiré de vos expériences de mentor ou superviseur ? Veuillez choisir toutes les réponses pertinentes.
() établissement d'une relation de travail durable et suivie avec le boursier
() amélioration de mes compétences de supervision et de leadership
() satisfaction personnelle d'avoir aidé un collègue à améliorer ses compétences en recherche et en administration
() idées ou orientations nouvelles apportées par le boursier
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

Veuillez passer à la question 6.

PARTIE B : IDRA, YCRA et Regard canadien

B1. Quelle a été votre interaction avec ces boursiers ? Veuillez choisir toutes les réponses pertinentes.
() j'ai évalué une des demandes de bourse

() je me suis rendu disponible pour les interactions avec le boursier
() j'ai offert des conseils professionnels (aide pour la bibliographie, etc.)
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

B2. Quelles sont à votre avis les contributions les plus importantes que le personnel de programme puisse apporter à ces boursiers ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4 aux énoncés suivants, où 1 signifie « aucune importance » et 4 signifie « beaucoup d'importance ».
() les conseiller au sujet des méthodes de recherche
() les conseiller au sujet des sources de renseignements
() leur offrir des commentaires et de la rétroaction
() leur offrir des opinions professionnelles au sujet de la qualité et de la pertinence de leur recherche
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

B3. Quels avantages jugez-vous avoir retiré de vos expériences de mentor ou superviseur ? Veuillez choisir toutes les réponses pertinentes.
() établissement d'une relation professionnelle durable et suivie avec le boursier
() m'a initié à un domaine particulier de recherche ou m'en a donné une perspective élargie
() j'ai pu utiliser le rapport final dans mon propre travail
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

Veuillez passer à la question 6.

À remplir par tous les répondants.

6. Quels avantages jugez-vous que votre Initiative de programme a tirés de son association avec les divers boursiers ? Veuillez choisir toutes les réponses pertinentes.
() occasion de repérer des candidats prometteurs pour du travail de consultation ou des postes à temps plein
() occasion d'exposer le programme à des idées et des perspectives nouvelles
() occasion d'aborder des questions ou d'entreprendre des recherches que le personnel de programme n'a pas le temps d'aborder ou d'entreprendre
() occasion d'expliquer la démarche de recherche du CRDI en faveur du développement et d'en faire la démonstration
() procure un soutien de programme et administratif important à l'équipe
() autre (veuillez préciser) :

7. Comment évaluez-vous le Programme de bourses à l'égard de chacun des énoncés suivants ? Veuillez attribuer une cote de 1 à 4 aux énoncés suivants, où 1 signifie « pas très bon du tout » et 4 signifie « très bon ».
() sensibilité à nos besoins de programme
() contribution qu'il apporte aux objectifs globaux du Centre
() communication avec le personnel de programme au sujet d'occasions particulières

() liaison avec le personnel de programme au sujet des boursiers et de leurs besoins pendant leur séjour au CRDI
() revue et diffusion des rapports d'étape et du rapport final
() suivi des recommandations formulées par les boursiers

8. Pouvez-vous donner des exemples précis de la façon dont le Programme de bourses a contribué à votre programme ?

9. À votre avis, quel est le meilleur élément du Programme de bourses ?

Pourquoi ?

10. À votre avis, quel élément du Programme de bourses a le plus besoin d'amélioration ?

Pourquoi ?
Quelle serait la meilleure façon de remédier à cette lacune ?

11. Avez-vous quoi que ce soit à ajouter pour m'aider à mieux comprendre comment le Programme de bourses interagit et contribue à vos intérêts de programme ?

Je vous remercie d'avoir pris le temps de me communiquer vos idées et vos opinions.

Michael Graham
mikegraham@lincsat.com

Appendix 4. Reminder email and email of thanks sent to respondents (emails modified to make them more personal as appropriate).

Confirmation of receipt and thanks

Thank you for taking the time to share your opinions and views on the IDRC Awards Program. Your input is an important contribution to this study.

Michael Graham

Merci d'avoir pris le temps de nous faire part de vos réflexions et opinions au sujet du Programme de bourses du CRDI. Vos commentaires apportent une importante contribution à l'étude.

Michael Graham

Reminder with extended deadline and copy of questionnaire

I hope that you received my earlier email seeking your opinions on the IDRC Awards Program. I would greatly appreciate your reply by 8 January if at all possible. Attached for your convenience is a second copy of the questionnaire. *If you have any concerns about the objectives or validity of this survey please contact Jean-Claude Dumais, Awards Officer, jdumais@idrc.ca, (613) 236-6163 ext: 2430.*

I very much look forward to your reply.

Thank you, Michael Graham

J'espère que vous avez bien reçu mon premier message sollicitant votre opinion au sujet du Programme de bourses du CRDI. Je vous serais reconnaissant de bien vouloir, si possible, me faire parvenir votre réponse d'ici le 5 janvier. Je joins une deuxième copie du questionnaire au cas où vous en auriez besoin. *Si vous avez des préoccupations au sujet des objectifs ou de la validité de ce sondage, prière de communiquer avec Jean-Claude Dumais, Agent des bourses (jdumais@idrc.ca ou 613 236-6163, poste 2430).*

J'espère avoir le plaisir de recevoir votre réponse et je vous remercie d'avance de votre bonne collaboration.

Michael Graham