

REPORT OF THE BOARD REVIEW PANEL
OF THE FELLOWSHIPS AND AWARDS DIVISION,
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE

January 1987

K.L. Stuart, Chairperson
A.A. MacDonald

J.C.M. Shute, Consultant

129.

IDDR: Report of the Board Review Pane of The
Fellowships and Awards Division, International
Development Research Centre

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
A. Executive Summary	1
B. Introduction	
1. Background to the Review	3
2. Terms of Reference	4
3. Review Methodology	4
4. Limitations of the Review	5
5. Acknowledgements	6
C. Observations and Recommendations	
1. Current Operating Mandate	6
2. Program Development, Delivery and Management	8
3. Funding Adequacy	13
4. Outcomes of Funding Support	15
5. FAD's Role Within the Centre	17
6. Research on Training and Human Resource Development	22
7. Training Policy Guidelines	23
8. Relations with CIDA	24
9. Impact on Third World Training Requirements	25
10. Priorities and Strategic Intentions	28
11. Growth Potential	29
12. Third Party Linkages	30
D. Other Issues Identified by the Board Review Panel	
1. Relations with Canadian Universities	31
2. Conditionality in Relations with Third World Institutions	33
3. Involvement of Women in Training Programs	34
E. Conclusion	35
Endnotes	36
Appendix A: Terms of Reference	37
Appendix B: Individuals Interviewed	40

A- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Board Review of the Fellowships and Awards Division (FAD) of IDRC conducted between May and October, 1986, is strongly supportive of the work of the division and **finds** that its contribution to the work of the Centre has grown in importance since its inception. The FAD program exhibits a number of strengths, among which are its effective decentralized planning and budgeting, the high quality of its professional staff, the FADMIS* data processing capability, the strategic emphasis of its past performance and future plans, and the creativity exercised in planning and conducting training activities. As the Centre and FAD look to the future, the Board Review **recommends** that:

- More explicit conditionality criteria should be tied to awards to ensure the maximum beneficial impact of training (pp. 7-8, 33).
- The FADMIS storage and retrieval system should be modified to handle all IDRC training data (p. 9).
- The "tilt to Africa" proposed in PPR: VII should be reflected in FAD programming (pp. 10, 28-29).
- FAD should take steps to become more familiar with Canadian resources for training and education (pp. 12, 31-33).
- More attention should be paid to the training process itself (pp. 12-13, 22-23).
- A greater proportion of awards should be allocated to human resource development research (p. 22).
- FAD should collect comparative training cost information as one element in developing a rationale for Centre training budget allocations (p. 14-15).
- The Centre, through FAD, should conduct a large-scale and detailed tracer study of former award holders to obtain a clearer picture of training impact than is now possible (p. 15-16).

(* Fellowships & Awards Division Management Information System)

- FAD (and others in IDRC concerned with training) should develop consistent evaluation instruments to enable continuous systematic assessment of training to be done (p. 16-17).
- Because of the need to rationalize training processes and logistics, to monitor total Centre training costs and to develop coherent Centre-wide training policy and strategy, FAD should be given a more prominent role and increased responsibility for training in the Centre (pp. 17-21, 28-30).
- Although the 1981 Training Policy Study remains relevant, a revision of training policy in general should be undertaken which would reflect, in part, a **modified** role for FAD and the consequent shifts in program division responsibilities for training (p. 23-24).
- Dialogue with CIDA (in particular with its new Social and Human Resources Development **Division**) should be intensified on matters related to human resource development (pp. 24-25).
- FAD (and others in IDRC concerned with **training**) should take deliberate measures to promote through training, the dissemination and implementation of research results (pp. 25-28).
- FAD (and others in IDRC concerned with **training**) should take whatever steps are appropriate to ensure the participation of a reasonable proportion of women in training activities (pp. 34).

For the detailed treatment of the items summarized here, we invite the readers to consider the material which follows.

B. INTRODUCTION

1. Background to the Review

Integral to the mandate of IDRC, as expressed in the Act which established it, is the responsibility of building up the human resource in research related to Third World development. The task of strengthening the capabilities of individuals and institutions to generate, adapt and apply knowledge for the benefit of the developing regions of the world has required the Centre to engage itself in promoting the development of a special range of human skills and talents. Over the years the Centre has evolved mechanisms for addressing research skill shortages in developing countries. The Fellowships and Awards Division, which was formed in 1983, now carries a major responsibility for assisting in the development of research skills in fields which are part of the broad mandate of IDRC. Although a program of training and awards had existed in the Centre's earlier years, the new Division (FAD) took over the administration of many of the Centre's training programs and awards. At the same time, other Centre divisions retained their own training interests and programs. This division of training responsibility persists and it is the root of a dilemma whose resolution, we suggest, will do much to advance the Centre's training objectives.

Now that the Fellowships and Awards Division has been in operation for almost four years, it was thought timely to review both its past performance and its future plans, and to consider **recommendations** for an enhanced response to training needs related to Third World development. Hence this review.

2. Terms of Reference

The review was guided by terms of reference which are summarized thus:

1. Review the current operating mandate of the division.
2. Assess the division's program development, delivery and management, and review past priorities, with reference to:
 - adequacy of funding
 - outcomes of funding support
 - role as a training division and relationships with other divisions
 - the division's role in support of research on human resource development
 - training policy guidelines
 - relationship with CIDA
 - impact on training requirements of the Third World
3. Assess the strategic intentions of the division by reviewing:
 - training needs as identified by the division
 - the allocation of future priorities by the division to its program
 - the potential for growth of the division
 - contractual links with Third Party institutions.

The more detailed official Terms of Reference are found in Appendix A (pp. 37-39).

3. Review Methodology

The panel adopted a variety of methods in undertaking this review. After a preliminary planning meeting of the panel in April, 1986, the consultant began data collection by reviewing in detail a large quantity of IDRC documentation, from board policy statements to Project Completion Reports and other files, **as well** as unpublished

material. One of the more important documents for purposes of the review was the FAD Program Statement from which a series of issues was identified which permitted the consultant to formulate a preliminary interview schedule. Interviews were subsequently held by the consultant and by the total review panel over a period of several months with a number of Centre staff. Interviews were also held by the consultant with several staff members of both CIDA and the World University Service of Canada, with a number of IDRC award holders in Sri Lanka and in Canada and with the administrator of the **Pearson** Fellowships (see Appendix B). In addition, the consultant attended a FAD staff meeting. The review panel met on four occasions over the six months of the evaluation to conduct interviews, review results and to formulate and clarify comments and recommendations.

4. Limitations of the Review

No one-time assessment can provide a comprehensive view of a program dealing with the development of human capacities and skills. Further, although the impact of training is difficult to assess at any time, in this instance that limitation was exacerbated by the inability of the panel to follow-up award holders in their own countries. Gauging the short and medium term impact of training on individuals and organizations would have permitted the evaluation to be made with greater confidence. In addition, time and circumstance did not permit us to solicit the views of a wider range of interested individuals, both inside IDRC and in organizations with related interests.

5. Acknowledgements

The review panel could not have completed its work without the assistance of many individuals. We wish to acknowledge the cordiality and helpfulness of Centre staff in eight divisions who were so willing to share with us their time and their views. The FAD staff were open and cooperative with us in every way and demonstrated to us clearly that they welcome this review. The Office of Planning and Evaluation, initially through Sing Chew and then through Tim Dottridge (and throughout in the person of **Cathi Raymond Martin**), was immensely helpful in facilitating smoothly the required logistical arrangements. Finally, we want to thank those few award-holders interviewed for this review. They are the direct beneficiaries of the Centre's training activities and the relevance and immediacy of their views are gratefully acknowledged.

C. OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We present our findings and recommendations in the sequence suggested by our Terms of Reference, followed by comments and suggestions arising from additional observations made in the course of our assessment. Although most of what follows reflects widespread support, even consensus, from our respondents, some of the views are purely our own.

1. Current Operating Mandate

When this review began, we could not identify an explicit **statement** of objectives or mission for FAD. The treatment of training in the Centre seems to have been fragmented and ad hoc since the

inception of the Centre in 1970, evolving gradually into a substantial commitment to human resource development. However, not until mid-1986 was a concrete mission statement for the division formulated -- this despite the fact that, as the 1981 Training Policy Study indicated, more than ten percent of Centre program appropriations over its first ten years had been allocated to training, a total of some \$20 million in support of over 3,000 trainees.' We felt that our evaluation was initially somewhat hampered by the lack of a statement of objectives against which achievements could be judged. However, by the time the Program and Policy Review: VIII was issued in August, 1986, an appropriate mission statement had been published by FAD. The review panel applauds this advance. Not only does it make explicit the objectives of the division for the period 1987-88 to 1990-91 but it makes future systematic performance evaluations more feasible. (Parenthetically, we note that although most other IDRC divisions finance training, only one treats training explicitly in the statement of objectives prepared for PPR:VIII.)

The panel is strongly supportive of the strategic emphasis in the new mission statement on institutional strengthening. We would like to recommend, in this connection, that the FAD mission statement be amended to make more explicit the expected relationship between training and the utilization of trained personnel in the pursuit of solutions to priority development problems in their **countries.**

The panel feels both that governments need to be encouraged to make use of research institutions and that the institutions themselves must make good use of trained individuals -- not, in either case as appendages of government, but rather in an effort to link individual

research talents more specifically to action and implementation. The panel would go as far as to urge the negotiation of conditionality of this kind in IDRC training agreements, recognizing, at the same time, that individual professional mobility is a byproduct of training. The intent of this suggestion is to press partner institutions to plan more precisely how they will deploy and reward individual researchers trained under IDRC sponsorship and to encourage institutions, in turn, to respond to the needs of national development.

Other elements of the Division's mandate will be treated in later sections of this report.

2. Program Development, Delivery and Management

Given its constraints of staff and budget, **FAD's** performance appears to us to be sound and effective. With only seven professional staff in Ottawa and the regions, FAD in 1985-86 disbursed a training budget of \$5,526,000. Even a cursory analysis of program development and delivery reveals a number of strengths in **FAD's** planning and management which should be acknowledged, among which are these features:

- Decentralized planning and budgeting, which work well in that they permit a degree of regional autonomy, encourage efficient decision-making, and engender a climate of trust and high morale among regional staff. Consultation with Ottawa is ensured by regular meetings there and through regional visits by Ottawa staff.
- Close working relations, for the most part, with the program

divisions and a sensitivity to the professional mandate of those divisions.

- High quality professionals in the regional offices as Senior Program Officers. This impressive group seem thoroughly conversant with their respective regions and with the technicalities involved in human resource development.
- The selection of trainees, despite the fact that selection criteria appear fluid and vary somewhat from region to region. Award holders interviewed for this study expressed few reservations concerning the selection process.
- The proportion of female award holders is thought to be reasonable, although two respondents felt that regional staff in some program divisions need to be more sensitive to the participation of women in training programs.
- The capability of the FADMIS data base, which is clearly an asset to the division and to the Centre. Given the fact that detailed training and trainee data are not gathered and stored in any consistent way among Centre divisions which sponsor training, we feel that FADMIS should be expanded to store and retrieve all IDRC training data.
- The emphasis on institutional strengthening. How to rationalize the selection and planning process in relation to institutional strengthening and establishing criteria to assess program impact on institutions, both formatively and **summatively**, will need FAD's continuing attention.

- Creative and interdisciplinary training programs which reflect a contemporary grasp of andragogical methods and educational processes.
- The forward planning capability which informs FAD's operations.
- Project Completion Reports which specify thoughtfully and astutely (in most but not all cases, unfortunately) the lessons learned from each training activity.
- Collaboration with third parties in training, as in the case of the administration of the Pearson Fellowships by Carleton University and the University of Ottawa.
- The distribution of awards by region appears proportional to need, consistent with the proposal in PPR:VII to "tilt more resources to Africa".* In terms of training, this tilt should continue. To quote one Regional Director, "Human resource development continues to be the major limiting factor towards building a scientific capacity in Africa and particularly in West Africa".²

It is only fair to draw attention, as well, to constraints hindering more effective program planning and delivery. Among several problems which appear to exist, we wish to comment in passing on these:

* The figures provided in Table 3C of the FAD Program Statement are a little misleading in that there is a double entry in the ASRO listing.

- There **seems** to be a lack of systematic follow-up of training award holders across IDRC divisions. One program division staff member asserted that there was no need for follow-up because project officers in the regions know who and where former trainees are and, moreover, that the mobility and turnover characteristics of former award holders make follow-up too difficult. For this and other reasons, few follow-up studies seem to have been conducted by agencies sponsoring training. However, **IDRC's** 1981 Training Policy Study surveyed 1,200 trainees, trainee supervisors and project leaders. More recently, partial follow-up **studies** have been done by **FAD** in **LARO** and **ASRO** and one is planned for **EARO**. There are also a growing number of Canadian award holders whose career paths should be tracked.* One advantage of systematically tracking the careers of former participants is that unexpected revelations of actual (rather than merely expected) training outcomes, as demonstrated by the Birch study³ and the Flores study⁴, can subsequently be used both in re-designing training programs and in policy re-formulation. For example, allocating resources to sustaining and supporting former trainees in their home institutions, possibly at the expense of training quantity or numbers, as recommended by Weisblat,⁵ Henderson⁶ and others, carries implications for policy, program and, of course, budget.

* Shortly after this report was drafted, FAD completed a review of the Young Canadian Research Awards program. Such a review, though the FAD review panel did not have the opportunity to examine it, is just the sort of follow-up study which we believe is needed (see pp. 15-16).

- The Canadian human and institutional training resource base seems not to be thoroughly familiar to FAD staff. Regular familiarization visits by senior FAD staff to universities and other training institutions across Canada will permit FAD to keep up to date its inventory of appropriate individuals, departments and institutions in Canada with whom FAD and other divisions may wish to collaborate. We return to this matter in D.1 (pp. 31-33).

- Training programs appear to us, distant as we are from the relevant sites, to be highly pragmatic and, though apparently effective, not perhaps sufficiently strongly based in sound instructional processes. FAD could take a lead in the Centre in giving greater attention to training needs assessment, selection criteria, conceptualizing and planning, group and individual training methodologies and evaluation, beginning with its own programs and gradually assisting other divisions to sharpen their training methods. An analysis of Project Completion Reports indicates that several group training projects were thought to suffer from the lack of a link between theory and practice, an imprecise focus, an inability to build on the background of participants, the unfamiliarity of instructors with local examples, and the absence of hands-on practice. FAD staff are the Centre's HRD professionals and they can contribute to improved training quality. To sustain high quality HRD, a greater proportion of training awards than are presently available should be allocated to

human resource development directed both to the specific training skills noted above in this paragraph and, more broadly, to strengthening skills in participatory and extension methodologies, planning, organizational development and research management -- in short, skills required for diffusing research results into application. The present situation can be illustrated by **EARO's** award distribution which indicates that of 83 awards, both active and in the pipeline, **only** twelve are tenable in HRD-related disciplines (adult education, agricultural extension, education, **adminis-**tration, technology **transfer**).⁷ We would like to see a more balanced mix of awards which **would**, in keeping with the Centre's concern for greater research impact, ensure that individuals and institutions supported by IDRC are enabled and equipped to maximize the impact of Centre-sponsored research.

- Not all program divisions use **FAD's** professional expertise or consult FAD with consistency regarding training plans and processes.

3. Funding Adequacy

Within the financial constraints of **IDRC**, actual budget allocations are related to function. Until **FAD's** role within the Centre is defined clearly, it is difficult for us to make a very useful judgement on the adequacy of the division's funding. Having said this, we do venture the following observations.

Field staff tell us that their budgets are inadequate to meet the

demands directed to them for both individual and group training. In the **WARO** office, for example, nearly 75 percent of incoming mail is directed to **FAD**. Presumably, the addition to that regional office of a **FAD** Senior Program Officer will add cost as **well** as needed professional support and service. Apart from this appointment, both the Centre's decision not to increase staff for the next year or two and **FAD's** modest projection for staff expansion until 1990 suggest that regardless of 'budgetary growth, staff size will remain fairly constant until at least **1988-89**. This factor alone will limit growth and will require that **FAD** programming become more efficient and focused. In terms of **FAD** financial management, we have nothing to add to the favourable assessment contained in the 1986 internal audit report.

With respect to the **cost/benefit** relationship in training, **it** is not easy to make firm evaluations. **It** is especially difficult **to** describe concrete benefits in other than economic terms, given the fragmentary qualitative data available. Some senior Centre staff hold that greater cost efficiency can be achieved by centralizing the management of training rather than contracting some of **it** to third parties, as in the case of the **Pearson** Fellowships. The view was also expressed that **FAD** needs to be more cost conscious. We find **it** difficult to make a definite yet helpful assessment of this matter, but we can suggest that **FAD** obtain comparative, location-specific data on training costs incurred on a per participant per time unit basis by other agencies sponsoring training, such as **CIDA**, the **Commonwealth** or the Inter-American Foundation. Being able to document Centre training costs relative to those of comparable agencies would

objectives now **expressed** in the **1986** mission statement. That prospect is one of the major advantages of having formulated such a statement. **However**, over the next period, FAD (and other divisions sponsoring training) will need to develop evaluative instruments which can be used to test the degree to which such objectives have been met.

5. FAD's Role Within the Centre

It is apparent to us that there is a diversity of views within the Centre on **FAD's** role and so we begin with three guiding principles. First, there is no disagreement, at least among those we interviewed, on the importance of training to Centre programs and the need to continue supporting **it** strongly. Although training appears historically to have been something of an afterthought at **IDRC**, such a commitment is expressed in the International Development Research Centre Act of 1970, the **1981 Training Policy Study**, and is either stated or implied in all subsequent IDRC policy documents which we have seen, as well as in personal **comments** which we have heard. Moreover, human resource development is beginning to attract greater support than hitherto (quite rightly, in our **view**) by both the donor community and developing countries themselves. Second, training constitutes such a proportion of **IDRC's** activity that **it** requires greater attention by the Centre to planning, coordination and management than **it** has thus far received. **It** seems to us that training, though highly valued across the Centre, has been organized mostly on a division-specific basis, not always with sufficiently close attention to such requirements as assessment of training needs and **institutions**, sensitivity to national manpower plans, the planning

strengthen **FAD's** internal planning process and would also assist the division in justifying its claims on total Centre resources.

We noted that there is no single Centre training envelope at present and thus no Centre training budget line items. Divisions do not report their aggregate training costs and budgets, but rather indicate training costs on a project-by-project basis within each division. **FAD's** allocation has been about **6.5** percent of the Centre's budget (roughly **\$6** million) over the past two or three years. Of the total IDRC training appropriation, however, only **54** percent (**\$4.3** million) was allocated to **FAD** in **1985-1986**. How is that allocation decided upon? Should there be a consolidated Centre training budget? If so, what is an optimum training allocation for IDRC? **FAD**, again, could perhaps take some initiative in **documenting** and justifying the costs of training of various types and locations. If other divisions would identify their total training costs, Centre management might, on the basis of knowing the amount spent on all forms of training, be able to establish something close to an optimum training allocation. We are not recommending a rigid top-down mechanism but rather some more **systematic** rationale for allocating training budgets to **FAD** and, for that matter, to other divisions concerned with training. Apart from its benefits for planning and financial management, **such** an approach might help the Centre decide, given the limitless demand for training, to what extent **it** needs to invest in toto in training.

4. Outcomes of Funding Support

If the outcomes of funding support are measured by the numbers and distribution of awards granted and institutions supported by **FAD**,

then an analysis of the figures in the detailed annexes in **FAD's Program Statement** will reveal the necessary data. If, however, outcomes are defined to mean the impact of training on individuals (both Canadian and **non-Canadian**), institutions and the development needs of the societies they serve, then our data are deficient. We have little basis on which to question the **frequencies** and distributions reported in the Program Statement aside from the comments we make elsewhere in this report. On the matter of impact assessment, however, we feel that the time has come for **IDRC**, preferably through **FAD**, to undertake a thorough tracer study of former award holders. The impact studies already done in **LARO** and **ASRO** suggest inter alia that awards have been scattered, not always tied to Centre programs, and that one-half of awardees subsequently become involved in non-research activities. Follow-up which has been undertaken until now, except in the case of the 1981 Training Policy Study, has been largely informal, especially in the program divisions of the Centre. It seems to us that so little hard information is available on former trainees that a large-scale detailed tracer study going back five years, yielding both qualitative and quantitative data, possibly differentiated or stratified by country, region, program, sex, award, institution or other appropriate category, is both timely and necessary. Only when such a study is complete will the Centre be in a position to draw more than impressionistic or anecdotal conclusions concerning the contribution of training both to institutional strengthening and to individual and national development

Over the longer term, judgements concerning the outcomes of **FAD's** programs will be made possible by measuring results against the

and conduct of educational **experiences**, the evaluation of results, the follow-up of training and the cumulative lessons that must by now have been learned by the Centre.

Third, and following from the foregoing two observations, we feel that in order to make training more coherent and professional, to maximize training impact, to facilitate inter-divisional cooperation and to ensure consistent administrative procedures, the primary responsibility for Centre training should devolve to FAD. This shift, which can evolve smoothly and gradually, would not only introduce greater coherence and professionalism into the Centre's training thrust but **it** could reduce substantially the ambiguity and lack of clarity which we sense are felt now by a significant number of Centre staff in all divisions as they approach training matters. Most of **all**, from a long-term point of view such a move would permit the IDRC to plan a Centre-wide training or human resource development strategy, region by region, in concert with its research priorities.

In moving in the suggested direction, a number of options are possible, among which are these:

- Training responsibilities could be demarcated between FAD and the other divisions in such a way that formal degree, certificate, diploma and other credential training be handled by FAD, with specialized short courses and non-degree awards being administered by the program divisions. Alterations to existing staffing and budgeting would probably be negligible if this option were chosen.
- FAD could become a coordinating unit, leaving the **adminis-**

trative resources in the divisions. In this case **FAD** would simply administer logistics and procedures to ensure their consistency across the Centre, looking after award stipend levels, contracts, records, travel and related matters, with or without a training program of its own, and without the requirement for divisions to consult **FAD** on training program planning and delivery.

- **FAD** could assume a larger policy role in developing a Centre-wide training policy and framework, including strategic planning, leaving the funding base pretty much as it now is. There would be the requirement, in this option, that all divisions consult **FAD** on a regular basis in matters related to training policy, planning, methods and logistics. Training content and financial decisions would remain largely a divisional responsibility; that is, divisional autonomy and financing would be altered only to the extent that such regular and systematic consultations would require. **FAD** itself could continue or not its own training program. In either case, there would be a necessity to appoint at least another staff member to **FAD**.
- **FAD** would administer a consolidated Centre training budget allocation and act as a banker for all Centre training. This control could ensure consultation, consistent procedures and policies and coherence in all aspects of training. It would also affect divisional autonomy by placing more authority than at present in **FAD**. Shifts in staffing to strengthen **FAD** would

also be required. In this option, FAD could, again, continue its own training program or drop its program in favour of becoming an administrative unit coordinating all Centre training.

We do not present these as mutually exclusive options but rather as possible alternatives from the present situation. We believe, however, that FAD's role must become more central in Centre training programs. Whichever model or combination of responsibilities is settled on, the decision should be guided by a consideration both of the principles we have put forward and of the potential benefits to be derived from shifting the present division of training responsibilities in the Centre. It seems to us that the policy implications of devolving more training responsibility, in one form or another, to FAD are such that greater integration of training effort and more cooperation on training methods and approaches among divisions will be required. For this reason, this issue seems to us to be one which senior management and the Board of Governors will need to examine carefully from a policy point of view.

Potential benefits deriving from allocating more training resources and responsibilities to FAD would include these:

- Confusion in LDC's and, in particular in partner institutions there, would be reduced. One IDRC training presence, not several, would be presented.
- FAD could become a catalyst for innovation in all divisions, since its professional interest in process as well as in

content would enhance the training program interests of the whole Centre. One thinks of new training opportunities, such areas as research management, **integrated/interdisciplinary** training, and training for dissemination, implementation and technology transfer.

- FAD could become the locus for **IDRC's** training memory. It already has **FADMIS** but it is also in the best position, given its commitment to institutional strengthening, to develop comprehensive institutional profiles of value to the Centre, both in the regions and in industrialized countries (especially Canada where, as noted, the Centre's institutional **familiarity** may need up-dating).
- FAD could serve **as** the Centre's professional training resource, providing valuable support* not only in contributing to the conceptualizing of Centre-wide training strategies but also in training methodology, needs assessment and evaluation, follow-up, data storage and retrieval, procedural consistency and in the production of relevant training materials.

To these ends, we recommend that the 1981 Training Policy Study be revised by 1988 to reflect the new FAD role vis-a-vis the total Centre training commitment.

6. Research on Training and Human Resource Development

Reference has already been made (p. 13) to the small proportion of FAD training awards directed to HRD in developing countries. There is, in addition, the related issue of HRD expertise within the Centre which, in most divisions, is quite incidental to research expertise. This is another reason for placing more HRD responsibility in FAD, so that divisions can draw upon FAD's training expertise in designing training focused more sharply on carefully planned human capacity building in the various divisional programs. We see two issues here, though they are connected. One issue is HRD research in developing countries that should be supported by the Centre and fostered by FAD. In our view, more resources should be allocated to such research, particularly in view of the finding from two regional follow-up studies (LARO, ASRO) that more than half of all award holders become active in training. More research emphasis, therefore, on the techniques and impacts of effective training and skills transfer, including participation and planning methodologies, as well as on broader HRD areas identified on pp. 12-13, is indicated. Such research is not at present included in the research program of the Social Sciences Division.

The second issue concerns the professional training-related skills of Centre staff. We would like to see FAD take a lead in identifying what could usefully be done to sharpen existing staff skills. The appointment of the new Senior Training and Development Officer in the Centre's HRD Division could assist greatly if part of her assignment could include complementing the existing capacity of FAD professionals to work with Centre colleagues in strengthening

their professional training know-how. For example, seminars on a range of training themes and issues could be built into regional or Ottawa staff meetings of FAD or in Centre-wide settings. This could be viewed as one element of an in-house staff development program for the Centre. As in universities, research expertise of IDRC staff is no guarantee of their ability to design, deliver and evaluate effective educational experiences.

7. Training Policy Guidelines

FAD and the Centre have been guided in their training programs by the 1981 Training Policy Study. The 1981 study, presented as a "preliminary policy paper", has, in fact, guided policy and practice **in general** in the years since 1981 and it still contains useful advice and appropriate approaches to training. For instance, the preference for master's level training over doctoral level training continues to guide Centre programs and this recommendation of the 1981 study is still widely supported within the Centre, except in AFNS Division where a substantial amount of doctoral training is sponsored on the grounds that more **Ph.D.** research is highly problem-specific (rather than individual-specific); focused on national research institutions (rather than on universities); undertaken in-country or with, at most, short attachments in a third country; and carried out as a complement to on-going research programs (rather than in isolation from such programs). **Not** only do we see no reason to alter this rule-of-thumb emphasizing master's level training at this time, but we would like to see the practice of the AFNS Division become somewhat more harmonious with this centre-wide approach, retaining as should all divisions the

flexibility which would always allow for exceptions.

We do not feel that we should provide in this report a critique or update of the Training Policy Study. We do feel, however, that in light of changes within and without IDRC since 1981, and given the policy shift we are proposing, a further training policy review, say in 1988, would be desirable. For the moment, however, we wish to endorse strongly the statement in the 1981 study that "... there is a clear need to take a broader and long-term view of training needs within the Centre's **mandate**".⁸ This view coincides with our own and remains true in 1986-87. The broad and long view rarely characterizes training policy but it should for IDRC. The 1981 Training Policy Study made an important contribution toward institutionalizing this point of view.

8. Relations with CIDA

Although CIDA and IDRC operate from very different mandates, the two agencies share several interests including building institutional and individual capacities. It is at this interface that they can fruitfully collaborate. At present, little cooperation is visible. At the very least, information-sharing can be promoted with regard to training strategy and impact, institution-building, support for **IARCs*** and related HRD concerns shared by both agencies. It is our impression that CIDA and FAD are not in particularly close touch and we therefore recommend that there should be dialogue between FAD and the Social and Human Resources Development Division of CIDA on a continuous basis. CIDA expects to issue in mid-1987 a **sectoral** policy paper to guide the new division. We urge FAD to obtain a copy of the

* International Agricultural Research Centres

policy paper and to take the initiative to begin a dialogue with CIDA related to areas of common interest, particularly in light of the Centre's commitment to move "down the R and D line" toward implementation of research results.⁹

Additional links which could be explored with CIDA might relate to the facilitation of research-related training in the private sector, a sector with which CIDA has experience, and the direct funding by CIDA of research-related training or research management training in countries or sectors of priority to both CIDA and IDRC.

9. Impact on Third World Training Requirements

In addition to our earlier comments concerning impact (see item 4, above), the main point which we wish to make here is that in our opinion one of the most effective ways for FAD to meet Third World training needs is to adopt a broader view of training than is implied in training for research alone. FAD has been reviewing requests to provide training for extension and dissemination of research results. We feel strongly that the time has come to empower FAD to do exactly that. In so doing, training beyond research would be fully consistent with the mood and tone of PPR: VII and PPR: VIII, both of which make it clear that "for research to be useful, it has to be used"¹⁰ and that "greater efforts should be made to ensure that promising technologies or approaches resulting from Centre-supported work are followed through to introduction and implementation".¹¹ If this commitment is now explicit (and certainly the words "applying and adopting" in the IDRC Act warrant it), FAD should be authorized to provide leadership in identifying appropriate training formats to

assist the research clientele of Centre training to learn dissemination and extension techniques. To begin, a pilot training project could be conducted in one of the regions, focusing on using, extending and applying a particular set of research results in collaboration with one (or more) program divisions (or with **CIDA**). Farming Systems Research is one obvious starting point for testing such an approach. Simply to publish proceedings and newsletters will not meet this objective, useful as such information may be.

One senior staff member of the Centre told us that in his view "if **it** doesn't include dissemination, **it** isn't research". Accepting a broader definition of research and the training related to **it** will not weaken research but strengthen **it** and, above all, will mean that more **telling** impacts will result for the benefit of the ultimate beneficiaries of the Centre's activities.

With regard to short-term impacts, we thought that **it** would be useful to canvass the view of a small sample of current IDRC award holders studying in Canada. Though not all of these trainees are FAD-supported, their views are illuminating and can be summarized thus:

- No problems were experienced with regard to selection, although one respondent suggested that IDRC become involved early in the selection process in order to counteract potential **favouritism**. One of those interviewed was incorrectly selected, according to YCR program guidelines, as noted in the internal audit report.¹²
- Few academic problems have been encountered in the course of the training programs experienced by these award holders. One

reported difficulty in having his academic transcripts appropriately interpreted by the Canadian university which he attends. Another characterized the research training as not sufficiently applied in nature, although he feels that the methodologies he is learning will be applicable back home. One student has found the coursework "tough". All are making satisfactory academic progress. On the non-academic side, two students expressed concern over the disparity between CIDA and IDRC stipend levels.

- All respondents, including the former award holder from Sri Lanka, find their training appropriate to their present and anticipated professional research roles, although several were of the opinion that since they expect to teach or to carry out extension duties they should be exposed to both teaching and extension methods as part of their programs in Canada.
- A number of benefits from IDRC-sponsored training were identified by those respondents, including the prestige of professional association with **IDRC**, upgraded credentials, greater self-confidence, the chance to develop international professional contacts and thus overcome professional isolation, the development of a wider worldview, and the opportunity to complete research needed for their nations' development.
- With regard to contact with **IDRC**, the consensus was that there is too little contact. Several students reported slow

responses to questions from Ottawa and an "impersonal" relationship with the Centre.

- Suggestions to the Centre (and FAD) arising from these interviews include the provision of pre-departure briefing for trainees; consistency of award stipends among divisions and with CIDA; more direct contact with IDRC while award holders are in Canada; recognition of the need to include training in both instructional methods and research dissemination; and the desirability of providing post-award support to ensure that research programs and skills are maintained.

10. Priorities and Strategic Intentions

We feel that the FAD mission statement and its draft Program of Work and Budget, 1987-88 are suitably and clearly presented and that they set out program priorities which are entirely consistent with the division's present operating mandate. We particularly applaud the concern in the statement with integrating training and research, the new framework distinguishing programs from mechanisms, the emphasis on long-term institutional strengthening and the adoption by FAD of the broader definition of training. These statements are already the result of careful consultation and analysis as well as of an appreciation of **FAD's** present role within the Centre. We have no basis on which to query the items as presented in the program of work nor the budget lines attached to them. We welcome the decision to relocate the Senior Program officer for **WARO** to Dakar in **1987-88**. It is not clear to us to what extent this assignment might alter regional

and personnel costs but **it** seems to us that in West Africa there is a need for FAD to focus increased attention and resources to the research-related human resource base of that area.

Should **FAD's** roles and responsibilities change in the directions we are suggesting, then revisions in budget and in the plan of work will need to follow.

11. Growth Potential

Looked at in one way, the potential growth of FAD is tied to growth in the Centre's global budget. **FAD's** budget is projected to hover at about **6.8** percent of the Centre's budget over the next three years, then decline to 6.4 percent in **1989-90**. Current staff complements are to be held constant for another year or two. In short, FAD, like other IDRC divisions, will be expected to plan and conduct its program within a relatively static resource allocation. Looked at from the point of view of demand, however, FAD could take on a good deal more work. The demand for training is virtually limitless and although FAD should not and cannot be expected to do all things for all people, **it** could certainly make effective use, as we see **it**, of an expanded budget allocation. This is true at present, given the existing FAD mandate. Should that mandate expand and FAD assume a greater Centre-wide training responsibility, **it** will be necessary for senior management to re-examine budgets and in particular the training budgets of program divisions, some proportions of which might best be transferred to FAD to facilitate the efficient execution of its modified role. Over even the short-term, this approach might well introduce cost efficiencies into the total Centre process of training

design and delivery.

12. Third Party Linkages

It is not clear to us that voluminous quantities of discretionary staff time have accrued to FAD because the administration of the **Pearson** Fellowships has been contracted to two universities. Nor is it easy to quantify the additional time absorbed in **FAD's** administration of the **CIDA/NSERC*awards**. In both cases there are motives and objectives which go beyond economic efficiency criteria. FAD hopes that the two universities and NSERC will gain from the collaboration with IDRC a more pronounced international sensitivity and that research links may evolve as well. FAD could consider contracting out the administration of the Young Canadian Research Awards if in so doing non-economic criteria consistent with the Centre's objectives could be applied. For instance, a small Canadian university or NGO or private sector consulting firm engaged in social development whose development capacities and sensitivities could be enhanced through such an involvement with IDRC could be considered. From a purely economic viewpoint, it is doubtful that it would be less expensive to contract these small programs to outside agencies. While FAD costs out such contracts, it should open up dialogue with institutions and agencies which tend to sponsor research and development related to IDRC program interest, to ascertain the extent to which fruitful cooperation is possible. In any event, FAD should monitor any such collaborations to ensure that Centre priorities and objectives are honoured. Given the **current** political climate in Canada and the various recommendations of the **Nielsen** Task Force report¹³ concerning

* **Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council**

contracting scholarships and training awards to non-governmental organizations or granting councils, IDRC through FAD needs to be in a position to respond to both pressures and opportunities.

D. OTHER ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD REVIEW PANEL

Though it was not required by their terms of reference, the Board Review panel feels that several additional issues relevant to the review of FAD need to be addressed. These matters arise partly from an analysis of the FAD Program Statement, from the interview process and from our own concerns and experience.

1. Relations with Canadian Universities

With its subtle reference to "an awkward and somewhat equivocal relationship with the Canadian research community",¹⁴ FAD's Program Statement points to an irritant which has been felt in the Canadian university community. Centre views vary with regard to this matter. There are those who feel that Canadian universities are "spoiled" and unwilling to listen to IDRC positions on such matters as overheads; that Canadian doctoral training is unsuitable for IDC award holders; that it is not the Centre's role to build or strengthen Canadian university capacities; that Canadian university admissions and other procedures are excessively bureaucratic; and that resources diverted to the Canadian university system are resources not spent in support of Third World development. On the other hand, some of our respondents expressed the view that the situation which obtained previously has improved substantially, especially with the advent of the Cooperative Programs Division in 1981, and its promotion of

collaboration between Canadian and Third World researchers (indeed, there have been 122 Centre-financed projects in Canadian universities Since 1981); that as more senior Centre staff positions have been assumed by Canadians a more thorough knowledge of the Canadian university research community has developed; that nearly all training (with a few important exceptions) needed in the North can be provided in Canada. There is the view, as well, that the "old boy" network is still too strong, that IDRC has an obligation to develop closer ties to Canadian universities, that the development-oriented capacity of the universities needs the support of IDRC and that the Centre "needs" the Canadian university research infrastructure.

What we distill **from this** theme and variations is the firm notion that the Centre, primarily through **FAD**, should:

- make more frequent personal visits to the relevant faculties and departments of Canadian universities in order to become familiar with present and potential research and development capacities and to monitor the academic progress of Centre trainees who are studying there;
- develop an inventory of Canadian university resources related to Centre **priorities**;
- adopt a proactive rather than merely reactive approach to consultations with universities over procedures and policies over which differences have emerged;
- cultivate, where resources permit, new areas of development research to which Canadian universities, with some **encourage-**

ment, might contribute from a special Canadian perspective, such as studies of socio-geographic inequalities or the analysis of the needs and opportunities related to remote, distant or rural communities.

Our view supports the principle enunciated in the 1981 Training Policy Study that where no appropriate Third World training facilities exist, Canadian institutions should be selected. To make most effective use of Canadian university resources, however, will require at least these initiatives by the Centre. Such initiatives might open another possibility for cooperation with CIDA. In any case, IDRC and FAD have substantial leverage and influence to exert in Canadian academe and in our view the climate is now conducive to closer and more cordial connections.

2. Conditionality in Relations with Third World Institutions

Further to our comments on pp. 5-6, most of those we interviewed support the view that a greater degree of conditionality should be associated with the granting of training awards, and that such awards should be tied to a written undertaking that award holders will be productively employed on return to their home institutions. This is not to limit professional mobility, a phenomenon which is widely recognized, but **it is** felt important for institutions to plan systematically for both the nomination of trainees and the eventual deployment of returning staff. Such conditionality is thus seen as an influence in the direction of supporting more autonomy and self-reliance in partner institutions. In support of this suggestion, we

would propose that FAD make somewhat more concrete its criteria for institutional and individual trainee selection, such as long-term **commitment** to national development, infrastructural adequacy, on-going employment and staff support mechanisms, attention to training and research quality and so on. Further, we think that there is a need to create rather detailed institutional profiles on the regional offices to serve **FAD's** (and the Centre's) corporate memory, particularly as staff rotate in and out of regional and Ottawa positions over time.

3. Involvement of Women in Training Programs

In the course of our analysis, we noted the arithmetic associated with the numbers of women included in Centre training over the years. As one might expect, these numbers and proportions have grown. In 1970-72, for instance, 11 percent of trainees were **female**, whereas by **1982-85** the percentage had risen to 26. Cumulatively, from 1970 to 1985, about 21 percent of all trainees were women. Just under **one-half** of the Young Canadian Researchers have been female but only 17 percent of the 391 trainees coming to Canada from the Third World have been women. We are aware both of the difficulty in identifying a more balanced cohort of award holders and of the delicacy of the nomination and selection process but we would nevertheless urge FAD to continue to be sensitive to this matter in its programming and to take steps, where possible and appropriate, to redress the **imbalance** between the sexes.

E. CONCLUSION

To conclude, we wish to commend the staff of the Fellowships and Awards Division for their achievements over its short history as a formal division of IDRC. Though few in number, the staff have been productive and creative professionals and we have been deeply impressed with their industry and commitment as well as with their energy and skill. A number of imaginative and innovative training partnerships and program initiatives have been established under their leadership. We hope to see such initiatives multiply over the years to come, preferably within a mandate which will encourage even greater leeway for the leadership which FAD should be empowered to provide the Centre and its programs.

Endnotes

- ¹ Training Policy Study. Ottawa: IDRC, 1981, p. 8. Up-dating this figure is not easily possible since there is at present no way to identify **cumulative** non-FAD training expenditures.
- ² Memo RD/FT/86/259.
- ³ Carol Birch. Report on Training Programs in Latin America: An Evaluation Study. Ottawa: IDRC, n.d. (Unfortunately, a number of IDRC documents which we examined were undated.)
- ⁴ Pedro Flores. FAD Training in Asia - Pacific Region, 1982-94: An Evaluative Study. Ottawa: IDRC, 1985.
- ⁵ A. Weisblat. Human Capital Development in Social Sciences: Insights from the Experience in Asia. Interim Report, n.d. [IDRC File 3-A-83-42601.]
- ⁶ Report on Evaluation of the Awards of International Development Resource Centre for the Research Associate Awards (Canada) and the Research Associate Awards (Developing Countries). Nepean: Wes Henderson and Associates, 1986.
- ⁷ Omari, I.M. EARO Report of Activities and Pipelines (Report prepared for FAO Staff Meeting, Ottawa, June 9-13, 1986).
- ⁸ Training Policy Study, p. 82.
- ⁹ Program and Policy Review: VIII. Ottawa: IDRC, 1986, p. 11.
- ¹⁰ Program and Policy Review: VII. Ottawa: IDRC, 1985, p. 15.
- ¹¹ PPR: VIII, p. 11.
- ¹² Audit Report, Fellowships and Awards Division. Ottawa: IDRC, September, 1986, p. 11.
- ¹³ Service to the Public: Education and Research. Ottawa: Department of Supply and Services, November, 1985.
- ¹⁴ Program Statement, Fellowships and Awards Division, March, 1986, p. 16.

APPENDIX A

TERMS OF REFERENCE

IDDR BOARD REVIEW PANEL - FAD

PURPOSE OF ~~THE~~ REVIEW

To review the division's mandate, past and present performance, and strategic intentions.

SCOPE OF ~~THE~~ REVIEW

In pursuance of the purpose listed above the Review Panel is requested to give particular attention to the following:

I. The **Mandate** of the Division

In view of the historical growth of the division from a **one-**project program to its present state, review the current operating mandate of the division.

II. The Past and Present Performance of the Division

a) Assess the division's program development, delivery and management, and review the past priorities assigned by division management to the different programs of the division.

b) Evaluate the program activities of the division for the last several years and the current situation in reference to:

- i) **the** inputs and adequacy of the funding support;
- ii) the outcomes of the funding support;
- iii) the role of the division as the training division within the Centre, and its relationship to other divisions;
- iv) the **role** of the division in support of research in areas of training and human resource development;
- v) the training policy guidelines established in the Centre's Training Policy Study, and assess especially, the appropriate approach to be taken in terms of providing support to formal degree training at the masters and doctoral levels;

- vi) its relationship and complementarity with the Canadian International Development Agency's training activities and programs; and
- vii) the impact and usefulness of the division's programs to the training requirements of the Third World with the view of enhancing the growth of indigenous research capabilities.

III. Strategic Intentions

- a)
 - i) Assess the training needs and opportunities identified by the division as guiding its strategic plans.
 - ii) Review the future priorities that have been assigned by division management to the different programs of the division in reference to training needs and opportunities in the Third World.
- b) Assess the potential for growth of the division within the Centre and, in particular, the percentage of the Centre's resources that might be devoted to training.
- c) Review future strategic training areas and opportunities that the division can pursue and undertake due to the availability of staff and funding resources as a result of the division's plans to contract out to third party institutions where appropriate, some of its award programs for coordination and management.

IV. Recommendations

- a) Provide comments on the division's mandate, and suggest modifications as appropriate, to improve the division's responsiveness to training needs and opportunities in the Third World.
- b) Comment on the program areas that the division currently funds and suggest changes if necessary.
- c) Comment on any constraints that might impede the division in meeting its operating objectives and suggest, if necessary, any major management areas which impinge on the effectiveness of the division's activities in fulfillment of Centre objectives.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR REVIEW PANEL

- a) Internal Audit Review to be prepared by Internal Audit.
- b) Divisional Statement to be prepared by division.
- c) Consultancy studies to be funded.
- d) Division files and division program staff interviews.
- e) Past briefs written by divisional staff.

APPENDIX B

INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED

IDRC Staff

- Raymond Audet, Vice-President, Resources
- Gerry Bourrier, Director, FAD
- * Paz Buttedahl, FAD Senior Program Officer (Latin America)
Sing Chew, Research Officer, Office of the Vice-President,
Resources
Doug Daniels, Director, Office of Planning and Evaluation
Rachel **DesRosiers**, Deputy Director, Cooperative Programs Division
Patrick Doherty, FAD
- Pedro Flores, FAD Senior Program Officer (South and Southeast
Asia)
- * Robin **Hallam**, Assistant Director (Operations Group),
Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences Division
Jim Harrison, Consultant to Cooperative Programs Divisional
Review
Joseph Hulse, **Vice-President**, Research Programs
Olga Lendvay, Training Coordinator, **Information** Sciences Division
- **Gilles** Lessard, Deputy Director, Agriculture, Food and
Nutrition Sciences Division
Gordon **MacNeil**, Acting Deputy Director, Social Sciences Division
- Jim **Mullin**, Vice-President, Collaborative and Information
Programs
- * Issa **Omari**, FAD Senior Program Officer (Eastern and Southern
Africa)
- * **Allan** Rix, Director, Human Resources Division
Sheldon Shaeffer, Associate Director, Education, Social Sciences
Division
- * Chris Smart, Deputy Director, FAD
Suzanne Taschereau, Senior Training and Development Officer,
Human Resources Division
Mousseau Tremblay, Director, Cooperative Programs Division
Robert Valantin, Associate Director, Information Tools and
Methods, Information Sciences Division
- * Richard Wilson, Director, Health Sciences Division

2. CIDA Staff

- Raymond **Côté**, Scholars and Fellows Unit, Human Resources
Division
- Stephen Free, Deputy Director, General Funds and Renewable
Natural Resources, Multilateral **Programmes** Branch
- Ron Hughes, Social Development Division, Professional Services
Branch

-
- These individuals were interviewed by the total Review panel.

3. World University Service of Canada

Michele Higginbottom, Coordinator, Canada–China Human
Development Training Programme
Ted Patterson, Special Assistant to the Executive Director
Kaye Thompson, Deputy Director for Education and Training
John Watson, Deputy Executive Director

4. Present and Former Award Holders

David **Benoit** (Canada)
Wame Boitumelo (Botswana)
Hamid Eisa (Egypt)
Jayantha Pereira (Sri Lanka)
Deogratias Rutatora (Tanzania)
Rama **Sharma (Nepal)**
Martin Shem (**Tanzania**)

5. Other

Joanne Pue, **Pearson** Fellowships Administrator, **Carleton**
University