

IDRC - Lib.

117935 => Centre File 00099

Final Report

**IDRC**  
**INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE**

**A REVIEW OF RATIONALE AND OPTIONS**  
**for IDRC**  
**TO SUPPORT UNIVERSITIES INVOLVED IN CIDA's**  
**UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP IN COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

**Ron Hughes**  
**10 April 2000**

ARCHIV  
241.1:338.004(71)  
H8



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS .....	3
1.0 INTRODUCTION .....	4
1.1 UPCDP .....	4
1.2 UPCDP's Phase I Mid-term Evaluation .....	7
1.3 IDRC and UPCDP Phase I .....	7
2.0 THE PURPOSE OF THE IDRC REVIEW .....	8
3.0 PROCEDURES .....	8
3.1 Document Review of Research in UPCDP .....	9
3.2 E-mail Survey Questions .....	9
3.3 E-mail Responses .....	9
4.0 RATIONALE .....	11
4.1 Relevance to Mandates, Policies and Priorities .....	11
5.0 IDRC PROGRAM STRATEGIES .....	16
5.1 IDRC Support .....	16
5.2 Complementarity of IDRC and UPCDP Components .....	16
5.3 Program Level Monitoring and Evaluation .....	17
5.4 Budgets .....	17
6.0 IMPLEMENTATION CONCERNS .....	19
6.1 General .....	19
6.2 Selection/Approval .....	19
6.3 Rejection .....	20
7.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	20
7.1 The Possible UPCDP Phase II .....	20
7.2 Validation of IDRC's Initial parameters for the Review .....	21
7.3 Recommendations .....	22
APPENDICES .....	24



## ACRONYMS

AUCC	Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada
CPB	CIDA's Partnership Branch
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CUs	Canadian Universities
DCs	Developing Countries
DCIs	Developing Country Institutions (of higher learning)
DCU	Developing Country Universities
EIP	Educational Institutions Program in CIDA (CIDA/PB/ICD/EIP)
FTETS	Full-Time Equivalent Teaching Staff
ICD	Institutional Cooperation Division in CIDA (CIDA/PB/ICD)
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
ILOs	International Liaison Officers (in Canadian Universities)
LOI	Letter of Intent
SDSS	Strategic Development and Support Services
TB	Treasury Board
TORs	Terms of Reference
UPCDP	University Partnership in Cooperation and Development Program in EIP



# **A REVIEW OF RATIONALE AND OPTIONS FOR IDRC TO SUPPORT UNIVERSITIES INVOLVED IN CIDA's UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP IN COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (UPCDP)**

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Decades of experience in international development have confirmed that equitable access to knowledge and research capacity are essential for sustainable development. These essentials are the foundation of IDRC's mandate which is:

'... to initiate, encourage, support and conduct research into the problems of the developing regions of the world'.

CIDA's mandate for sustainable development does not explicitly support research, but it does support access to knowledge through training and other forms of human resources development as part of broader strategies for capacity development, some of which rely specifically on Canadian universities for their implementation.

IDRC's interests in research for development and CIDA's interests in various forms of capacity development for sustainability, bring them both to cooperation with universities in Canada and in developing countries. CIDA's UPCD Program is Canada's largest single program of support through Canadian universities, for international development.

## **1.1 UPCDP**

CIDA's University Partnership in Cooperation and Development Program (UPCDP) was designed specifically to provide a single window of opportunity for Canadian universities to obtain support from CIDA's Canadian Partnership Branch (CPB) for cooperation with developing country institutions of higher education. From within the Partnership Branch, UPCDP is directed by the Institutional Cooperation Division (ICD) as part of the Educational Institutions Program (EIP) which has supported Canadian and developing country university cooperation for over twenty years.<sup>1</sup>

Phase I of UPCDP had a goal and four objectives which referred to strengthening developing country universities, training to meet development needs, sustainable partnerships (linkages), internationalization of Canadian universities and development education. Research was not mentioned. These objectives have been under review for the past year by CIDA, AUCC and Canadian university representatives. Among the alternatives being reviewed was a single objective to focus on results of strengthened developing country university capacities to sustain developmental impact in the communities they serve.

---

<sup>1</sup> By March 2000, CIDA, AUCC and Canadian universities completed reviewing Phase I of UPCDP and are working on detailed plans for a redesigned second phase. A number of parameters have apparently been agreed for UPCDP Phase II but some issues remain under consideration. Documentation for Phase II is expected to be completed by June 2000.



UPCDP Phase I had two components:

Tier 1: Administered by CIDA, provided grants every 12-18 months for up to \$5 million each for five years. It was intended for multi-disciplinary programs involving various departments and faculty within a university and/or in partner universities.

Tier 2: Administered by AUCC, provided contributions annually for up to \$750,000 each for linkage projects of up to five years. A total of \$25 million was budgeted for Tier 2 under a contribution agreement between CIDA and AUCC.

Canadian universities provided a 30 percent matching contribution in each component.

Information available for this Review shows that by December 1999, 40 (44 %) out of a total of 90 Canadian universities had approved UPCDP linkages. Of these, 18 universities were active in 18 Tier 1 programs and 32 were active in 56 Tier 2 projects. There were 84 linkages overall. Table 1.1 below shows the distribution of Canadian universities which have sent proposals to UPCDP, whether successful or not. About half of the Canadian universities with approved linkages have two or more.

**Table 1.1a Number of Canadian Universities (CUs) With Some Involvement in UPCDP**

Type of CU Involvement	Total	Region				Size				Experience		
		East	QC	ON	West	Large	Medium	Small	VSmall	High	Medium	Low
CUs Active in UPCDP	40	8	12	10	10	10	10	11	9	16	10	14
# of CUs in Tier 1	18	3	6	6	4	5	4	7	2	8	6	4
# of CUs in Tier 2	32	7	9	7	9	10	7	8	7	15	5	12
# of CUs whose proposals were never accepted	23	3	5	10	5	0	5	9	9	1	6	16
Total CUs involved	63	11	17	20	15	10	15	20	18	17	16	30

NB: Numbers in the columns do not add because some universities are active in both Tier 1 and Tier 2 and some have more than one Tier 2.

- Tier 1: Universities getting approved linkages for the first time in 1998: University of Toronto; UQAM
- Tier 2: Universities getting approved linkages for the first time in 1998: Laval, Manitoba, Okanagan; Toronto

Further Notes:

- 23 Universities sent proposals in 1997-98 and/or in previous years but were never successful (total # of proposals): Athabasca (3), Brandon (3), Brock (4), Cariboo (2), DalTech (8), EHEC (5), (EPM (3), Huron UWO (1), NBC (1), OISE (1), Ottawa (5), PEI (2), Queen's (7), St. Thomas UNB (2), Ryerson (8), UQAC (3), UQAH (3), UQAR (1), Victoria U of T (3), Waterloo (10), Western (7), Wilfrid Laurier (2), Winnipeg (2).
- 27 Canadian universities have no involvement with UPCDP (i.e., have not proposed): Acadia, Augustana University College, Bishop's, Brescia, British Columbia Open University; Campion, Cape Breton, Collège dominicain de philosophie et de théologie, Concordia University College of Alberta, Fraser Valley University College, King's College, King's University College, Lethbridge, Luther, Mount Allison, Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, Redeemer College, Royal Military College, Saint Anne, Saint-Boniface College universitaire, St. Paul University, St. Michaels, St. Jerome's, St-Francis Xavier, Trinity Western, Trinity, University of King's College.



**Table 1.1b SUMMARY OF IDRC'S AND CIDA'S MAIN OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES**

IDRC <sup>2</sup>	CIDA <sup>3</sup>
<p><b>Corporate Objectives 1997-2000</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. to support the production and application of research results leading to policies and technologies that enhance the lives of people in developing regions.</li> <li>2. to strengthen indigenous research capacities in countries of those regions.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Mandate</b> Sustainable Development in Developing Countries to reduce poverty and contribute to security, equity, prosperity.</p> <p><b>EIP Mandate</b> Build capacity of educational training institutions in Developing Countries to train the human resources required to ensure their sustainable and equitable development.</p> <p><b>UPCDP's Proposed Objective for Phase II</b> Strengthening developing country universities to achieve specified development impacts in the communities they serve. (Proposed by CIDA in June/99)</p>
<p><b>Programming Themes</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. food security;</li> <li>2. equity in natural resource use;</li> <li>3. biodiversity conservation;</li> <li>4. sustainable employment; and</li> <li>5. strategies/policies for healthy societies.</li> </ol> <p><b>Program Initiatives - 1997/8</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Communities and the Information Society in Africa;</li> <li>2. Alternatives to Poverty and Resource Degradation;</li> <li>3. Social Policy Reforms;</li> <li>4. Cities Feeding People;</li> <li>5. Community Based Natural Resource Management;</li> <li>6. Ecosystem Health;</li> <li>7. Micro Impacts of Macroeconomic Adjustment Policies;</li> <li>8. PAN Networking;</li> <li>9. Peace building and Reconstruction;</li> <li>10. People, Land and Water;</li> <li>11. Small Medium and Micro Enterprises (SMMEs) Innovation and Technology;</li> <li>12. Sustainable Use of Biodiversity; and</li> <li>13. Trade, Employment and Competitiveness.</li> </ol>	<p><b>The Sustainable Development Concept: Five Pillars</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental</li> <li>• Economic</li> <li>• Political</li> <li>• Social, and</li> <li>• Cultural sustainability</li> </ul> <p><b>Action Plan: Two Thrusts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improving policy and programming</li> <li>• greening internal operation</li> </ul> <p>which commit CIDA to enhancing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ability to acquire, share and use knowledge</li> <li>• working relations with partners</li> <li>• ability to learn from experience</li> <li>• CIDA's and partner's skills as CIDA's roles evolve</li> <li>• coordination among donor initiatives</li> <li>• ability to demonstrate results.</li> </ul> <p><b>Program Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• meeting basic human needs;</li> <li>• supporting the involvement of women in development;</li> <li>• improving infrastructure services;</li> <li>• increasing respect for human rights, democracy, good governance;</li> <li>• investing in private sector development; and</li> <li>• securing environment sustainability.</li> </ul>

Note: Research is not explicit in CIDA's statements of mandate or priorities, although knowledge is. CIDA has supported Canadian universities in development of capabilities in research for development as part of human, institutional or capacity development, e.g., The Centre for Participatory, Research - University of Calgary.

<sup>2</sup> *Corporate Program Framework: To the Year 2000.* IDRC. March 1997

<sup>3</sup> *Our Commitment to Sustainable Development: The Strategy of the Canadian International Development Agency.* CIDA. December 1997



## 1.2 UPCDP's Phase I Mid-term Evaluation

An Evaluative Review of UPCDP (Dec/21/98)<sup>4</sup> confirmed the effectiveness of UPCDP's first phase and, among other things, noted CIDA's lack of a mandate to fund university research directly. The Review noted that a major problem with UPCDP was its complexity.

The Evaluative Review found that 21 approved UPCDP linkages, visited by reviewers, were generally modest, concrete and focussed on developmental impact in communities served by the partner developing country university. The Review recommended continuing UPCDP support of Canadian and developing country university linkages with simplification and clarification which can be grouped into three areas relevant to this IDRC Review:

Rationale focussed on:

- intended developmental results in DCs with specified objectively verifiable indicators;
- strengthening capacities of DCIs to sustain developmental effects in the communities they serve;
- developmental results through DCI strengthening without other conflicting objectives;
- DCI involvement in and ownership of its capacity development relevant to its agreed priorities.

Programming focussed on:

- equal opportunity for CU faculty interested in international development, rather than for CUs;
- a single tier only for selection and implementation with study of appropriate CIDA/AUCC roles;
- a strengthened CIDA's strategic program role;
- a confirmed administrative role for AUCC;
- a policy level Program Review Committee;
- flexible strategies to allow responsiveness to diverse priorities of universities relevant to UPCDP;
- staff exchanges among universities, CIDA and AUCC, to improve mutual understanding;
- evaluation of SDSS and improved understanding in universities about its role and benefits.

Implementation focussed on:

- agreed selection criteria for the commitment of universities to linkages for developmental results;
- reduced bias against poorer DCs by using TB travel directives for reimbursing travel expenses;
- providing guides for capacity development assessment/implementation for developmental results;
- formal linkage agreements which clearly specify expected developmental outcomes and impacts;

Recommendations contained no specific reference to research. However, a proposed vision statement emphasized the need for flexibility to support the diverse expertise of universities, implying research - especially research for development and actually mentioning participatory research.

## 1.3 IDRC and UPCDP Phase I

The Centre (IDRC) has played a minor role in the competitions for the larger Tier 1 grants. Centre staff were invited to review and comment on the proposals short-listed for the competition. They commented on the merits of the proposals using the Centre 'lens of research for development', placing most emphasis on a knowledge of what research and capacity building efforts were underway

---

<sup>4</sup> CIDA, *Evaluative Review of The University Partnership in Cooperation and Development Program (UPCDP)*, R. Hughes, J.C. Cairns and J-L Fortin, 1998



in the domains/development sectors of the proposals. Centre staff also commented on how well proposals fit with regional needs, priorities and opportunities.

IDRC's Victoria University office recalls that CIDA/IDRC cooperation often also occurred on an ad hoc basis through creative hard work of committed individuals, and that there were numerous examples of IDRC or CIDA projects beginning together or following and building on each other.

As a result of the Centre's participation in the review process, the Centre sometimes identified proposals that offered links with research the Centre was funding and had the opportunity to draw this to the attention of the UPCD selection committee. There is some indirect evidence that the Centre's support for related or proximate projects may have influenced the choice of the selection committee (some examples: Carleton University, University of Havana; 'Supporting Cuba's Management of Transition' and Dalhousie University, University of Cienfuegos, University of Havana, University of Oriente: 'Integrated Coastal Zone Management').

As the UPCD program implementation progressed, some observers noted that UPCD is about university partnerships for development and a major strength of universities is research that can contribute to solving development problems. In the rationale for UPCDP's large investments in university partnerships, where does research for development come into play? Whether or not there is a research component in the UPCD projects, what issues are raised for IDRC's particular role in research for development – especially where this involves Canadian universities? Comparisons are sometimes made between the \$30 million a year CIDA is putting into the UPCD and the \$15 million (18 percent) of its budget for research) that IDRC contributes to projects that involve Canadian researchers collaborating with developing country researchers, usually in universities.

One comment frequently made within the university community is that 'research' (for IDRC that would mean mainly 'research for development') is not a notable feature of UPCDP. Some have observed that CIDA avoided the inclusion of research in the design of the UPCD program because support for research for development does not fall within the mandate of the agency. Nevertheless, the goals and objectives of the UPCD project strongly imply many opportunities for research – to enhance the capacity of higher education institutions to contribute to national objectives and sustainable development. Given that research is one of the three grounding *raison d'être* for the existence of universities (the other two being teaching and community outreach/service), it is difficult to think of enhancing the capacity of higher education institutions without strengthening research capacity.

## **2.0 THE PURPOSE OF THE IDRC REVIEW**

IDRC 'wishes to examine the opportunities for making productive links between its support for research for development where this involves Canadian university partners and projects supported under UPCDP' (see TORs, Appendix C).

## **3.0 PROCEDURES**

To address the above Purpose, this IDRC Review identifies some pros and cons, issues of rationale for the possibility of IDRC co-operation in UPCDP. This Review also identifies possible program strategies



and implementation issues for IDRC in considering whether or not to support research for development through co-operation with UPCDP linkage projects.

The Review is based mainly on document reviews, interviews, discussions and e-mail surveys of people who are knowledgeable about IDRC, CIDA, Canadian and developing country universities and UPCDP.

### **3.1 Document Review of Research in UPCDP**

Review of UPCDP documents explored questions about the extent to which research for development was already a part of UPCDP; the nature of that research (e.g., knowledge generation, capacity development or evaluation); and what opportunity this research offers for IDRC co-operation.

Initially it was thought that a review of UPCDP proposals and summaries of approved linkages would yield information about the extent and types of research that are currently part of UPCDP proposals and linkage projects. However, a review of a few of these documents found no mention of research, although many research opportunities were often implied or seemed obvious to the Reviewer.<sup>5</sup> Follow-up discussions with CIDA and university faculty revealed a perception that CIDA generally, and sometimes specifically, discourages the mention of research in UPCDP proposals and during implementation of approved linkages. Thus, proposal writers often avoid statements about research, even if some research is intended to be carried out in connection with the linkage. Document reviews for the purpose of learning about the extent and type of research currently associated with UPCDP were therefore discontinued.

Further discussion led to the conclusion that the amount of research actually underway in UPCDP was probably minimal and the best way to learn about any that was underway would be to ask the faculty members in Canadian universities who have been and/or are involved in the Program. (See Section 4.1, paragraph 4, below.)

### **3.2 E-mail Survey Questions**

E-mailed questionnaires were designed to obtain information about research in actual UPCDP linkage projects and about rationale, program strategies and operational strategies. Three sets of questions were designed for International Liaison Officers (ILOs), linkage managers and unsuccessful proposers (see Appendix D). About 175 e-mail messages were sent in the first week of September 1999, a busy time in universities. By September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 16 replies had been received. The final analysis of results is based on a total of only 25 replies.

### **3.3 E-mail Responses**

As Table 3.3 below shows, the response rate to the e-mail survey was very low. One large university declined to respond, declaring the UPCDP far too complex to be worth IDRC's cooperation. Another refused to respond to a survey in English only. Responses were received from only:

- 22 (35%) of 63 universities involved in UPCDP;
- 8 (13%) of 63 ILOs of involved universities;

---

<sup>5</sup> A similar finding is described in *"The Roles of CIDA and IDRC in Research for Development and Policy Research: A Case Study for the Areas of Environment and Governance"*, Nihal Kappagoda, IDRC. Nov/98



- 13 (33%) of 40 managers of approved UPCDP linkages; and
- 4 (17%) of 23 Proposers who had no proposals approved.



**Table 3.3 Summary of Canadian University Respondents to E-mail Survey**

	Total	Region			Size				Experience		
		East	Central	West	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	High	Medium	Low
ILOs	8	0	5	3	3	4	1	0	6	1	1
Managers	13	4	5	4	3	5	4	1	8	3	2
Proposers	4	1	3	0	2	1	1	0	3	1	0
Universities	22*	5	12	5	6	9	6	1	14	5	3

\*22 out of a total of 63 universities involved in UPCDP responded to the questionnaire (40 of the 63 universities have approved projects and 23 have submitted proposals but never had one approved). Two responses were received from each of three of the 22 responding universities. There was only one response from each of the other 19 universities.

Generally, the responses mirror the great diversity among Canadian universities. The low response rate and this diversity make generalizations from this sample difficult. The narrative comments (See Tables 4.1.1, 5.3 and 6.0 below) for example, are useful in terms of their variety and, as informed observations from individual professionals, they add to a qualitative understanding of the issues. However most do not translate into generalizations about positions of Canadian universities or their international development specialists as a whole on issues related to IDRC's possible cooperation in UPCDP. In a few cases, where responses are highly consistent across more than one group, some general trends may be indicated.

Questions were designed to be answered by three groups:

- 1: ILOs alone,
- 2: both ILOs and managers
- 3: both managers and proposers.

Respondents were asked to use a scale of 0 to 4 to rate issues as follows: (See Appendix E).

- 0 = none,
- 1 = VL      very low
- 2 = L        low
- 3 = H        high
- 4 = VH      very high

The 85 percent confidence range for the mean rating was calculated for each question. This range suggests an 85 percent chance that the average of ratings by the total group in Canadian universities presumed to be represented by the small sample of this survey, would fall within this range. To aid understanding, the 85 percent confidence range is reported in terms of the five rating categories. For example, the ratings of eight ILOs on the extent to which research is encouraged in UPCDP yielded an average with an 85 percent confidence range within the very low (VL-VL) category. This suggests an 85 percent chance that ILOs across Canada consider there to be very low encouragement for research in UPCDP. In contrast, the ILO's average ratings of the extent of encouragement for evaluation research ranged from very low to high (VL-H), allowing no conclusion to drawn, except that there seems to be varying opinions on the issue.



## **4.0 RATIONALE: Reasons for and Against IDRC Support in UPCDP**

### **4.1 Relevance to Mandates, Policies and Priorities**

**4.1.1 The Extent and Nature of Research in UPCDP:** As mentioned above, the general perception in CIDA, AUCC and Canadian universities is that little or no research has been carried in most UPCDP linkages. Most discussions suggest that this is because CIDA is not mandated to support research, especially 'academic' research and, therefore, CIDA discourages it in UPCDP. ILOs consider that CIDA's encouragement of sectoral or academic research has been very low, and encouragement of training in research methods and/or research management and research for development has ranged from very low to low. E-mail ratings by ILOs of the extent of CIDA encouragement for research capacity development and evaluation research ranged from very low to high allowing no conclusion to be drawn.

For some observers, CIDA not only does not encourage research but actively discourages it and UPCDP is so complex and bureaucratic that it would interfere with the freedom, innovation, creativity and flexibility required for good research. The absence of research in UPCDP is seen by some as a reason for IDRC to NOT become engaged in UPCDP.

For other observers the absence of research in UPCDP offers an opportunity for IDRC to bring added value to UPCDP linkages, and UPCDP itself as CIDA's largest single international development program for Canadian universities. Both IDRC and CIDA consider that their particular mandates and approaches for supporting Canadian universities are complementary. This IDRC Review found a number of university and AUCC observers, familiar with UPCDP, who would argue for IDRC to support research components in UPCDP linkages, but only if complexity were not increased and other conditions mentioned below were met.

Thirteen managers of approved UPCDP linkages and four proposers rejected by UPCDP used the e-mailed questionnaire to give ratings of the extent to which development of research capacities and knowledge distribution were part of their actual UPCDP linkages and proposals. Their combined ratings were very high, contrary to general perceptions. Other characteristics of research in actual UPCDP linkages, which these 13 managers and four proposers seem to think have a high incidence include :

- knowledge contributions to a discipline or sector;
- knowledge generation; and
- DCU ownership of knowledge and its generation.

The small sample and wide range of responses means that the results are inconclusive on other characteristics of research in UPCDP.

Contrary to these negative perceptions, senior executives of CIDA responsible for UPCDP were unanimous in their support for the value and validity of IDRC's support for research components in UPCDP linkages – a 'win-win' situation.



**Table 4.1.1 Pros, Cons and Pitfalls for Rationale of IDRC Cooperation in UPCDP**

<p><b>Pros: Q2.3.1:</b> Among the many good reasons for IDRC to cooperate in UPCDP, describe ONE that is most important.</p> <p><b>ILOs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IDRC's relevance to academic research; IDRC's mandate to explicitly fund research.</li> <li>• To add a research dimension and thus stimulate greater academic interest in development issues.</li> <li>• Stop marginalizing research as a component in creating development capacity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Managers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R&amp;D go hand-in-hand: research building is capacity building.</li> <li>• To provide opportunities for scholars in DCUs to undertake relevant research.</li> <li>• IDRC's experience in development research.</li> <li>• IDRC's involvement will enhance the research activities in developing countries.</li> <li>• To support research as such (in the south and jointly).</li> <li>• Universities have a double mandate: teaching &amp; research. Funding for research is mainly from NCERC.</li> <li>• Nothing against co-operation – good teaching requires research capacity.</li> <li>• Maximize impacts of university projects.</li> <li>• Rationale for faculty to devote time to international development projects.</li> <li>• Institutional development related to higher education can be substantively increased through enhanced research capabilities at the institution in question.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Cons: Q2.3.2:</b> What is ONE of the most important valid arguments against IDRC's cooperation in UPCDP?</p> <p><b>ILOs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research is more self centred; development is globally focussed.</li> <li>• Potential for confusion of objectives.</li> </ul> <p><b>Managers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IDRC and UPCDP have quite different mandates, what would fit in one will not necessarily fit in the other</li> <li>• Reduction of IDRC's independence</li> <li>• Sending out conflicting signals/bureaucracy</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pitfalls: Q2.3.3:</b> What are ONE or TWO of the most important problems or pitfalls to be avoided in IDRC cooperation in UPCDP?</p> <p><b>ILOs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CIDA antipathy to research, e.g., research dilutes concrete development implementation and outcomes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IDRC starts excellent initiatives that CIDA could not have, although CIDA supports established work.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ILOs and managers emphasize the relevance of IDRC and research to UPCDP.</li> <li>• Managers also emphasize the relevance of research to teaching and capacity development.</li> </ul>

**4.1.2 University mandates** generally include three functions: research, teaching and community service.<sup>6</sup> Canadian universities vary considerably in their mix of priorities within these functions. The larger Canadian universities can be strong on all three functions. Smaller universities must be more focussed; some emphasize teaching and outreach more than research. Many developing country universities must often address teaching and outreach as priorities ahead of research, partly because of the national priority of human resources development and partly because of the high cost and, therefore, the underdeveloped state of research expertise and capacities.

**There is a growing voice for developing country ownership of and, therefore, capacities for their own development, including their own capacities for research.**

<sup>6</sup> Industry Canada, "Public Investments in University Research: Reaping the Benefits - Report of the Expert Panel on the Commercialization of University Research", Advisory Council on Science and Technology, May 4, 1999, p.9.



- IDRC's focus on research for development, is obviously relevant for developing country universities. The Centre's more specific mandate: *to initiate, encourage, support, and conduct research into the problems of the developing regions of the world* is even more pertinent to universities in developing countries. Moreover, it is intended to compliment the objectives of CIDA and, especially, CIDA's UPCDP.
- CIDA's focus on the sustainability of developmental impact and UPCDP's focus on such impact in the communities served by developing country universities are obviously more relevant to the mandates of developing country universities than to most Canadian universities. However, these foci are also relevant to many Canadian universities as subjects of study, teaching, research and outreach inside and outside the university.

However, unlike CIDA, Canadian universities are not primarily in the business of developing, managing and reporting on projects for developmental impact in developing countries. It is often especially difficult for them to conform to CIDA's progress and financial reporting requirements, which are seen to be too bureaucratic and complex. Therefore, for some individuals in Canadian universities, CIDA's requirements are seen to interfere with the developmental impact of UPCDP linkage projects and with exploring and generating new knowledge through research.<sup>7</sup>

Notwithstanding, within the universities there are also programs, courses, research and individuals in teaching, research and outreach with a focus on development. For them, UPCDP is very relevant.

UPCDP's focus on institutional and broader capacity development could legitimately include some forms of capacity development for research which is integral to the mandates of Canadian and developing country universities. Research capacity development would also be an IDRC priority for any of its support to universities involved in UPCDP.

- UPCDP linkages could gain added value from IDRC's ability to support university research in ways that CIDA can not. IDRC's support could and should complement CIDA's support, enabling more holistic approaches to assisting developing country universities in strengthening their capacities in research, teaching and outreach to enhance their developmental impact in communities they serve.
- IDRC grants to universities involved in UPCDP, provided to developing country universities directly or through Canadian universities, would enable developing country universities' to improve their ownership of their own capacity development for research, as well as their own conduct of research.

**4.1.3 The faculty of Canadian universities** who propose and manage UPCDP linkages were found by the UPCDP Review and by this IDRC Review to be interested in achieving developmental impact in developing countries. The eight ILOs and 13 managers who responded to the IDRC Review's e-mail questionnaire consistently gave the highest possible ratings to the importance of directing IDRC support in UPCDP linkages to benefit the DCU, its faculty and the community it serves. Their ratings

---

<sup>7</sup> At the time of this IDRC Review, CIDA is reviewing the Education Institutions Program (EIP) policy framework under which UPCDP operates, but the requirement for Results Based Management, with its focus on verifiable developmental impact, is more likely to be strengthened than reduced.



of the importance of benefit to the linkage itself, the Canadian university or faculty appeared not to be as high.

The UPCDP reviewers estimated that about 7% of all full-time equivalent teaching staff (FTETS) of Canadian universities were interested in being involved in international development.

In this IDRC Review, the average of estimates by the eight ILO e-mail respondents of the percent of FTETS in their own universities who were interested in international development was:

- 6% actually involved in UPCDP or similar projects;
- 10% actually involved in other international development including research;
- 20% actually involved in other international development with DCs, NOT mainly research;
- 22% known to be interested in international development with developing countries.

Support for these individual staff members' interests in research in international development is consistent with IDRC's mandate but not with CIDA's. Some of these individual development specialists are concerned that they do not receive adequate credit towards promotion and tenure in their university for work in international development which does not involve research and its publication. The chances of such credit being received towards promotion and tenure might be improved with IDRC support for research within UPCDP linkages. It might also attract more of the research oriented and young staff to development work.

- The interests of most individual Canadian university staff members in international development research within UPCDP Phase I were curtailed by the limits on the number of approved linkages being set for universities rather than individuals. The Review of UPCDP (Dec/98) noted that the 26 large and medium Canadian universities had about 27,000 staff members while the 62 small and very small universities had 7,000 staff<sup>8</sup> – 80 and 20 percent respectively of total staff. Assuming an equal proportion of individual staff in each university is interested in UPCDP, it is clear that applying such limits to all universities regardless of size disadvantages the 80 percent in the medium and large universities more than the 20 percent in the small and very small universities. This disadvantage increases directly with the size of the Canadian university and was a cause of considerable discontent with UPCDP. It reduced the interest of many individuals with potential to contribute to development. Current plans for UPCDP Phase II apparently will not include any change in this practice.
- IDRC could counter this disadvantage by making some funding available for proposals from faculty members in larger universities which have received their limit of UPCDP approvals, thus rendering large portions their faculty members ineligible to submit proposals.
- If IDRC were to provide support to universities with approved UPCDP linkages under these circumstances, that support would likewise be available to a larger proportion of international development enthusiasts in Canada's smaller than in the larger universities.

IDRC could consider providing support to individual Canadian university development specialists whose proposals to UPCDP were rejected and yet had research components which could be viable without the CIDA support. The data from e-mailed questionnaires appears to support this. Eight ILOs

---

<sup>8</sup> See Appendix A for a table of universities involved in UPCDP and definitions for large, medium, small and very universities.



and 13 UPCDP managers rated from “high to very high” the importance of IDRC considering support for research associated with proposals rejected by UPCDP.

**4.1.4 Equal Opportunity for all Canadian Universities or for all university development specialists:** CIDA and AUCC provide a number of explanations for the value of ensuring that Canadian universities are treated equally in UPCDP.

- There is concern that catering to the interests of individuals rather than institutions could undermine an innovative objective of Tier 1, to encourage institutional multi-disciplinary “programs” involving various faculties within one Canadian university and within its developing country university partner(s).
- CIDA’s June/99 position paper proposed changes in UPCDP selection which generally increase the number of approved linkages a Canadian university may have at one time. No change was expected that would offer UPCDP to individuals and set limits at the level of individuals rather than the institutions, as is the practice of most other university granting agencies. A number of reasons are provided to support this.
- The CIDA/PB/ICD/EIP mandate is to work in cooperation with Canadian institutions to support sustainable development in DCs. Under this mandate, the Canadian university accepting UPCDP funding is accountable at the institution level to CIDA to ensure that the funding (tax dollars) is used strictly for achievement of the agreed developmental objectives of a Tier1 or Tier 2 linkage project. ICD/EIP can not enter into such an agreement with individuals.
- To implement UPCDP, CIDA has designed selection procedures to identify Canadian universities and their staff members, whose interests, expertise and experience are consistent with CIDA’s priority of sustainable development in developing countries and with CIDA’s management and reporting requirements. CIDA supports university faculty who are interested by obtaining the commitment of their Canadian university CEOs to support them and be accountable to CIDA for the funding received.
- The CIDA/PB/ICD/EIP focus on institutions rather than on individuals is expected to enable all different sizes and kinds of Canadian universities in large and small urban areas across Canada to be involved in international development. This objective could be undermined if each Canadian university did not have an equal chance. The focus of UPCDP project selection on individuals rather than institutions would give the larger universities, with more staff, greater chance of selection for the limited funding available. More smaller universities would be left out.

**4.1.5 Any CIDA/Canadian University Project, not just UPCDP, could be eligible for IDRC support to help leverage CIDA’s and perhaps other donors’ existing investments.**

- IDRC currently allocates 18 percent of its total funding to Canadian universities. Since 1980 this IDRC funding has gone to Canadian universities or developing country universities or both jointly. Recognizing that CIDA provides substantial support to Canadian and developing country universities through UPCDP and other CIDA programs, IDRC could consider complementing any of the various CIDA programs of support to universities. IDRC’s current preference for this support would be for proposals from the development country university and to benefit mainly developing country universities through Canadian universities with UPCDP linkages.



#### **4.1.6 Other Positive Considerations**

- IDRC could direct support to research activities relevant to its sectoral, thematic or multi-disciplinary program priorities which complement the developmental objectives of UPCDP linkages. The research activities could include:
  - the generation of new scientific or technical knowledge;
  - knowledge contribution to a discipline or sector;
  - research on CIDA or IDRC themes or program priorities;
  - development of research capacities relevant to development priorities;
  - evaluation research on developmental issues;
  - evaluation research on the effectiveness of the supported linkage.
- IDRC's participation could allow some linkages to be seen as research projects to investigate the processes and results of institutional strengthening, capacity development, research oriented development, developmental impact and sustainability.
- IDRC's addition of research to UPCDP linkages would likely increase the probability of continued longer term relations and linkages between/among Canadian universities and DC universities.
- CIDA, IDRC, AUCC and university cooperation could mutually benefit their public image and enhance their effectiveness as partners in development.
- IDRC funds in UPCDP would allow exploration of the impact of research within linkage projects.

#### **4.1.7 Other Negative Considerations**

- IDRC support to Canadian university linkages in UPCDP would be limited by some of the parameters of UPCDP operations, for example, there are no linkages in eastern Europe.
- UPCDP is already seen as too cumbersome by some involved observers. They suggest that adding IDRC would not be of benefit to universities.
- Adding IDRC to UPCDP should not result in larger and fewer projects with less variety. It would be better to support more smaller projects.

### **5.0 IDRC PROGRAM STRATEGIES - Optimizing Advantages**

#### **5.1 IDRC Support**

The scope of IDRC's support should be as broad as possible to enable research for development and research capacity development. For example:

- within any of IDRC's six themes and program initiatives;
- knowledge contributions to a discipline or sector;
- research relevant to academic priorities of the partner universities;
- indigenous research capacity development, especially in DCs and their universities;



- evaluation research on any development issues or processes in the UPCDP linkage project;
- evaluation research on the impact of the UPCDP linkage project itself;
- evaluation research on development generally;
- research on the impact of research, indigenous and other, on development;
- research on the extent and impact of research dissemination and application in development;
- policy research, especially development policy;
- ILOs' e-mailed ratings seem to suggest that their preference would be for IDRC to:
  - focus on priority sectors or regions;
  - consider further the implications of focussing on themes or the poorest countries; but
  - definitely avoid changing the focus annually.

## 5.2 Complementarity of IDRC and UPCDP Components

- The importance of IDRC and UPCDP components being complementary was:
  - rated "very high" by both managers and ILOs; but
  - ratings of the importance of proposals for the two components being submitted together for approval at the same time, were inconclusive.
- IDRC research grants, which are complementary but not dependent on UPCDP, would allow IDRC to support research starting:
  - before linkages begin;
  - mid-way in their implementation, (managers', not ILOs' ratings seem to support this);
  - near their completion; or
  - even after completion (managers' and ILOs' ratings seem not to support this).
- IDRC research components and CIDA capacity development components which are compatible or complementary should be administered separately by IDRC and CIDA.
- Mutually dependent IDRC/UPCDP components (i.e., both necessary for the success of the other and the linkage) would require:
  - the initial Letters of Interest to declare and explain both the UPCDP and IDRC components and their interdependence;
  - some form of joint administration by CIDA and IDRC; and
  - result in an unavoidable increase in complexity.
- Mutually independent IDRC and UPCDP components could also be allowed with the IDRC support beginning at any stage (managers', but not ILOs', ratings seem to support this).



**Table 5.2 Pros, Cons and Pitfalls for Programming Strategies of IDRC Cooperation in UPCDP**

<p><b>Pros: Q2.3.1:</b> Among the many good reasons for IDRC to cooperate in UPCDP, describe ONE that is most important.</p> <p><b>Managers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would help to widen the UPCDP in which research is already a training tool.</li> <li>• Enhancement of research component in capacity building activities.</li> <li>• If present IDRC approach is kept and UPCDP funds more Tier-2s, cooperation would be net value.</li> <li>• Funding now is very limited.</li> <li>• The links are already established.</li> <li>• It is still possible to create linkages with those IDRC programs in our T-2 in WBA.</li> <li>• Provide opportunity for well-based evaluation of the outcome/results (explore more than “lessons learnt”).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Cons: Q2.3.2:</b> What is ONE of the most important valid arguments against IDRC’s cooperation in UPCDP?</p> <p><b>ILOs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk that CIDA reduces UPCDP funding in favour of less equivalent support through IDRC.</li> </ul> <p><b>Managers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UPCDP has a lot of demands already – this may affect the research component.</li> <li>• Double bureaucracy, double evaluation.</li> <li>• IDRC – old boys club: proposal acceptance/evaluation not transparent, objective; consistent in requirements</li> <li>• IDRC and UPCDP may overlap on some projects, in other cases only one would be an appropriate source of funds.</li> <li>• Variety would be reduced: better to have lots of little projects than fewer big projects</li> <li>• Lack of money.</li> <li>• Might be some duplication of efforts and additional bureaucratic developments if the program is not well managed.</li> <li>• May narrow the question to be studied or push for research before parties take time to agree on question to be studied and how each party will be involved.</li> <li>• Interests of IDRC and UPCDP are too distinct from each other to design a program to serve both effectively.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is better to keep IDRC funding separate for smaller more experimental initiatives. IDRC’s success is in its flexibility.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pitfalls: Q2.3.3:</b> What are ONE or TWO of the most important problems or pitfalls to be avoided in IDRC cooperation in UPCDP?</p> <p><b>ILOs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rejection of good project proposals because they fall in the cracks; lack of clarity in who is responsible for auditing results and exercising accountabilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Managers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of coordination in a joint funding program.</li> <li>• Funding for university capacity building will likely get tighter, therefore should be widely allocated.</li> <li>• Treat IDRC as an independent project but supporting one or more objectives of UPCDP project.</li> <li>• UPCDP is constrained by CIDA’s politics, priorities, buzzwords, RBM; IDRC can keep things simpler.</li> <li>• Institutional development pressures could dilute or be a distraction to the research objective.</li> <li>• Funding: there will be need for flexibility: dollars have different values/returns in different countries.</li> <li>• UPCDP committee deciding on proposals: committee tends to be too narrowly composed to entertain full range of applications received.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CIDA does not want to fund research for development (1a); given CIDA’s constraints, they turn down proposals that emphasize research (1L)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>CU faculty involved in UPCDP seem to suggest major pitfalls to be avoided include lack of coordination, over-complexity and conflict between the objectives of research and development.</p>



### **5.3 Program Level Monitoring and Evaluation should:**

- focus on overall developmental outcome impact and CIDA, IDRC and AUCC management effectiveness;
- have an established program monitoring and evaluation framework, with indicators of expected outputs, outcomes and impacts at the outset of CIDA-IDRC cooperation;
- support CIDA and IDRC in maintaining their established requirements for work plans, monitoring (internal and external), evaluation and reporting with their respective components reported separately and preferably simultaneously.

### **5.4 Budgets**

What are viable options for IDRC budgets to support developing country and Canadian universities involved in UPCDP?

- eight ILOs' and UPCDP managers' both gave very high ratings of appropriateness for grants:
  - from \$10,000 - \$200,000, as opposed to \$10,000 - \$100,000 or to \$50,000; and
  - not quite so high for grants to be for DCUs mainly, but where necessary also for CU;
- eight ILOs gave very high ratings of appropriateness for grants to be provided directly to and administered by CUs in cooperation with and primarily for the benefit of DCUs;
- ratings were inconclusive on the appropriateness for grants for DCUs exclusively, and grants provided directly to and administered by DCUs in cooperation with CUs.



## 6.0 IMPLEMENTATION CONCERNS - Managing Complexity

### 6.1 General

- the introduction of IDRC support should not interfere with established UPCDP selection/approval, management, reporting and other processes;
- complexity and lapsed time for selection, especially, should not be increased;
- proposals and project implementation plans for IDRC support should clearly distinguish CIDA and IDRC elements to be funded to facilitate separate auditable accounting;
- CIDA Tier 1 and Tier 2 Guidelines should include an annex for IDRC's guidelines.<sup>9</sup>

**Table 6.1 Pros, Cons and Pitfalls of Implementing IDRC Cooperation in UPCDP**

<p><b>Pros: Q2.3.1:</b> Among the many good reasons for IDRC to cooperate in UPCDP, describe ONE that is most important.</p> <p><b>Managers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IDRC has networks of researchers in developing countries which provide better opportunities for local investigation, project monitoring, implementation assistance.</li> <li>• In research development, flexibility and quality are essential, guidelines should be minimal. A successful UPCDP proposal could be appended to the IDRC proposal (short, like NSERC), but evidence of peer-reviewed scientific productivity of the applicant should be given through the applicant's CV (now omitted in UPCDP forms. NSERC or SSHRC forms could be used.</li> <li>• IDRC/UPCDP: faculty can do both research and training (usual duties of university faculty members).</li> <li>• It will strengthen the evaluation component and training during the implementation phase.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Cons: Q2.3.2:</b> What is ONE of the most important valid arguments against IDRC's cooperation in UPCDP?</p> <p><b>ILOs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If it causes further delays in getting projects approved and running.</li> <li>• Current CIDA application/approval/reporting processes are too long/detailed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Managers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UPCDP is complicated and burdensome enough without involving IDRC.</li> <li>• It [The UPCDP LOI or proposal stage] may be too early to formulate what question is to be explored and getting the right person from each team to initiate the research.</li> <li>• Application/approval/reporting must be streamlined, especially if IDRC requirements are added.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CIDA's requirements, flow charts, management structure, financial reporting are horribly cumbersome.</li> </ul> <p><b>Group</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UPCDP is already too cumbersome: adding IDRC would not benefit IDRC or the universities.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pitfalls: Q2.3.3:</b> What are ONE or TWO of the most important problems or pitfalls to be avoided in IDRC cooperation in UPCDP?</p> <p><b>ILOs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Separation of IDRC funded activities from UPCDP projects: integration of activities is essential.</li> </ul> <p><b>Managers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep it simple.</li> <li>• Make sure the research component remains in focus.</li> <li>• Co-ordinate so proposals don't get caught in limbo between IDRC and UPCDP.</li> <li>• More paper work, more reports.</li> <li>• Research grants should be monitored by CU/UPCDP authority; narrow interpretation of IDRC themes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>Managers emphasize that IDRC would improve links, funding, variety, evaluation and capacity development. However, Managers also consider that complexity is a major issue.</p>

<sup>9</sup> Tier 1 Guidelines were being revised for distribution December 1999.



## **6.2 Selection/Approval**

- Discussions with CIDA suggest that Phase II of UPCDP may:
  - continue to have two separate Tiers,
  - each with its own two stage selection procedure,
    - stage 1: preparation, submission and approval of Letters of Intent (LOI);
    - stage 2: the preparation of proposed costed implementation plans
- Discussion with CIDA and AUCC managers, and e-mailed ratings by ILOs suggest that:
  - LOIs for UPCDP should declare any intentions for IDRC components at the outset;
  - the two components should be clearly distinguished to avoid double funding.
  - the involvement of DC stakeholders in LOI preparation should be verified in the LOIs;
- ILO and UPCDP Manager e-mailed ratings consistently give very high importance to IDRC components being complementary to UPCDP components, as opposed to being independent, essential or dependent.
- LOIs should:
  - explain if the two components are to be implemented simultaneously or separately;
  - there should be two separate selection processes with two separate committees which do not increase lapsed time for selection;
  - if research is identified after a linkage has begun, IDRC could use a selection process with CIDA representation.

## **6.3 Rejection**

- to minimize proposal rejection rate, guidelines should clearly articulate UPCDP and IDRC limits criteria, processes, funding amounts and any preferences;
- rejection of proposals with both CIDA and IDRC components should be announced jointly by CIDA and IDRC.
- Faculty members whose proposals were rejected by UPCDP could still be considered by IDRC support for viable research related activities.

## **7.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The conclusions and recommendations which follow are based mainly on the Reviewer's judgement of what appear to be significant findings from the foregoing sections of this report. Also considered are what appear to be the changes which could be found in UPCDP Phase II, when it is finally approved for implementation, perhaps in June, 2000.

### **7.1 The Possible UPCDP Phase II**

UPCDP Phase II parameters are not yet all decided, but it appears that it will involve:

- a single objective of development impact in communities served by the DC university partner;
- a tier 1: administered by CIDA with linkages funded up to \$3M;
- a tier 2: administered by AUCC with linkages funded up to \$1M;
- selection that is streamlined with
  - the same Committee for both tiers
  - the same two stage process for both tiers
    - stage 1: Letter of Intent



- stage 2: funded proposal development
- limits on the number of approved linkages applied equally to each Canadian Universities regardless of the number of international development specialists among faculty members.

## 7.2 Validation of IDRC's Initial parameters for the Review

Experience and knowledge of CIDA and UPCDP lead IDRC to formulate some initial parameters or guides for an approach to possible IDRC cooperation with UPCDP. This review was to 'confirm or refute their validity/usefulness as a guide to' innovation and to framing 'pros' and 'cons'.

**Table 7.2 Results of Review of IDRC Initial "Parameters" for Cooperation with UPCDP**

IDRC Initial Parameters to be Reviewed for Validity	Review Results
1. The Centre's grants would have to complement and not contradict or compromise the goals and the objectives of the CIDA UPCD project. (Given that the overall UPCD goal of increasing the capacity of Higher Education Institutions to contribute to national development objectives and sustainable development, this should not be a problem.)	VALID: feasible and widely supported
2. The Centre would prefer to see all of its funds flow to the developing country researchers but a spread of the funds between developing country and Canadian researchers could be worked out. The emphasis here is on meaningful research collaboration as opposed to Canadian dominated partnerships.	VALID: feasible with support to CUs for research, DCI ownership is essential
3. The Centre would want to fund research, or research-related activities (as opposed to the teaching and community outreach functions of the universities which are the other two raisons d'être of the university).	VALID: UPCDP funds teaching and outreach
4. The Centre would prefer that its funds line up with UPCD projects that fall within the Centre's program priority areas. An option might also be to confine the Centre's funds to just one of the priority areas in any one year so that the small resources could be brought to bear on a sector that needed strengthening.	MAY BE VALID if flexible within IDRC priorities; NOT VALID AT ALL if priorities set yearly
5. The Centre could focus on just one geographic region – on Africa, for instance – or across all the regions but in the poorest countries.	MAY BE VALID: focus on regions OK; on sectors preferred; on poorest needs more analyses
6. Small grants mechanism might be used to provide additional research support to UPCD projects but this is but one option and others need to be explored.	MAY BE VALID – if complementary/integrated
7. Any Centre funding opportunity linked to the UPCD must not increase the complexity of the UPCD project selection and implementation.	VALID, feasible and widely supported
8. The exploration of a Centre link with UPCD must advise on an important pitfall: how would a Centre-UPCD collaboration avoid (or justify) 1) double funding for partners already in receipt of UPCD grants; and 2) excluding Canadian universities who had not been successful in a bid for UPCD funds.	VALID – but avoidable: 1. with reporting; and 2. IDRC consideration of CU's rejected by or ineligible for UPCDP



### 7.3 Recommendations

If IDRC were to establish its own program of support to universities to compliment CIDA's UPCDP Phase II, under the conditions outlined in 7.1 above, consideration should be given to the following:

#### 7.3.1 Rationale that is founded on the:

- 1.1 fact that CIDA does not fund university research, even when it is relevant to a linkage;
- 1.2 priority of sustainable developmental results in developing countries;
- 1.3 principle of research capacity as integral and necessary to sustainable development capacity;
- 1.4 value of DC universities' strengthening their capacities in research for development;
- 1.5 necessity of developing country institutions' ownership of their own capacity development and research processes;
- 1.6 common aspects of the mandates of IDRC, CIDA and universities in Canada and developing countries.

#### 7.3.2 Programming that:

- 2.1 offers funding mainly to DC universities, through Canadian university faculty members who:
  - have been successful in obtaining UPCDP support,
  - have had their UPCDP proposals rejected, or
  - are among hundreds of international development specialists in a larger Canadian university which has reached UPCDP's limit of approved proposals and is therefore ineligible, or
  - have sent no proposals to UPCDP, but demonstrate valid interest in international development;
- 2.2 is strategically directed by IDRC with an appropriate policy level committee of stakeholders;
- 2.3 has grants which are mainly to benefit the DC partners and which are administered by:
  - CU recipients in cooperation with DC partners;
  - DCU recipients in co-operation with CU partner(s).
- 2.4 has flexible strategies to encourage responsiveness to the diversity of priorities of universities;
- 2.5 is distinctly separate from CIDA's UPCD Programming including separate:
  - selection procedures, committee, criteria, timing/scheduling and notification which
    - are transparent and seen to be objective,
    - allow proposals before, mid-way, near completion or after complementary UPCDP linkages,



- require any proposals for research related activities which are mutually dependent with or may affect UPCDP activities, to be subject to approval processes agreed with CIDA,
- uses selection criteria of commitment to linkages that aim at developmental results in DCs,
- require LOIs to provide evidence of DC partners involvement in their preparation,
- reduces rejection rates by clearly articulating criteria, limits, priorities, funding available, the maximum numbers likely proposals to be approved, etc.;
- financial and progress reporting, scheduled in coordination with UPCDP reports to facilitate
  - comparisons and assurances of complementarity and lack of conflict,
  - verification of compliance with distinct financial requirements,

2.6 is as broad as possible to:

- enable research for development; or
- research capacity development, for example,
  - within any of IDRC's six themes and program initiatives,
  - indigenous research capacity development, especially in DCs and their universities,
  - evaluation research on any development issues or processes in the UPCDP linkage project,
  - evaluation research on the impact of the UPCDP linkage project itself,
  - evaluation research on development generally,
  - research on the impact of research, indigenous and other, on development,
  - research on the extent and impact of research dissemination and application in development,
  - policy research, especially development policy;
- establishes priorities based on sectors or regions;
- offers incentives for linkages with the poorest countries;
- allows grants from \$10,000 to 200,000 – but appropriateness of this range should be confirmed.

### **7.3.3 Implementation that:**

- 3.1 allows linkage management to proceed with minimal additional requirements to those of UPCDP;
- 3.2 avoids bias against poorer DCs by funding actual and reasonable costs of travel and operations;
- 3.3 requires clear formalized linkage agreements on each partners' responsibility for developmental results;
- 3.4 has guides for assessments of the necessary and sufficient conditions for DCI capacity development;
- 3.5 applies principles of research design and analysis to
  - the generation of new scientific or technical knowledge,
  - development of research capacities relevant to development priorities,



- evaluation research on developmental issues,
- self-evaluation of the extent to which investments in research and/or research capacity development actually achieve their intended results (outputs, outcomes, effects or impacts).

**7.3.4 How might IDRC go about establishing a program that would fund research for development in university linkages which were either approved or rejected by UPCDP? How might IDRC best ensure that such a program avoids administrative complexity and complex negotiations on each linkage?**

- 4.1 IDRC could work jointly with a few recognized Canadian and developing country university stakeholders to develop and propose a program to be considered by CIDA, AUCC and Canadian universities.
- 4.2 Initially consideration could be given to further survey and analyses needed to supplement this brief review and provide a solid foundation for program decisions and planning.
- 4.3 To minimize complexity, consideration should be given to strategies for:
  - keeping the program level and linkage level administration of the CIDA UPCD Program and the new IDRC program as separate as possible;
  - separate management, LOIs, proposals, implementation, monitoring, reporting, evaluation etc..
  - joint management at the linkage level for sure, perhaps also at the program level, but only where the IDRC research component and the UPCDP capacity development component of a particular linkage are **mutually dependent**, (each dependent on the other for their success, each part of the necessary and sufficient conditions for success of the other).
- 4.4 Considerations should be given to issues raised in this review and from other sources.



## **APPENDICES**



# ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES WITH UPCDP LINKAGES

Appendix A

#	University	Prov.	Size	Exp	Rejected	Approved Program/Project Title	Number	Manager's Name	Manager's e-mail
					T-1 94-7	T-2 94-8			
1	Alberta	AB	L	H	2	8	087-TT05-95	Marty Luckert	marty.luckert@ualberta.ca
1	Alberta	AB	L	H			210-TT05-97	Swee-Hin Toh	s.h.toh@ualberta.ca
1	Alberta	AB	L	H			298-TT05-98	Pamela Brink	pamela.brink@ualberta.ca
2	Calgary	AB	L	H	3	10	Central American Water Resource Management Network		
2	Calgary	AB	L	H			206-TT05-97	Merlin B. Brinkerhoff	brinkerh@acs.uucalgary.ca
3	Carleton	ON	M	M	1	9	Supporting Mgmt of its Transformation (S051664)		
4	Concordia	QC	L	M		10	123-TT05-95	Florence Stevens	stevefl@vax2.concordia.ca
5	Dalhousie	NS	S	H			053-TT06-94	Sheva Medjuck	sheva.medjuck@msvu.ca
5	Dalhousie	NS	S	H			287-TT05-98	Aldo Chircop	aldo.chircop@dal.ca
5	Dalhousie	NS	S	H			010-TT06-94		
6	Guelph	ON	S	H		10	010-TT06-94	Douglas Pietsch	dpietsch@res.uoguelph.ca
6	Guelph	ON	S	H			258-TT05-98	Jana Janakiram	janakira@uoguelph.ca
6	Guelph	ON	S	H			0-036769		
6	Guelph	ON	S	H			149-TT05-96	John K. Naysmith	john.naysmith@lakeheadu.ca
7	Lakehead	ON	S	M	1	2	0-036769		
7	Lakehead	ON	S	M			149-TT05-96		
8	Laurentian	ON	S	L		1		Patrick Julig	
9	Laval	QC	L	H	1	7	290-TT05-98	André Casault	andre.casault@arc.ulaval.ca
10	Manitoba	MB	M	H	1	10	263-TT05-98	Annalee Yassi	yassi@cc.umanitoba.ca
11	McGill	QC	L	H	3	10	237-TT05-97	Duncan Pedersen	duncan@odyssey.net
12	McMaster	ON	M	H	1	7	025-TT06-94	Gary Warner	warner@mcmail.cis.mcmaster.ca
12	McMaster	ON	M	H			200-TT05-97	Basanti Majumdar	majumdar@fhs.csu.mcmaster.ca
13	Memorial	NF	M	H	1	7	053-TT06-94		
13	Memorial	NF	M	H			276-TT05-98	Mervyn J. McIntyre	mmcintyr@gill.ifmt.nf.ca



#	University	Prov.	Size	Exp	Rejected	Approved Program/Project Title	Number	Manager's Name	Manager's e-mail
					T-1 94-7 T-2 94-8				
13	Memorial	NF	M	H		T-2 Mollusc Aquiculture Enhancement in Chile	071-TT05-95	A. B. Dickinson	adickins@morgan.ucs.mun.ca
13	Memorial	NF	M	H		T-2 Training for Primary Health Care Workers	167-TT05-96	Lan Tran Gien	lgien@kean.ucs.mun.ca
13	Memorial	NF	M	H		T-2 Women's Health & Com. Outreach	217-TT05-97	M. K. Matthews	matthews@morgan.ucs.mun.ca
14	Moncton	NB	S	H	6	T-1 Strategie/Securite Alimentaire	(S051663)	Lise Ouellette	
15	Montréal	QC	L	H	10	T-2 DRH matières de maladies/sexuelle/SIDA	165-TT05-96	Madeleine Ravaoarinoro	
15	Montréal	QC	L	H		T-2 Formation des formateurs en santé	090-TT05-95	Suzanne Kérouac	kerouac@eve.umontreal.ca
15	Montréal	QC	L	H		T-1 Programme de gestion urbaine		Jean McNeil	jean.mcneil@umontreal.ca
16	Mt St Vincent	NS	VS	L		T-2 Community Partnerships & Women's Studies	053-TT06-94		
17	Nipissing	ON	VS	L		T-2 Teacher Education : Montserrat & Anguilla	012-TT06-94	David Marshall	davem@admin.unipising.ca
18	NS Agr Coll	NS	VS	L	4	T-2 Training Prog Sustainable Agriculture	155-TT05-96	Norman Goodyear	ngoodyear@cox.ns.nsac.ca
19	Okanagan	BC	VS	L		T-2 West African Rural Dev. Centre	266-TT05-98	Don Sawyer	dsawyer@okanagan.bc.ca
20	Québec	QC	L	H	4	T-1 Appui au développement institutionnel et régional en gestion		Guy Goulet	goulet.guy@uqam.ca
20	Québec	QC	L	H		T-2 EnvEd - amazonienne	129-TT05-95	Lucie Sauvé	saue.lucie@uqam.ca
20	Québec	QC	L	H		T-2 Femmes, santé et travail	065-TT06-94	Karen Messing	messing.karen@uqam.ca
21	Québec - AT	QC	VS	L	1	T-2 DRH-Projets Mines	239-TT05-97	André Gbodossou	gbodossou@quat.quebec.ca
22	Québec - ÉNAP	QC	VS	M	4	T-1 La didactique internat'le en management publique			
23	Québec - ÉTS	QC	VS	L	3	T-2 Entrepreneuriat: Université-Industrie	112-TT05-95	Michel Galopin	mgalopin@mec.etsmtl.ca
23	Québec - ÉTS	QC	VS	L		T-2 Liaison enseignement-industrie	040-TT06-94	Sinh LeQuoc	slequoc@etsmtl.ca
24	Québec - INRS	QC	VS	M	1	T-1 Développement urbain: Partenariat universitaire			
25	Québec - Tél-U	QC	M	L	5	T-1 Centre d'application d'étude en formation à distance		Louise Patoine	lpatoine@telu.quebec.ca
26	Québec Trois R	QC	M	M	5	T-2 Formation à distance en admin scolaire	014-TT06-94	André Quirion	andre_quirion@uqtr.quebec.ca
27	Regina	SK	S	M	6	T-2 Flooding Control, Eco Protect, Sus Dev	296-TT05-98	Gordon Huang	gordon.huang@uregina.ca
27	Regina	SK	S	M		T-2 Training: Regional Dev	244-TT05-97	Polo Diaz & David Gauthier	harry.diaz@uregina.ca
28	Sa.Ind.Fed C.	SK	VS	L	3	T-2 Joint Prog. in International Indigenous Studies	242-TT05-97	Ronald Hoenes	rhoenes@tansi.sific.edu
29	Sask	SK	M	H	7	T-2 Land & Groundwater Mgmt in Vietnam	119-TT05-95	D.F. Action	acton@digger.usask.ca
29	Sask	SK	M	H		T-2 Low Input Sustainable Agr in the Rift Valley	139-TT05-96	A. R. Mermut	usask.ca



#	University	Prov.	Size	Exp	Rejected	Approved Program/Project Title	Number	Manager's Name	Manager's e-mail
					T-1 94-7				
					T-2 94-8				
29	Sask	SK	M	H		T-1 Training for Health Renewal			
30	Sherbrooke	QC	M	H		T-2 Formation en gestion des coopératives (CRica)	140-TT05-96	Nicole St-Martin	nstmarti@courrier.usherb.ca
30	Sherbrooke	QC	M	H	1	T-2 Formation en gestion des coopératives (Cuba)	221-TT05-97	Nicole St-Martin	nstmarti@courrier.usherb.ca
30	Sherbrooke	QC	M	H		T-2 Programme pour les coopératives	260-TT06-98	Paul Prévoist	pprevost@courrier.usherb.ca
30	Sherbrooke	QC	M	H		T-2 Renforcement & diffusion de la géomatique	107-TT05-95	Q. Hugh J. Gwyn	hgwyn@courrier.usherb.ca
30	Sherbrooke	QC	M	H		T-2 Renforcement & diffusion de la géomatique	259-TT05-98	Ferdinand Bonn	fbonn@courrier.usherb.ca
30	Sherbrooke	QC	M	H		T-2 Réseau panaméricain Pour les coopératives	006-TT06-94	Jean-Paul Gravel	jpg gravel@courrier.usherb.ca
31	Simon Fraser	BC	M	M	7	T-2 Distance Education Dev't Project (Ghana)	015-TT06-94	Colin Yerbury	colin_yerbury@sfu.ca
31	Simon Fraser	BC	M	M		T-2 Distance Education Dev't Project (Philippines)	073-TT05-95	Colin J. Yerbury	colin_yerbury@sfu.ca
32	St. Mary's	NS	S	L	2	T-2 Aquatic Resource Mgmt	158-TT05-96	Liette Vasseur	lvasseur@shark.stmarys.ca
32	St. Mary's	NS	S	L		T-2 Capacity Building for Higher Education	137-TT05-96	Kenneth Ozmon	
32	St. Mary's	NS	S	L		T-2 Community Partnerships & Women's Studies	053-TT06-94		
32	St. Mary's	NS	S	L		T-1 Community-based Conservation Mgmt	01843-S53305	Liette Vasseur	Liette.Vasseur@stmarys.ca
32	St. Mary's	NS	S	L		T-2 Sex Trade in the Philippines	267-TT05-98	Edna Keeble	edna.keeble@stmarys.ca
33	Toronto	ON	L	L	13	T-2 Violence Prevention in Costa Rica	275-TT05-98	Heather Maclean	h.macleam@utoronto.ca
33	Toronto	ON	L	L		T-1 Waste-Economy Program		Roman Ozga	
34	Trent	ON	S	M	1	T-1 Inter-Amer Ntwk Stud/Train'g- Na Res for Com'ty Transf.			
35	UBC	BC	L	H	2	T-2 DisEd in Child & Family Health	144-TT05-96	Michael Seear	mseear@wpog.childhosp.bc.ca
35	UBC	BC	L	H		T-2 Ed. For Democratic Plan	151-TT05-96	Aprodicio A. Laquian	alaguian@unixg.ubc.ca
35	UBC	BC	L	H		T-1 Pov.Reductn Bld Capacity: Policy Asmt/proj/Pln'g			
36	UNB - F	NB	S	L	6	T-2 Biomedical Engineering	113-TT05-95	Edmund N. Biden	biden@unb.ca
37	UNB - SJ	NB	S	L	2	T-2 HRD - Marine Sector	143-TT05-96	Alan Logan	logan@unbsj.ca
37	UNB - SJ	NB	S	L		T-2 Management of Sustainable Agriculture	192-TT05-97	Bob Chanteloup	chantelo@unbsj.ca
37	UNB - SJ	NB	S	L		T-2 Management Dev in Vietnam	072-TT05-95	Eileen Pike	pike@unbsj.ca
38	Victoria	BC	M	M	3	T-1 Brazilian Mariculture Linkage Project	S51668	John Littlepage	littlepg@uvvm.uvic.ca
39	Windsor	ON	S	L	1	T-2 Development HR-Nursing	037-TT06-94	Sheila Cameron	camero2@uwindsor.ca
40	York	ON	L	H	10	T-2 York-Catholic U. Linkage Project	288-TT05-98	Ricardo Grinspun	ricardo@yorku.ca
40	York	ON	L	H		T-2 York-URACCAN Linkage Project	148-TT05-96	Harry Smaller	hsmaller@oise.on.ca

NB: Tier 1: Universities getting approved linkages for the first time in 1998: University of Toronto; UQAM

Tier 2: Universities getting approved linkages for the first time in 1998: Laval, Manitoba, Okanagan; Toronto



# Summary of All Canadian Institutions (CUs) Active in Tier 1 and Tier 2

	Total	Region			Size				Experience			Project Time Active	
		East	Central	West	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	High	Medium	Low	<1 year	> 2 years
CUs Active in UPCDP	40	8	22	10	10	10	11	9	16	10	14	28	29
# of CUs in Tier 1	18	3	11	4	5	4	7	2	8	6	4	7	7
# of CUs in Tier 2	32	7	16	9	10	7	8	7	15	5	12	21	22

NB: Numbers do not add because some universities are active in both Tier 1 and Tier 2

## Further Notes:

23 Universities that applied in 1997-98 and in previous years but have never been funded (total submissions): Athabasca (3), Brandon (3), Brock (4), Cariboo (2), DalTech (8), EHEC (5), (EPM (3), Huron (1), NBC (1), OISE (1), Ottawa (5), PEI (2), Queen's (7), St. Thomas (UNB) (2), Ryerson (8), UQAC (3), UQAH (3), UQAR (1), Victoria (U of T) (3), Waterloo (10), Western (7), Wilfrid Laurier (2), Winnipeg (2)

27 Canadian universities have no involvement with UPCDP: Acadia, NS; Augustana University College, AB; Bishop's, QC; Brescia, ON; British Columbia Open University; Campion, SK; Cape Breton, NS; Collège dominicain de philosophie et de théologie, ON; Concordia University College of Alberta; Fraser Valley University College, BC; King's College, ON; King's University College, AB; Lethbridge, AB; Luther, SK; Mount Allison, NS; Nova Scotia College of Art and Design; Redeemer College, ON; Royal Military College, ON; Saint Anne, NS; Saint-Boniface College universitaire, MB; St. Paul University, ON; St. Jerome's, ON; St-Francis Xavier, NS; Trinity Western, BC; Trinity, ON; University of King's College, NS



## LIST OF PEOPLE CONTACTED

Jean-Louis Fortin	consultant
John Cairns	consultant
Sylvie des Longchamps	CIDA
Keith Olson	CIDA
Eva Egram Polak	AUCC
Karen McBride	AUCC
Michel St. Claire	AUCC
Chris Smart	IDRC
Roman Osga	CIDA



## REFERENCES

## Appendix B

CIDA, *Evaluative Review of The University Partnership in Cooperation and Development Program (UPCDP)*. R. Hughes, J.C. Cairns and J-L Fortin, 1998

CIDA, *Our Commitment to Sustainable Development: The Strategy of the Canadian International Development Agency*. December 1997

IDRC, *Corporate Program Framework: To the Year 2000*. March 1997

Industry, Canada "*Public Investments in University Research: Reaping the Benefits - Report of the Expert Panel on the Commercialization of University Research*". Advisory Council on Science and Technology, May 4, 1999



## TERMS OF REFERENCE

## Appendix C

for  
a Review of  
IDRC Support to University Linkages of  
the Canadian International Development Agency's (CIDA)  
University Partnership in Cooperation and Development Program (UPCDP)

### Preamble

#### Context

CIDA, through its University Partnerships in Cooperation and Development (UPCD) contributes approximately \$30 million a year to support the international development activities of Canadian universities. At 18 month intervals, four or five project in the \$5 million range and three to five years duration are approved under UPCD Tier 1. Under UPCD Tier 2, ten to twelve projects with a maximum value of \$750,000 are approved. Since the start of the UPCD program in 1995, 13 Tier 1 and 55 Tier 2 projects have been supported.

The Centre (IDRC) plays a minor role in the competition for the larger Tier 1 grants. Centre staff are invited to review and comment on the proposals short-listed for the competition. Centre program staff comment on the merits of the proposals using the Centre 'lens of research for development', placing most emphasis on a knowledge of what research and capacity building efforts are underway in the same or related domains/development sectors to those covered in proposals. Centre staff also comment on the fit to regional needs, priorities and opportunities.

As a result of the Centre's participation in the review process, the Centre sometimes identifies proposals that offer links with research the Centre is funding and has the opportunity to draw this to the attention of the UPCD selection committee. There is some indirect evidence that the Centre's support for related or proximate projects may have influenced the choice of the selection committee (some examples: Carleton University, University of Havana: 'Supporting Cuba's Management of Transition' and Dalhousie University, University of Cienfuegos, University of Havana, University of Oriente: 'Integrated Coastal Zone Management').

As the UPCD program has settled into its stride, observations have been made along the following lines: CIDA-UPCD is about university partnerships for development. A major strength of universities is research that they can contribute to solving development problems. If CIDA is putting large resources into university partnerships, where does research for development come into play? Whether or not there is a research component of the UPCD projects, what issues are raised for the Centre's particular role in research for development – especially where this involves Canadian universities? Comparisons are sometimes made between the \$30 million a year CIDA is putting into the UPCD with the \$15 million (18 percent) of its budget for research) that the Centre contributes to projects that involve Canadian researchers collaborating with developing country researchers.

One comment frequently made by those watching the progress of UPCD in the university community is that 'research' (for the Centre, that would be 'research for development') is not a notable feature of the UPCD projects. Some have observed that CIDA avoided the inclusion of research in the design of the UPCD program because support for research for development does not fall within the mandate of the agency. Nevertheless, the goals and objectives of the UPCD project strongly imply many opportunities for research– to enhance the capacity of higher education institutions to contribute to national objectives/sustainable development. Given that research is one of the three grounding *raison d'être* for the existence of universities (the other two being teaching and community outreach/service), it is hard to think of enhancing the capacity of higher education institutions without strengthening research capacity.

A recent Evaluative Report of the UPCD done for CIDA focusses on the university twinning or linkage as a mechanism to educate and train human resources. The review suggests that the projects funded under the UPCD cannot take full advantage of many other important roles of the university – research, knowledge generation, networking, problem solving and providing advice to government. The evaluation observes that in practice many



of the projects find a way in include research in the execution of the project – with this activity being funded not from the CIDA contribution but by funds contributed by the Canadian and developing country universities. The Report suggests that the ‘research factor’ in the UPCD program is a cause of ambiguity and tension. It is this circumstance that causes those familiar with both the Centre’s and CIDA’s programming – especially where it involves the universities – to ask if the two agencies, working in tandem, might fund a way to resolve the tension and lessen the ambiguity.

### **Goals for the Centre’s investigation**

The Centre wishes to examine the opportunities for making productive links between its support for research for development where this involves Canadian university partners and projects supported under the UPCD.

#### **Guiding parameters**

Based on the Centre’s approach to research for development and on what is known of the UPCD program, several building paradigms are suggested. These are not considered limits to discourage open ended thinking. They do indicate for the Centre is approaching the issue. The study will confirm or refute their validity/usefulness as a guide to how the ‘pros’ and ‘cons’ might be framed. Innovation is sought:

20. The Centre’s grants would have to complement and not contradict or compromise the goals and the objectives of the CIDA UPCD project. (Given that the overall UPCD goal of increasing the capacity of Higher Education Institutions to contribute to national development objectives and sustainable development, this should not be a problem.)
21. The Centre would prefer to see all of its funds flow to the developing country researchers but a spread of the funds between developing country and Canadian researchers could be worked out. The emphasis here is on meaningful research collaboration as opposed to Canadian dominated partnerships.
22. The Centre would want to fund research, or research-related activities (as opposed to the teaching and community outreach functions of the universities which are the other two *raison d’être* of the university).
23. The Centre would prefer that its funds line up with UPCD projects that fall within the Centre’s program priority areas. An option might also be to confine the Centre’s funds to just one of the priority areas in any one year so that the small resources could be brought to bear on a sector that needed strengthening.
24. The Centre could focus on just one geographic region – on Africa, for instance – or across all the regions but in the poorest countries.
25. Small grants mechanism might be used to provide additional research support to UPCD projects but this is but one option and others need to be explored.
26. Any Centre funding opportunity linked to the UPCD must not increase the complexity of the UPCD project selection and implementation.
27. The exploration of a Centre link with UPCD must advise on an important pitfall: how would a Centre-UPCD collaboration avoid (or justify) 1) double funding for partners already in receipt of UPCD grants; and 2) excluding Canadian universities who had not been successful in a bid for UPCD funds.

#### **Terms of Reference and Schedule**

Taking account of the frame of reference presented in the above preamble, the consultant will:



(Unless otherwise stated, the consultant will include both UPCD Tier 1 and Tier 2 in the scope of work. The consultant will review project files and interview appropriate Centre, CIDA and AUCC staff, and UPCD project directors.)

- a) examine the stock of the Tier 1 and those Tier-2 projects, where the titles (and short project descriptions) suggest the subject matter overlaps with the Centre's program priorities as these are set out in the Program Initiatives, to determine:
  - the extent to which research for development is currently a feature of UPCD projects,
  - the nature of the research activity (knowledge contributions to a discipline/sector, a contribution to capacity building, evaluative research to guide university policy, etc.), and
  - what opportunity the current approach to research within UPCD projects might offer by way of links to the Centre's priorities and programs; (4 days)
- b) provide a 'pro' and 'con' analysis for the proposition that the Centre might offer complementary support to research through Canadian universities funded through the UPCD mechanism; (3 days)
- c) describe a set of 'what if' alternative program descriptions and mechanisms which the Centre might offer to support Canadian researchers in such a way as to complement and build on the projects supported by the UPCD. The set of alternative program descriptions and mechanism will be as large as is required to elaborate reasonable alternatives based on combinations of the following possibilities: (10 days)
  - a range of budget options: no budget; \$200,000; \$500,000, \$1,000,000,
  - possible points of entry: pre-project (including the pre-competition project development stage; project execution and delivery phase; post project,
  - grants to Canadian researchers and/or grants to developing country researchers through the agency of Canadian researchers;
- d) present a draft report to and participate in a meeting that the Centre will convene of Canadian university researchers and other actors who are involved with or monitoring the progress of the UPCD program; (1 day)
- e) share whatever other insights with respect to the Centre's interaction with the UPCD project that will arise in the course of the study; (1 day) and
- f) submit to the Centre a detailed and satisfactory report of the work accomplished by December 31, 1999.

References



## QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questions were used in three separate messages sent to (1)ILOs alone, (2)ILOs and Managers, and (3)Managers and Proposers

### Introduction

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) is considering if and how best it should compliment its support to universities, by offer support to Canadian and developing country universities involved in linkages under the CIDA, University Partnership in Development Program (UPCDP). IDRC would like your input to their considerations, so this e-mail, with the following questions is sent to you from Ron Hughes, a consultant working with Chris Smart of IDRC. Marjorie J. Edwards administers the e-mail, sending questionnaires and receiving responses.

### Background

Decades of experience in international development have confirmed that indigenous research capacities of developing countries, an IDRC objective, is a pre-requisite for their sustainable development, CIDA's main objective. But CIDA's multi-million dollar UPCD Program does not explicitly encourage research and although IDRC allocates 18 percent of its funding for Canadian collaborative research for Canadian and developing country universities, it does so without systematic reference to UPCDP. A Review of UPCDP (Dec/21/98) noted its implicit opportunities for development research. UPCDP's second phase is being fine tuned to begin later this year.

Questionnaires like this, are being sent to ILOs, managers of approved UPCDP linkages and Canadian university faculty who had UPCDP proposals rejected, to obtain ideas for IDRC's consideration.

Note: IDRC funds research capacity development and research for knowledge generation, dissemination, publication and utilization. CIDA/UPCDP funds developing country universities development of capacity for sustainable developmental impact in the communities they serve. Thus either CIDA or IDRC may fund research capacity or institutional development or training. A summary of IDRC and CIDA programs follows the questionnaire.

**PLEASE COPY THIS SURVEY IN AN E-MAIL MESSAGE, ADD YOUR RESPONSES AND SEND IT TO [<mjedwards@sprint.ca>](mailto:mjedwards@sprint.ca).**

**Please use a 0-4 rating scale (0=none; 1=very low; 2=low; 3=high; 4=very high; a blank=no response.**

### 1. ILOs only

1.1 To what extent has UPCDP in past years encouraged:

- 1.1A - sectoral or academic research ( )
- 1.1B - training in research methods and/or research management ( )
- 1.1C - research for development ( )
- 1.1D - research capacity development ( )
- 1.1E - Evaluation research ( )
- 1.1F - Other, specify and rate ( )
- 1.1X Optional comment:

1.2 How effective would it be for research capacity development and maximum impact if IDRC funds were focussed on:

- 1.2A - a priority theme or themes; ( )
- 1.2B - a priority sector or sectors; ( )
- 1.2C - a priority region or regions; ( )
- 1.2D - the poorest countries only ( )
- 1.2E - priority themes, sectors or regions each year ( )
- 1.2F - Others, specify and rate ( )



1.2X Optional comment:

1.3 How important would it be for the approval processes for UPCDP linkages and for IDRC research grants to be

1.3A - separate ( )

1.3B - combined ( )

1.3X Optional comment:

1.4 How important would it be for CIDA and IDRC components of a proposed linkage project to

1.4A - each have separate Letters of Intent and proposals ( )

1.4B - be combined in Letters of Intent and proposals ( )

1.4C - have either separate or combined LOIs and proposals as suits the needs of a particular linkage ( )

1.4D - be clearly defined and distinguished to avoid double funding ( )

1.4X Optional comment:

1.5 How many full-time equivalent faculty members are there in your university? (Number: )

1.6 Estimate the percent ( %) of your Canadian university's full-time faculty members are or have been:

1.6A - actually involved in UPCDP or similar linkage projects with developing country institutions: ( %);

1.6B - actually involved in other international development with developing countries- mainly in research: ( %);

1.6C - actually involved in other international development with developing countries- NOT mainly in research ( %)

1.6D - known to your ILO office to be interested in international development with developing countries. ( %).

## 2. ILOs and Managers

2.1 How important would it be for proposals for IDRC support to be submitted for approval

2.1A - at the outset, at the same time as initial Letters of Intent and proposals for UPCDP ( )

2.1B - after the UPCDP approval and during linkage implementation ( )

2.1C - during UPCDP phase-out ( )

2.1D - after UPCDP completion ( )

2.1E- at any of the above UPCDP stages ( )

2.1X Optional comment:

2.2 How important would it be for IDRC to consider proposals for research related activities in Canadian university/developing country university linkages which the UPCDP selection committees have rejected? ( )

2.2X Optional comment:

### 2.3 Pros and Cons of IDRC cooperation in UPCDP

2.3.1 Among the many good reasons for IDRC to cooperate in UPCDP, describe ONE that is most important.  
Response:

2.3.2 What is ONE of the most important valid arguments against IDRC's cooperation in UPCDP?  
Response:

2.3.3 What are ONE or TWO of the most important problems or pitfalls to be avoided in IDRC cooperation in UPCDP?  
Response?

2.3.4 Optional comment:

2.4 CIDA's general priority is sustainable development, UPCDP's objective is developmental impact in communities served by participating developing country universities. Neither of these explicitly encourage research in development. Given this context, how appropriate or realistic would it be to expect IDRC's research related support to universities through UPCDP to be:

2.4A independent and not detract from the UPCDP objective ( )



2.4B complementary of the UPCDP objective ( )

2.4C essential to the UPCDP objective ( )

2.4X Optional comment:

2.5 How important would it be for the highest benefit from IDRC support in UPCDP to be obtained by the:

2.5A - linkage itself ( )

2.5B - Canadian university ( )

2.5C - developing country university ( )

2.5D - Canadian faculty members involved ( )

2.5E - developing country faculty members involved ( )

2.5F - the community served by the Canadian university ( )

2.5G - the community served by the developing country university ( )

2.5X Optional comment:

2.6 How important would it be for the objectives of IDRC grants to be

2.6A - independent of the UPCDP linkage objectives ( )

2.6B - complementary to the UPCDP linkage objectives ( )

2.6C - essential to the UPCDP linkage objectives ( )

2.6X Optional comment:

2.7. How adequate would be each of the following ranges of IDRC funding for research related activities in any one UPCDP Tier 1 or Tier 2 linkage:

2.7A - Can\$10,000 - 50,000 ( )

2.7B - Can\$10,000 - 100,000 ( )

2.7C - Can\$10,000 - 200,000 ( )

2.7D - other specify \_\_\_\_\_ ( )

2.7X Optional comment:

2.8. How appropriate would it be for IDRC research grants to be:

2.8A - for developing country universities exclusively ( )

2.8B - mainly for developing country universities but where necessary for Canadian universities as well ( )

2.8C - provided directly to and administered by developing country universities in cooperation with Canadian universities ( )

2.8D - provided directly to and administered by Canadian universities, in cooperation with and primarily for the benefit of developing country universities ( )

2.8X Optional comment:

### **3. For Managers and for Proposers with Rejected Proposals:**

3.1 To what extent does (did) your Tier 1 or Tier 2 linkage (proposal) address:

3.1A - research for development ( )

3.1B - any of IDRC's Program Initiatives ( ) (See list under Summary below)

3.1C - knowledge contributions to a discipline/sector ( )

3.1D - development of research capacities ( )

3.1E - knowledge generation ( )

3.1F - knowledge distribution ( )

3.1G - developing country universities' ownership of knowledge and its generation ( )

3.1H - application of new knowledge ( )

3.1I - evaluative research to guide University policy ( )

3.1J - policy research to guide governments, industry or universities ( )

3.1K - evaluation research on the effectiveness of the linkage itself ( )

3.1L - research that would have met IDRC requirements for funding ( )

### **Summary of IDRC's and CIDA's Main Objectives and Priorities**

**IDRC's- Mandate:** to initiate encourage, support and conduct research into the problems of the developing regions;



**Mission:** empowerment through knowledge.

- **Corporate Objectives 1997-2000:** (More details on IDRC's Web-site: <[www.idrc.ca](http://www.idrc.ca)>;
- to support the production and application of research results leading to policies and technologies that enhance the lives of people in developing regions;
- to strengthen indigenous research capacities in countries of those regions
- **Programming Themes:** food security, equity in natural resource use, biodiversity conservation, sustainable employment and strategies/policies for healthy societies;
- **Program Initiatives - 1998/9 (funding channels):** 1-Communities and the Information Society in Africa; 2- Alternatives to Poverty and Resource Degradation; 3- Social Policy Reforms; 4-Cities Feeding People; 5- Community Based Natural Resource Management; 6- Ecosystem Health; 7- Micro Impacts of Macroeconomic Adjustment Policies; 8- PAN Networking; 9- Peacebuilding and Reconstruction; 10- People, Land and Water; 11- Small Medium and Micro Enterprises Innovation and Technology; 12- Sustainable Use of Biodiversity; 13- Trade, Employment and Competitiveness.

**CIDA's Mandate:** Sustainable Development in DCs to reduce poverty & contribute to security, equity, prosperity..

- **Program Priorities:** basic human needs; women in development; infrastructure services; human rights, democracy and good governance; private sector development and the environment.
- **Educational Institutions Program's (EIP) mandate:** to build capacity of educational training institutions in DCs to train the human resources required to ensure their sustainable and equitable development.
- **UPCDP's proposed objective for Phase II Tier 1 and Tier 2 linkages:** strengthening developing country universities to achieve specified development impacts in the communities they serve. (Research is not mentioned specifically.)
- **Some Proposed UPCDP Phase II Adjustments:** (1) Tier 1 limit down from \$5M to \$3M; Tier 2 up from \$750k to \$1M, all grants, no loans.; (2) All Canadian universities eligible for first Phase 2 competition; (3) Two Tier 2 proposals per university allowed each year regardless of Tier 1; (4) Canadian universities with approved Tier 1 linkages eligible to propose another Tier 1 after three years. (5) Proposals to require more thorough capacity assessments, with funding available up to 1% of total project cost.

Any Question?

On E-mail receipt or mailing: Marjorie Edwards: Phone/Fax 1-613-592-6418; <[mjedwards@sprint.ca](mailto:mjedwards@sprint.ca)>.

Other questions: Ron Hughes, Phone 1-613-727-6410; Fax: 1-613-225-8575; <[RonCHughes@aol.com](mailto:RonCHughes@aol.com)>



Responses to Questionnaires		Average Rating (85% Confidence Range)			
No.	Questions to ILOs	ILOs	Managers	Proposers	Combined
1.1	To what extent has UPCDP in past years encouraged:				
1.1A	sectoral or academic research	VL - VL			
1.1B	training in research methods and/or research management	VL - L			
1.1C	research for development	VL - L			
1.1D	research capacity development	VL - H			
1.1E	evaluation research	VL - L			
1.2	How effective would it be for research capacity development and maximum impact if IDRC funds were focussed on:				
1.2A	a priority theme or themes	L - VH			
1.2B	a priority sector or sectors	H - VH			
1.2C	a priority region or regions	H - VH			
1.2D	the poorest countries only	VL - H			
1.2E	priority themes, sectors or regions each year	VL - VL			
1.3	How important would it be for the approval processes for UPCDP linkages and for IDRC research grants to be:				
1.3A	separate	L - VH			
1.3B	combined	H - VH			
1.4	How important would it be for CIDA and IDRC components of a proposed linkage project to:				
1.4A	each have separate Letters of Intent and proposals	VL - H			
1.4B	be combined in Letters of Intent and proposals	H - VH			
1.4C	have either separate or combined LOIs and proposals as suits the needs of a particular linkage	L - VH			
1.4D	be clearly defined and distinguished to avoid double funding	H - VH			
1.5	How many full-time equivalent faculty members are there in your university?	(600-1900)	1,064		
1.6	Estimate what percent of all your CU's full-time faculty members are or have been:				
1.6A	actually involved in UPCDP or similar linkage projects with developing country institutions	(1-10%)	6%		
1.6B	actually involved in other international development with developing countries- mainly in research:	(4-20%)	10%		
1.6C	actually involved in other international development with developing countries- NOT mainly in research	(20%)	20%		
1.6D	known to your ILO office to be interested in international development with developing countries	(15-30%)	22%		



Responses to Questionnaires		Average Rating (85% Confidence Range)			
No.	Question to ILOs and Managers	ILOs	Managers	Proposers	Combined
2.1	How important would it be for proposals for IDRC support to be submitted for approval:				
2.1A	at the outset, at the same time as initial Letters of Intent and proposals for UPCDP	L - VH	L - VH		L - VH
2.1B	after the UPCDP approval and during linkage implementation	VL - H	H - VH		H - VH
2.1C	during UPCDP phase-out	VL - H	L - H		L - H
2.1D	after UPCDP completion	VL - L	VL - H		VL - L
2.1E	at any of the above UPCDP stages	VL - VH	L - VH		L - H
2.2	How important would it be for IDRC to consider proposals for research related activities in CU/DCU linkages which the UPCDP selection committees have rejected?	L - VH	H - VH		H - VH
2.4	CIDA's general priority is sustainable development, UPCDP's objective is developmental impact in communities served by participating DCUs. Neither of these explicitly encourage research in development. Given this context, how appropriate or realistic would it be to expect IDRC's research related support to universities through UPCDP to be:				
2.4A	independent and not detract from the UPCDP objective	L - L	V - VH		L - VH
2.4B	complementary of the UPCDP objective	VH - VH	VH - VH		VH - VH
2.4C	essential to the UPCDP objective	L - VH	VL - H		L - H
2.5	How important would it be for the highest benefit from IDRC support in UPCDP to be obtained by the:				
2.5A	linkage itself	VH - VH	H - VH		H - VH
2.5B	Canadian university	H - VH	H - VH		H - VH
2.5C	developing country university	VH - VH	VH - VH		VH - VH
2.5D	Canadian faculty members involved	H - VH	H - VH		H - VH
2.5E	developing country faculty members involved	VH - VH	VH - VH		VH - VH
2.5F	the community served by the Canadian university	L - VH	L - VH		L - H
2.5G	the community served by the developing country university	VH - VH	VH - VH		VH - VH
2.6	How important would it be for the objectives of IDRC grants to be:				
2.6A	independent of the UPCDP linkage objectives	VL - VH	VL - H		VL - H
2.6B	complementary to the UPCDP linkage objectives	VH - VH	VH - VH		VH - VH
2.6C	essential to the UPCDP linkage objectives	L - VH	L - H		L - H
2.7	How a adequate would be each of the following ranges of IDRC funding for research related activities in any one UPCDP Tier 1 or Tier 2 linkage:				
2.7A	Can\$10,000 - 50,000	VL - VH	VL - H		VL - H
2.7B	Can\$10,000 - 100,000	L - VH	H - VH		H - VH
2.7C	Can\$10,000 - 200,000	VH - VH	H - VH		VH - VH
2.8	How appropriate would it be for IDRC research grants to be:				
2.8A	for DCUs exclusively	VL - L	VL - H		VL - L
2.8B	mainly for DCUs but, where necessary, for CUs as well	H - VH	H - VH		H - VH
2.8C	provided directly to and administered by DCU's in cooperation with CUs	VL - VH	L - H		L - H
2.8D	provided directly to and administered by CUs, in cooperation with and primarily for the benefit of DCUs	VH - VH	L - VH		H - VH



Responses to Questionnaires		Average Rating (85% Confidence Range)			
No.	Question to Managers and Proposers	ILOs	Managers	Proposers	Combined
3.1	To what extent does or did your Tier 1 or Tier 2 linkage address:				
3.1A	research for development		H - VH	L - VH	H - VH
3.1B	any of IDRC's Program Initiatives (See list under Summary below)		L - VH	H - VH	H - VH
3.1C	knowledge contributions to a discipline/sector		H - VH	H - VH	H - VH
3.1D	development of research capacities		H - VH	H - VH	VH - VH
3.1E	knowledge generation		H - VH	L - VH	H - VH
3.1F	knowledge distribution		H - VH	H - VH	VH - VH
3.1G	DCU ownership of knowledge and its generation		H - VH	H - VH	H - VH
3.1H	application of new knowledge		H - VH	H - H	H - VH
3.1I	evaluative research to guide University policy		L - VH	VL - H	L - H
3.1J	policy research to guide governments, industry or universities		L - VH	H - VH	H - VH
3.1K	evaluation research on the effectiveness of the linkage itself		VL - VH	VL - L	VL - H
3.1L	research that would have met IDRC requirements for funding		H - VH	L - VH	H - VH

2.3 was a narrative response only and could not be included in this analysis (see Appendix F)

#### Summary of Canadian Universities (CUs) Respondents to Questionnaire

	Total	Region			Size				Experience		
		East	Central	West	Large	Medium	Small	Very Small	High	Medium	Low
ILOs	8	0	5	3	3	4	1	0	6	1	1
Managers	13	4	5	4	3	5	4	1	8	3	2
Proposers	4	1	3	0	2	1	1	0	3	1	0
Universities	22*	5	12	5	6	9	6	1	14	5	3

\*22 universities out of a total of 40 Universities involved in UPCDP (i.e., including those which have submitted proposals but never had one approved) responded to the questionnaire. (Two people responded from three universities.)