

PART II

A BRIEF ON THE YOUNG CANADIAN RESEARCHERS AWARD

Françoise Coupal
Awards Officer
FAD



The following brief summarizes salient points of the Young Canadian Researchers Award. The brief does not represent an in-depth evaluation of the YCR awards, but seeks to provide an overview of trends and characteristics. The brief also provides baseline data for the future monitoring and evaluation of the program.

After presenting the salient points characterizing the YCR program since its inception, an overall assessment is made. Recommendations address some of the weaknesses and reinforce positive aspects of the award. A special emphasis has been placed on the selection process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
I. OVERVIEW OF YCR AWARD	1
A. PAST PROCEDURES FOR SELECTING YCR RESEARCHERS	2
II. ASSESSMENT OF YCR AWARDS	2
1. OVERVIEW OF PAST TRENDS	2
2. YCR SUPPORT TO THE HEALTH SCIENCE FIELD AND TO OTHER FIELDS OF STUDY	3
3. ASSESSMENT OF YCR SELECTION PROCESS	4
III. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE	5
1. OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS	5
2. THE SELECTION PROCESS	6
CONCLUSION	7
 <u>ANNEXES</u>	
ANNEX 1: YCR BASE DATA	9
ANNEX 2: YCR EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT RATING FORM	10
ANNEX 3: MEMO - YCR SUPPORT TO THE HEALTH SCIENCE FIELD; AND YCR SUPPORT TO OTHER FIELDS OF STUDY	14
ANNEX 4: MEMO - MEETING WITH VALERIE YOUNG OF CIDA	16
ANNEX 5: STATISTIQUES GÉNÉRALES SUR LES DEMANDES DE BOURSES 1986-87, ACDI	17

INTRODUCTION

While the majority of awards bestowed by the Division of Fellowships and Awards are granted to Third World people, a special program exists for young Canadian researchers. The award, entitled the Young Canadian Researchers Award, supports research undertaken at the Doctorat or Master's level in Third World countries by Canadians registered at a Canadian University. An exception is made for young Canadian professionals in the field of journalism, finance and administration who need not necessarily be registered at a University.

Until FY 83-84, FAD had funded the Young Canadian Researchers (YCR) from the Centre's allocation to the Fellowship program. Beginning in FY 84-84 COOP funds were available to FAD to support the YCR and Medical Health Exchange Program. The current budget of the YCR is \$450,000 for 12 months. Since 1982, \$1,170,686 has been allocated to the YCR program.

I. OVERVIEW OF THE YCR AWARD

As noted in Annex 1, a number of salient points have characterized the award. Since its inception in 1982, a total of 85 awards have been granted to young Canadians. The average age of award holders has been 22.8 years. Women account for 44% of the awards. While the YCR awards are oriented toward postgraduate students (PhD or MA), a large percentage--54%--has been given to individuals as part of their career development or formal training other than postgraduate.¹

With regard to the field of study, 49.5% of awardees have undertaken research in the Health field; followed by 20% in Social Sciences; 15% in the Agriculture, Food and Nutrition field; 7% in Journalism; 5% in Earth Sciences; and 3.5% in the Communications field. There have been no awards in the Information field.

The geographic distribution of research has spanned the developing regions with the highest percentage--31%--of research being undertaken in Latin America; followed by 23.5% in West Africa; and 16.5% in Asia. A low number of awardees--2.4%--have undertaken research in the Middle East and the South Asia region. Approximately 5.8% of the total awardees have not undertaken research in a developing country within the context of the YCR award.

¹ The majority of awards other than postgraduate have been granted to Medical students using the YCRA to support their elective.

A. PAST PROCEDURES FOR SELECTING YOUNG CANADIAN RESEARCHERS

In the past, candidates for the YCR award have submitted their application for competition. Applications are first screened by FAD to ensure that eligibility requirements are met. Completed applications are then forwarded to the appropriate division for their evaluation and comments.

In the past, the Division was requested to address the following two questions in assessing the candidates's proposal:

1. Does the proposal refer to a subject of high priority to your Division?
2. Are the candidate's academic qualifications satisfactory?

On the basis of recommendations made by the Centre's program staff, a Selection Committee composed of the Deputy Director of the COOP Division, the Director and Associate Director, Canadian Programs and the Award Officer of FAD met to make the final selection.

II. ASSESSMENT OF YCR AWARDS

Before touching upon this section a caveat is in order. Rather than undertake an exhaustive assessment of the YCR awards, this brief will highlight or identify characteristics and areas of weakness of the YCR award program.

1. Overview of Past Characteristics

A number of features have characterized the YCR program. These are:

- a) a very high number of awardees --49.5%-- in the Health Science field;
- b) a very low number of awardees --2.4%-- undertaking research in the Middle East and South Asia;
- c) 5.8% of awardees have not undertaken research in a Third World country as part of their award;
- d) a high number of awardees --54%-- received an award as part of their training vs toward an M.A. or PhD;
- e) a low rate of return of applications by the competition deadline. While the number of candidates selected through competition has increased over the years, only 51.7% have been selected through competition and the Selection Committee; and
- f) the undistinguished quality of activity reports by awardees.

2. YCR support to the Health Science field and to other fields of study.

- a. FAD support to the Health Science field within the context of the YCR awards has been unique (see Annex 3). The eligibility criteria for candidates in this field has been applied in a different manner in comparison to the overall YCR requirements. Support to the Health Science field has been characterized by a number of distinguishing features. These are:
 1. YCR awards have been given to the Département de microbiologie, Université de Montréal and the Department of Community Health Sciences, University of Alberta, for the selection, support and administration of awards. These awards are given to medical students who choose to do an elective in development/international health. Support has totaled \$ 69,000;
 2. the awards granted to the above universities have ranged in duration from one to three months;
 3. the YCR awards to the Health Science field account for 49.5% of the total awards granted; and
 4. several of these awards have been given to candidates who are not planning to undertake research in a Third World country (Anderson, Manitoba; J. Farrow, U.K.; Dery, Hawaii; and Loevinsohn, Boston).

A number of interrelated factors have shaped the nature of FAD's assistance to the Health Science field. First, Canada has placed little emphasis on the importance of tropical medicine and international health. Consequently, it was felt that a gap needed to be filled in order to encourage and support pre-med students working in the Health and Medical field in understanding the health problems of the Third World. Secondly, medical students follow a different type of program of studies than other students. Normally, a research thesis or topic is not a prerequisite for graduation. While electives do exist, they are usually three months in duration. Similarly, internships are often only one month.

For the above reasons, the YCRA criteria has not been rigidly adhered to candidates in the Health Science field.

- b. Another issue is the field and level of study supported by FAD and as defined in the brochure. 52 award holders or 61% do not fall into the categories as those prescribed in the brochure. For example, there are many awardees undertaking research in agriculture as part of their M.A. rather than the PhD. Such cases alone account for 11.4% of the 52 award holders whereas health science takes the lion's share with more than 62% not fitting into the prescribed YCR field and level of study. Such a high figure, may indicate the need to reassess the fields of study supported by IDRC.

If the CIDA Awards Program for Canadians supports primarily on-the-job training and practical work/study assignments in Third World countries rather than academic research, IDRC may want to study the possibility of opening up the YCR awards to both the PhD and M.A. level in the fields of Administration, Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences; Information Sciences; Social Sciences; Energy; and Health Sciences. Such a policy would avoid confusion by applicants, greatly simplify the process, avoid the contradictions noted above and complement CIDA's program.

3. Assessment of YCR Selection Process

As for the selection process, a large part would appear to be done in a "bureaucratic fashion". Application forms and proposals are simply forwarded to the concerned division for their evaluation and appraisal. Very little exchange, between and within divisions, would appear to go on to discuss the objectives of the YCR awards, the criteria for selection and/or the merits of the proposal in question.

The strength of such a procedure is that considerable latitude is given to the division in assessing the candidate. The major weakness, however, is that the criteria and tools of evaluation lie in the hands of the individual program officer and consequently can vary greatly from person to person.

In many cases, the Division could not adequately evaluate the applicant's proposal due to:

- a) an incomplete file (lack of c.v., thesis proposal or transcripts) making it difficult for a full and fair evaluation;
- b) eligibility requirements not fulfilled.

Where the applicant's file could be evaluated, comments varied widely. In some cases, the Division gave a full-fledged evaluation of the proposal, three to four pages in length, whereas others were very short and to the point (i.e. "the proposal on ... by ... was very weak and should not be considered for support"). In general, comments averaged a paragraph.

The following comments made by the Divisions were the most common:

- meets eligibility criteria;
- important development or research topic;
- appropriate choice of country to carry out research;
- has familiarity with literature on topic;

- proposal well presented, developed and clear;
- proposal has been approved by the University;
- speaks other languages;
- has lived in LDC and is therefore familiar with living and research conditions there;
- has strong, good or weak recommendations from referees;
- has an appropriate academic background to carry out research;
- present and future relevance of research topic to issues and interests of LDC's and/or other countries;
- sufficient information on how research will be carried out;
- research is of direct and central relevance to our program vs peripheral priority to Division;
- candidate has a serious and extensive involvement in development;
- study retrospective vs related to future policy orientation;
- proposal broad and unfocused vs clear and precise;
- proposal of academic and practical interest;
- innovative topic;
- considerable body of work exists on topic;
- time in field sufficient to undertake research;
- previous field experience;
- potential for making scholarly contribution;
- research design weak vs strong;
- evidence of strong commitment to development;
- proposal already intensively studied, well documented vs innovative;
- proposal too ambitious;
- clear idea of questions wanted answered;
- research topic too theoretical; and
- applicability of results.

The above comments show the extent and degree to which comments can vary.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

It is important to enhance and strengthen the YCR award program. In particular, changes would focus on a number of interrelated areas that address weaknesses and reinforce positive aspects of the program.

1. Overall Recommendations

In the future, FAD should pay greater attention to the following:

- a) increase the number of awardees chosen through competition via a more extensive distribution of YCR kits to NGO's, CIDA and through newspaper advertising;
- b) establish an ad-hoc selection committee to evaluate those candidates not considered through the competition in January;

- c) decline all applicants not undertaking any type of research or training in a Third World country;
- d) evaluate the focus and orientation of the awards given to the Health Science field to ensure that the short-term elective of one to three months is an effective support in this field (such support could possibly be financed under the umbrella of the Medical Exchange Program) (see Annex 3);
- e) study the possibility of opening up the YCR awards to both the PhD and M.A. level; such a policy would avoid confusion by applicants, greatly simplify the process, avoid contradictions and complement CIDA's program (see Annex 3);
- f) upgrade the quality of activity reports by awardees.

For awards given to the Health Science field, a special evaluation will be undertaken at the end of 1986. The quality of Activity reports will be upgraded through discussions with awardees. Feedback from these exchanges will contribute to the development of a new format of a more substantive nature.

2. The Selection Process

FAD needs to streamline the existing selection process and to introduce more effective mechanisms of evaluation. In particular, changes would foster a better understanding of the YCR program within the Centre and ensure that all evaluations are screened equally using more comprehensive criteria.

This brief proposes the following course of action for the 1987/88 competition:

1. a preliminary screening of applications by FAD to ensure that the files are complete;
2. a meeting with all the concerned Divisions in February/March to discuss the YCR award, answer queries and explain the evaluation and assessment grid;
3. the introduction of an evaluation and assessment grid for the screening of all candidates. Annex 2 presents the proposed grid for the screening of applicants; and
4. an evaluation of the usefulness of the grid;

5. the inclusion of a representative of CIDA in the Selection Committee.

CONCLUSION

Past characteristics of the YCR program can serve as a basis for proposed changes and improvement. Through periodic reviews of this nature, changes and modifications made to the various aspects of the award program will be evaluated to ensure that they lead to the progressive overall improvement of the YCR award program. Hopefully, this will avoid Alphonse Karr's dilemma of "plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose".

ANNEXES

ANNEX I

1982-1986
YOUNG CANADIAN RESEARCHERS AWARDS

BASE DATA:	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
1) Total number of awards granted ¹	85	100%
2) Total number selected through Competition/Selection Committee	44	51.7%
3) Number completed 1982-1986 Number active	64 29	75% 25%
4) Average age	21.8 yrs.	-
5) Total Male Total Female	48 37	56% 44%
6) Toward PhD Toward MA As Part of Training ²	28 11 46	33% 13% 54%
7) <u>Stream of Research & Study:</u> AFNS Communication Health Sciences ³ Information Sciences Social Sciences Energy Earth Sciences Journalism	13 3 42 - 17 - 4 6	15% 3.5% 49.5% - 20% - 5% 7%
8) <u>Geographic Distribution:</u> ASRO EARO LARO MERO SARO WARO Other: - Manitoba (Anderson) - Liverpool U.K. (Jane Faber) - London U.K. (J. Farrow) - Hawaii (Déry) - Boston (Loevinsohn)	14 15 27 2 2 20 5	16.5% 18% 31% 2.4% 2.4% 23.5% 5.8%

¹ Of the total number of awards granted, one declined.

² Awardees recipient of awards as part of their training and/or professional development other than postgraduate as in the journalism, administration and medical field.

³ 41 Health Sciences awards have been granted averaging 4.85 award months or 16.5 award years.

ANNEX 2

EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT RATING FORM
YOUNG CANADIAN RESEARCHERS AWARDS
IDRC

Name of Candidate: _____

Research Topic of Thesis Title: _____

Year of Competition: _____

TO BE FILLED IN BY FAD:

BASIC ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS	YES	NO	COMMENTS
1. Canadian citizenship			
2. Registered in a canadian university			
3. Proposed MA, Doctorate or Training in appropriate field of study			
4. Affiliation with institution or organization where research & training, or placement will take place			
5. Dossier complete (transcripts, references)			
- transcripts			
- reference 1			
- reference 2			

Name: _____

Date: _____

INSTRUCTIONS: The following grid has been designed to facilitate the evaluation & assessment of YCR applicants. Please assess the applications & assign a numerical ranking in accordance with the selection criteria listed below. Feel free to comment on any aspect of the proposal.

SELECTION CRITERIA

I. Suitability of Candidate

The objective of the YCR award is to facilitate the involvement of younger Canadians in research on Third-World issues. It is important to ensure that applicants are suitably qualified to successfully undertake research in a developing country. To what degree is the applicant suitable given the following:

	Poor 0-4	Marginal 5-6	Good 7-8	Excellent 9-10
1) Appropriate academic background to undertake research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) Academic standing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Letters of references	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) Previous professional experience	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5) Previous field experience	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6) Language skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

II. Research Proposal

	Poor 0-4	Marginal 5-6	Good 7-8	Excellent 9-10
1) Is it coherent, relevant, well-formulated & presented?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) Is it methodologically sound?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Is it significant in development terms?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) Does it include a substantial period of professionally relevant fieldwork?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5) Does it represent a reasonable degree of challenge for the candidate in question?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

III. Feasibility of Research

Is the purpose and research feasible with respect to:

- a) the technical qualifications of the candidate
- b) the constraints of time (tenure of YCR award is up to 12 months)
- c) location
- d) institutional arrangements
- e) the proposed budget

Poor
0-4

☐

Marginal
5-6

☐

Good
7-8

☐

Excellent
9-10

☐

IV. Proposed Affiliation

Based on the information provided in the application & your own experience:

Is the proposed institution or organization where research training or placement will take place qualified to advise the candidate in the field of expertise?

Poorly
Qualified
0-4

☐

Marginally
Qualified
5-6

☐

Qualified
7-8

☐

Highly
Qualified
9-10

☐

Comments:

V. Career Objectives

What is the likelihood that the research or training proposed will assist the candidate in achieving his/her career objectives.

VI. IDRC Priority

To what extent is the applicant's proposed programme relevant in light of IDRC's mandate & the priorities of your Division?

Comments:

Poor
0-4

☐

Marginal
5-6

☐

Good
7-8

☐

Excellent
9-10

☐

Irrelevant

0-4

☐

Marginally
Relevant
5-6

☐

Relevant

7-8

☐

Very
Relevant
9-10

☐

VII. Future Impact

1) Is the individual committed to international development in the long run?

No Commitment

0-4

☐

Irrelevant

Somewhat
Committed
5-6

☐

Marginally
Relevant
5-6

Very
Committed
9-10

☐

Relevant

Difficult to
Assess

☐

Very
Relevant
9-10

2) What is the potential for making a scholarly contribution?

0-4

☐
☐
☐
☐

3) Are the findings and results likely to find practical application?

☐
☐
☐
☐

Comments:

VIII. Developing Country Requirements

1) How relevant is the proposed research in terms of the requirements and needs of developing countries?

Irrelevant

0-4

☐

Marginally
Relevant
5-6

☐

Relevant

7-8

☐

Very
Relevant
9-10

☐

Comments:

IX. Possible Recommendations for: (optional)

1) Contacts:

2) Host Institution:

X. WHAT IS YOUR OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THIS APPLICANT?

Name of Assessor(s)

Division

Date

ANNEX 3

Gerry Bourrier/Chris Smart

October 29, 1986

Françoise Coupal

YCR support to the Health Science field, and
YCR support to other fields of study
=====

1. FAD support to the Health Science field within the context of the YCP awards has been unique. The criteria or eligibility requirements for candidates in this field have been applied in a different manner in comparison to the overall YCR requirements. Support to the Health Science field has been characterized by a number of distinguishing features. These are:
 1. Part of monies of the YCR budget have been earmarked to the Département de microbiologie, Université de Montréal and the Department of Community Health Sciences, University of Alberta, for the selection, support and administration of awards since 1985. Support has totaled \$69,000;
 2. The awards granted by the above universities have ranged in duration from one to three months;
 3. The YCR awards to the Health Science field account for 49.5% of the total awards granted;
 4. Some of these awards have been given to candidates who are not planning to undertake research in a Third World country (Anderson, Manitoba; J. Farrow, U.K.; Dery, Hawaii; and Loevinsohn, Boston).

As this approach was developed under the auspices of the previous Director, Mr. Allan Rix, and that no explanatory note could be found in the files, it was felt that a discussion with Mr. Rix could be both enlightening and beneficial to our corporate memory. This meeting took place in early October, 1986.

Indeed, the rationale behind such an orientation helps to transform an enigma such as the particular nature of support to the Health Science field, into a greater understanding of the approach adopted by FAD.

Basically, a number of interrelated factors have helped shape the nature of FAD's assistance to the Health Science field. First, Canada has placed little emphasis on the importance of tropical medicine in comparison to other industrialized countries. Consequently, it was felt that a gap needed to be filled in order to

encourage and support pre-med students working in the Health and Medical field in understanding diseases of the Third World. Secondly, medical students follow a different type of program of studies than other students. Normally a research thesis or topic is not a prerequisite for graduation. While electives do exist, they are usually three months in duration. Similarly, internships are often only one month.

For the above reasons, special consideration has been taken into account for candidates in the Health Science field.

Indeed, it would be extremely worthwhile to evaluate the support to the Health Science field in order to ascertain if IDRC support is having the desired impact.

- II. Another issue, indirectly related to that of the Health Science field, is the field of study or research supported by FAP and as defined in the brochure. It would appear that 51 award holders or 60% do not fall into the categories as those prescribed in the brochure. For example, there are many awardees undertaking research in agriculture as part of their M.A. and not Ph.D. Such a high figure, may indicate the need to reassess the fields of study supported by IDRC.

If CIDA Awards Program for Canadians supports primarily on-the-job training and practical work/study assignments in Third World countries, we may want to study the possibility of simply opening up the YCP awards to both the Ph.D. and M.A. level in the fields of Administration; Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences; Information Sciences; Social Sciences; Energy; and Health Sciences. Such a policy would avoid confusion by applicants, greatly simplify the process, avoid contradictions as noted above and complement CIDA's program.

Indeed, I would welcome the opportunity to discuss with you in greater depth the above issues.

FPG/vs

ANNEX 4



INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE

CENTRE DE RECHERCHES POUR LE DÉVELOPPEMENT INTERNATIONAL

MEMORANDUM/NOTE DE SERVICE

TO/A:

DATE:

FILE

October 30, 1986

FROM/DE:

Françoise Coupal *FPC*

SUBJECT/OBJET:

Meeting with Valerie Young of CIDA within the context of the
Young Canadian Researchers Awards

I met with Valerie Young of CIDA on October 23, 1986 to familiarize myself with CIDA Awards Programs for Canadians.

Indeed, the meeting proved to be very informative on a number of fronts. First, it would appear that there is a tendency not to fund applicants undertaking research. Emphasis is placed particularly on practical work/study assignments and on-the-job training programs. Secondly, the award program is currently being reviewed which will orient future CIDA policies in this area. It was hinted that a recommendation might be put forth to transfer CIDA's awards programs for Canadians to IDRC.

Reference was also made to an ARA Assessment (Toronto, 1985) and to the Nielsen Task Force and the document "Improved Program Delivery - Education and Research" which comments on both IDRC's and CIDA's programs. These documents as well as CIDA's mailing list will be copied to us for our information by Ms. Young.

If the CIDA awards are not oriented toward research at the M.A. level then it would be important for IDRC to possibly review its criteria. There could be a lacuna that neither CIDA nor IDRC are filling (research in the areas of agriculture, social sciences, development, etc. at the M.A. level). It would be a shame not to fund outstanding proposals in these areas, because they could not be pigeon-holed.

This could be remedied by reviewing our own criteria and by ensuring an exchange of information between CIDA and IDRC in order that excellent proposals of possible interest to IDRC are not overlooked.

FPC/vs

ANNEX 5

STATISTIQUES GÉNÉRALES SUR LES DEMANDES DE BOURSES
1986-87
CIDA AWARDS APPLICATION BREAKDOWN

Nombre total de demandes/Total applications.....	162
Anglophones.....	117
Francophones.....	45
Hommes/Men.....	88
Femmes/Women.....	74
Dossiers incomplets/Files incomplete.....	10
Dossiers ne répondant pas aux critères d'admissibilité/Files which do not meet criteria.....	26
Dossiers rejetés après analyse/Files rejected after analysis.....	113

PROVINCES

. Terre-Neuve/Newfoundland.....	2
. Nouvelle-Ecosse/Nova Scotia.....	4
. Nouveau-Brunswick/New Brunswick.....	3
. Ile-du-Prince Edouard/Prince Edward Island.....	0
. Québec/Quebec.....	52
. Ontario.....	57
. Manitoba.....	6
. Saskatchewan.....	2
. Alberta.....	17
. Colombie Britannique/British Columbia.....	17
. Territoires du Nord-Ouest/North-West Territories.....	0
. Non-spécifiés/Unspecified.....	2
	<u>162</u>

SECTEURS/SECTORS

Ressources Naturelles/Natural Resources

. Agriculture.....	36
. Forêt/Forestry.....	4
. Pêche/Fisheries.....	6
. Inventaire des ressources/Resource Inventories.....	2
. Services industriels/Industrial Services.....	11
	<u>59</u>

Développement social/Social Development

. Santé/Health and Population.....	24
. Education.....	18
. Développement Sociale/Social Development.....	11
. Habitat/Human Settlements.....	3
. Communication pour le développement/Communications....	7
. Femmes dans le développement/Women in Development.....	9
. Gestion/Management.....	2
	<u>74</u>

Infrastructure

. Energie/Energy.....	4
. Eaux/Water.....	11
. Architecture.....	3
. Transport/Transportation.....	1
	<u>19</u>

TOTAL126

Dossiers incomplete (10) ou ne répondant pas aux
critères (26) non inclus/files incomplete (10) or
files which do not meet criteria (26) not included

Jim Mullin

December 3, 1986

G.R. Bourrier

Young Canadian Researchers Awards: A Review

The Fellowship and Awards Division undertook a review of the YCR program during the past few months. Attached for your information are copies of two separate documents which constitute the review: Part I is a survey undertaken by Patrick Doherty while Part II is a brief written by Françoise Coupal. The review is then analyzed by Chris Smart in his memo to me of 24 November.

The review brought out a number of interesting facts relating to the YCR, some of which will cause us to reassess certain elements of the program. In particular, the program appears overfunded, in its present form, which up until now has required FAD to adopt a much more flexible approach to spending the YCR funds than originally planned. Though this is not necessarily improper, it does open us up for criticism. In anticipation of this, our most recent YCR project summary, approved by the Board in October, made reference to the possibility of an oversubscription, and suggested alternatives. This in my judgement is a short term solution.

The overriding feature of this whole program has to be whether the program has achieved its ultimate goal - to train young Canadians in research for development in order to direct them to development related activities as a career choice. The statistics are promising in this regard (61.5% maintain some involvement with international development) although the response sample is disappointingly small. Also, only 33% will have obtained a PhD, despite the fact that the principal focus of the program is directed to that level of academic qualification.

One of the questions which we must ask ourselves is why are we not attracting more qualified candidates into the mainstream of our program - the training of young PhD's. Chris captures this dilemma in his statement on page 3, last para: "The survey results lead me to believe that no amount of advertising will increase either the quantity or quality of the applicants". He then goes on to conclude: "The survey has shown that we do not attract people into development who have not previously begun to think in this direction". He then

explains this by referring to the "filters" we exercise to screen out candidates and which in part is the cause of our not being able to attract enough qualified candidates. The end result is a bending of the rules to spend the money, which has some merit if the ultimate goal is achieved!

This brings me to the point of examining alternatives to ensure that the majority of awards are given out by competition based on selection criteria suited to a greater cross-section of our target population. I think we have to examine the award itself and question whether we should continue to target the PhD population, and if so, whether we are realistic in our expectations. For instance, we could change the nature of the competition to open it to a wider group and/or extend the duration of the awards. Here are some examples:

- 1) Make the award 2 years rather than 1.
- 2) Open it officially to MSc level awards
- 3) Open it to visa students
- 4) Open it to a combination of the above.

There are pros and cons to the above alternatives which will need to be examined more fully. However, I have a few thoughts which I would like to share at this time:

- 1) Make PhD award 2 years rather than 1. I believe that the current 1 year PhD award is unrealistic. It is almost asking too much of a PhD student to split his /her research into two components - one in Canada and one abroad (a PhD research thesis project invariably will take more than one year). Thus, we could offer the award for 2 years, with the second year being renewable following satisfactory progress during year 1.

- 2) Open to MSc level: At the moment 13% of our awards are for MSc's, and these are not all in the eligible areas (Health, Journalism, Finance and Administration). There is merit in opening this competition to MSc's. After all, the young person who is prepared to do an MSc in development might be more apt to embark on a development career than the PhD candidate who might already be committed to a career other than in development. This is an issue which requires debate, particularly in view of CIDA's current program for Canadians which includes MSc training as one of the three target groups. (The other two are in-service training and attachments).
- 3) Visa students: I'm not yet ready to concede to our spending a portion of our YCR funds for visa students. The whole issue is fraught with problems which have to be thought out carefully. Thus, in that respect, I'm not as sanguine as Chris is to opening up the competition to that group. Having stated my bias, I agree that we have to assess this aspect carefully in preparation for the discussion which surely will come up during our IDDR defense.

In summary, this review comes at a very opportune time. In a sense, we are at a crossroad. Our Division is reaching maturity (if not already there), we are currently being reviewed by the Board, the Division is under new management (including a new Awards Officer with a new, fresh perspective) and lastly, the Coop Division is being reviewed (Coop funds are the source of funding for the YCR).

We have a bit of time on our hands in that the YCR project summary was approved in October and we have stepped up our advertising campaign to see if we can attract more people into the competition under the existing format. However, I think changes will be in order for next year.

For obvious reasons, I would like to keep this review more or less in-house for the time being, at least until we get a chance to discuss internally some of the above issues. Your comments/advice would be gratefully appreciated in the interim.

Thank you.

Attach.

PEARSON CANDIDATES OVERVIEW 1986-87 (LARO)

Introduction

In the 1986-87 Pearson Selection from the Latin American Regional Office there were a total of 111 applicants representing many countries, areas of interest and sectors of public service. The deadline for submission of the applications was September 30th, 1985 and during the week of October 28th - 31st a selection of 12 applicants for interview was made. The following is an overview of the total applications for this year's selection along with some observations and recommendations for future selections.

Overview

Country Distribution of Applicants

Amongst the 111 candidates for this year's Pearson Fellowships were applicants from the majority of countries within the region. However, perhaps because of the relative differences in size, Latin America was somewhat better represented than the Caribbean. The following table summarizes the overall distribution of applicants.

Table 1 - Country Distribution of the 1986-87 Pearson Applicants

Country:	Number:
Argentina	8
Bahamas	1
Barbados	2
Brazil	40
Chile	8
Colombia	7
Costa Rica	2
Dominican Republic	2
Ecuador	1
Guatemala	3
Haiti	2
Honduras	2
Jamaica	5
Mexico	8
Panama	3
Peru	13
St. Lucia	2
Uruguay	1
Venezuela	1

As the preceding table shows the overwhelming number of applications originated with Brazil followed somewhat distantly by Peru, Argentina, Chile, Mexico and Colombia, countries, with the notable exception of Argentina and perhaps Mexico, which have traditionally been most successful in receiving Pearson Fellowships in the past.

Table 2 - Country Distribution of LARO Pearson Awardees 1976-85

Country:	Number:
Bolivia	1
Brazil	3
Bahamas	1
Belize	1
Chile	3
Colombia	6
Jamaica	1
Mexico	1
Panama	1
Peru	2

Areas of Interest

Not surprisingly, the 111 candidates for this year's selection reflected many areas of interest. However, as with country distribution, the traditional areas of interest remain strong. Research and training in the areas of Health Sciences and Agriculture remain constant but there appears, as well, to be an increasing demand for studies centered on communications and management skills. The following two tables summarize the current areas of interest and the areas which have been supported in the past.

Table 3 - Areas of Interest Proposed by Pearson Candidates for 1986-87

Area:	Number:
Agriculture	9
Communications	14
Computer Studies	5
Economics	2
Education	1
Health Sciences	15
Library Science	4
Public Admin./Management	22
Resource Management	6
Research Methodology	5
Rural Development	2
Science & Technology Policy	1
Sociology	1
Urban Development	6
Other	3
Not Defined	15

Table 4 - Fields of Study of Pearson Awardees 1976-85

Area:	Number:
Agriculture	3
Computer Studies	1
Economics	1
Education	3
Engineering	1
Fisheries	2
Geography	1
Health	4
Information Science	2
Public Administration	1
Technology Policy	1

Positions Held by the Applicants

In accordance with Centre policy the majority of applicants performed planning and management functions in government positions or were professionals assisting the governments in its planning and management functions. However, there were a significant number of applicants who were government officials not involved in planning or management functions and were therefore not in line with Centre priorities and an even greater number of private individuals, professionals, researchers, even a student who did not meet Centre requirements at all. Among these there were a surprising number of academics from State universities who clearly saw themselves as civil servants but who would not be considered as such within the Centre.

Table 5 - Positions Held by the Pearson Applicants of 1986-87

Position:	Number:
Government Officials	33
Managers of Government Corporations	12
Researchers & University Professors	21
Miscellaneous Professionals	32
Students	1
Others Not Defined	12

Observations on Application Procedures

Under the present system the Centre is responsible for the distribution of application packages to the Regional Offices and the Embassies. The Embassies, in turn, are responsible for the dissemination of information, the identification of candidates, the overseeing of the completion of the required forms and the return of the completed forms to the Regional Office, or alternately Ottawa, by the September 30th deadline. The candidates are



required to complete standard application forms and to attach a letter of support from their current employer. They frequently include their CV's, language certificates and copies of their diplomas or awards, but they are not currently required to do so.

In this year's applications certain anomalies were observed. Firstly, it was discovered that there was a discrepancy between the candidates' language ability as indicated by their completion of the application forms or by their attached language ability test score and their own perception of their ability. Such a discovery calls into question the ability of the primary selector to assess the candidates' language ability thereby leaving this assessment in the hands of the panel of interviewers, a costly exercise. Secondly, the applications for 1986-87 appeared to take several forms. There were original Centre published forms, xeroxed copies of these forms, alternate forms and CV's with no forms any of which might or might not be accompanied by a referral letter from the Embassy. (See Table below).

Table 6 - Type of Form Submitted by the 1986-87 Pearson Applicants

Type of Form:	Number:
Original IDRC Printed Form	32
Xeroxed IDRC Printed Form	67
Alternate Form	3
C.V. Only	9

This difference in applications posed several problems. Firstly, if procedure was to be followed all forms ought to be original, as distributed by the Embassies, and accompanied by letters of referral, since the Embassies are responsible for identifying the candidates and forwarding their applications. Moreover, when procedure was not followed many of the forms, and certainly the alternates and CV's, were incomplete and did not provide sufficient information for accurate assessment of the candidate concerned. In addition, it was clear that those applications which were submitted without proper forms or on xeroxed forms represented the majority of applications which might be rejected immediately upon first reading as not meeting the conditions of the award.

In light of these observations it seems advisable to recommend two things. Firstly, that all candidates be required to attach a language certificate or copy thereof to their application so as to render the language assessment, a vital portion of the preliminary selection, more accurate. Secondly, that in future a policy be made that only applications which are complete and submitted on the appropriate form with Embassy's endorsement be considered. Thereby increasing fairness to those who do follow procedures and eliminating immediately those who do not meet Centre requirements thus allowing greater time for careful and thoughtful examination of the endorsed candidates before the interview.