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## GENERAL PRESENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

## Creation : 2008 (by the France Chicago Center)

The purpose of this program is to develop excellence scientific and technological exchanges between the French and Chicago laboratories, by promoting new scientific collaborations and integrating in the projects young researchers and PhD students.
Total budget (France + Chicago) : around $233000 €$ / year >> including budget from the French part : around $105000 €$ / year >> including budget from the US part : around $130000 €$ / year
Average budget per project (France + Chicago) : around $15000 €$ / year
Number of new funded projects per year : around 12

## From 2008-2018:

251 applications submitted

122 projects funded

## DATA SOURCES

## Data base (2008-2018)

- FACCTS Statistics
- Number of projects received/funded per year, in total and per categories
- Budget: France Chicago Center annual report


## Survey (2008-2018)

- Target : French Principal Investigators of the 122 selected projects between 2008 and 2018
- Survey duration : from May 15 to June 30, 2020
- $40 \%$ response rate (46 respondents for 116 queries)


## SURVEY RESPONSES

Average response rate to the survey : 40 \% (46 answers)
$\square$ Number of funded projects $\quad$ Number of survey answers


122 funded projects between 2008 and 2018, 115 valid email adresses
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## 2008-2018 Key Points

## NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS AND SELECTION RATE

Average selection rate from 2008-2018: 53\%
$\square$ Number of applications
■ Number of funded projects
Selection rate


DE LA RECHERCHE

## BEFORE JOINING THE FRANCE CHICAGO PROJECT

## (1/2)

## Did you already cooperate with USA in the past ?

If yes, was it<br>with the same partner?



Data from 46 responses
Data from 25 responses

## BEFORE JOINING THE FRANCE CHICAGO PROJECT

(2/2)

## With which of scientific collaboration program ?

| Chateaubriand | $27 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| France - MIT Funds | $13 \%$ |
| France - Berkeley Funds | $7 \%$ |
| France - Stanford Funds | $7 \%$ |
| NSF | $7 \%$ |
| Others | $40 \%$ |

Others : CNRS PICS, Lavoisier fellowship, Marie Curie fellowship, France-MIT fund...

## NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS VS SELECTION RATE <br> (COMPARISON between 39 different bilateral programs)



Average selection rate for 2008-2018 : 49\% vs 38\% mean USA and 36\% general mean Average number of applications 2008-2018:22 vs 38 mean USA and 49 general mean

## NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS VS SELECTION RATE <br> (COMPARISON between 39 different bilateral programs)



Average selection rate for 2008-2018 : 49\% vs 38\% mean USA and 36\% general mean Average number of applications 2008-2018:22 vs 38 mean USA and 49 general mean

## FRENCH PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

## Pl's employers

## Laboratory authorities



# AGE OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS (PI) (COMPARISON BETWEEN 39 DIFFERENT BILATERAL PROGRAMS) 



Pls under 40 years old : $39 \%$ vs $43 \%$ mean USA and $25 \%$ general mean
PIs over 55 years old: $9 \%$ vs $9 \%$ mean USA and $15 \%$ general mean $52 \%$ of the Pls are between 40 and 55 years old

## AGE OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS (PI) (COMPARISON BETWEEN 39 DIFFERENT BILATERAL PROGRAMS)




## PROFESSIONAL FUNCTION OF FRENCH PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS

Previous professional status (at the beginning of the project)


■ Full professor
$\square$ Senior researcher $\quad$ Junior researcher

Current professional status


■ Assistant professor

■ Other
$\square$

## IMPLICATION OF WOMEN (FRANCE)

(COMPARISON BETWEEN 39 DIFFERENT BILATERAL PROGRAMS)

\% of women Pls in the applications : NOT AVAILABLE \% of women Pls in the selected projects : $22 \%$ vs $24 \%$ mean USA and general mean

## PARTICIPATION OF FRENCH YOUNG RESEARCHERS

Number of Masters

$24 \%$ of projects involve at least one Master student
$39 \%$ of projects involve at least one PhD student

Number of postdoctoral researchers

$50 \%$ of projects involve at least one post-doctoral researcher

Data from 46 responses

## IMPLICATION OF YOUNG RESEARCHERS (COMPARISON BETWEEN 39 DIFFERENT BILATERAL PROGRAMS)


\% of projects implying young researchers : $76 \%$ vs $78 \%$ mean USA and $67 \%$ general mean $\%$ of PhD or postdoc implicated in the copublications : NOT AVAILABLE

Data from 46 responses

## MOBILITY

## YOUNG RESEARCHERS MOBILITY 2017-2019

Comparison between 38 bilateral programs

\% of young researchers in outgoing mobilities

USA $\rightarrow$ France Comparison between 14 bilateral programs

\% of french young researchers in outgoing mobilities: $19 \%$ vs $31 \%$ mean USA and $34 \%$ general mean $\%$ of american young researchers in incoming mobilities : $29 \%$ vs $40 \%$ mean USA and $46 \%$ general mean

Data received from 44 funded projects including mobilities

# FRENCH YOUNG RESEARCHERS MOBILITY 2017-2019 

France $\rightarrow$ USA
Comparison between 38 bilateral programs

\% of french young researchers in outgoing mobilities : $19 \%$ vs $31 \%$ mean USA and $34 \%$ general mean

Data received from 44 funded projects including mobilities

## AMERICAN YOUNG RESEARCHERS MOBILITY 2017-2019

USA $\rightarrow$ France
Comparison between 14 bilateral programs

\% of american young researchers in incoming mobilities : 29\% vs 40\% mean USA and 46\% general mean

Data received from 41 funded projects including mobilities

# SCIENTIFIC PRODUCTION (2008-2017) 

## SCIENTIFIC OUTPUT (1/2)

Number of funded projects (survey): 46


## SCIENTIFIC OUTPUT (2/2)

Data from 37 funded projects

|  | Number of financed projects in the survey | Average number of co-publications per project |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mathematics | 2 | 1,5 |
| Physics | 15 | 3,0 |
| Marine/Earth/Planet Sciences | 2 | 1.5 |
| Chemistry | 3 | 6,3 |
| Biology and Health | 12 | 0,8 |
| Humanities | 0 | - |
| Social Sciences | 0 | - |
| Engineering Sciences | 0 | - |
| Information Technology | 2 | 1,0 |
| Agronomy / Ecology | 1 | 0,0 |
| TOTAL | 37 | 2,0 |

Overall average annual number of co-publication per project : 1,01 vs 0,90 general mean
58\% of funded projects led to one co-publication at least
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## WHAT HAPPENS AFTER JOINING THE FRANCE-CHICAGO PROGRAM?

# CONTINUATION OF THE COLLABORATION (1/6) (COMPARISON BETWEEN 39 DIFFERENT BILATERAL PROGRAMS) 



Continuation of the collaboration : $85 \%$ vs $85 \%$ mean USA and $81 \%$ general mean
Continuation of the collaboration with other grants: $26 \%$ vs $27 \%$ mean USA and $33 \%$ general mean
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Data from 46 responses (continuation) and 35 responses (financing)

## CONTINUATION OF THE COLLABORATION (2/6) (COMPARISON BETWEEN 39 DIFFERENT BILATERAL PROGRAMS)



Continuation of the collaboration : $85 \%$ vs $85 \%$ mean USA and $81 \%$ general mean
Continuation of the collaboration with other grants: $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ vs $\mathbf{2 7 \%}$ mean USA and $\mathbf{3 3 \%}$ general mean
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Data from 46 responses (continuation) and 35 responses (financing)

## CONTINUATION OF THE COLLABORATION (3/6)

## $85 \%$ of the collaborations continued after the France-Chicago project

| Which activities? |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Collaborative research | $74 \%$ |
| Researchers mobility | $36 \%$ |
| Co-publications | $33 \%$ |
| Joint participation at conferences | $31 \%$ |
| PhD mobility | $28 \%$ |
| Co-organisation of scientific events | $15 \%$ |
| Joint participation at PhD thesis | $5 \%$ |
| Mobility of Master's students | $3 \%$ |
| Other | $13 \%$ |

## CONTINUATION OF THE COLLABORATION (4/6)

## What kind of funded collaborations after the France-Chicago project ?

■ Horizon 2020 Program


Among the others fundings : one European ERC Consolidator Grant has to be noted

## CONTINUATION OF THE COLLABORATION (6/6)

## Has the French-US collaboration involved new partners?



For a total of 12 new partners from 7 different countries

## IMPACT ON YOUNG RESEARCHERS' CAREER (1/2)

## Was young researchers' career impacted by the FranceChicago program ?

Data from 46 responses

## Type of impacts



$\square$

de La Recherche
Data from 35 positive responses for a total of 49 young researchers ET DE L'INNOVATION

## IMPACT ON YOUNG RESEARCHERS' CAREER (2/2)

Detailed types of impacts
$\square$ Post PhD in France
$\square$ Post PhD in the United States
$■$ Post PhD in another country
$\square$ Teacher-researcher in France
$\square$ Teacher-researcher in the United States
$\square$ Teacher-researcher in another country
$\square$ Researcher in an public research institution in France
$\square$ Researcher in an public research institution in the United States
$\square$ Researcher in an public research institution in another country
■ Employed in a private company in link with the field of Higher Education-Research in France
■ Employed in a private company in link with the field of Higher Education-Research in Portugal

- Employed in a private company in link with the field of Higher Education-Research in another country
$\square$ Other in France
$\square$ Other in the United States

Other in another country

## GENERAL OPINION OF FRENCH PIS ON THE PROGRAM

## 98\% of French principal investigators are satisfied



■ Not satisfied at all

- Not satisfied
- Quite satisfied
- Very satisfied

■ Extremely satisfied

Data from 46 responses

# GENERAL OPINION OF FRENCH PIS ON THE PROGRAM (2/3) POSITIVE COMMENTS 

## SURVEY OF 46 FUNDED PROJECTS

| Strengths of this program | Number of <br> occurencies <br> (out of 205) | \% <br> (out of 46) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Simplicity of the application process | 41 | $89 \%$ |
| Fostering researchers' mobility | 29 | $63 \%$ |
| Easy implementation (administrative flexibility) | 28 | $61 \%$ |
| Fostering an international research collaboration | 27 | $59 \%$ |
| Fostering the training of the young researchers | 22 | $48 \%$ |
| Fostering exchanges enabling scientific production | 14 | $30 \%$ |
| Sufficient financial means for the mobility costs | 13 | $28 \%$ |
| Good scientific-added value on financial investment | 9 | $20 \%$ |
| Transparency of the selection process | 7 | $15 \%$ |
| Helpful to initiate other fundraising | 6 | $13 \%$ |
| Helping to know the partner country | 5 | $11 \%$ |
| Sufficient amount of mobility time given to collaborate | 3 | $7 \%$ |
| Other | 1 | $2 \%$ |
| Total number of occurencies | 205 |  |

# GENERAL OPINION OF FRENCH PIS ON THE PROGRAM (3/3) NEGATIVE COMMENTS 

## SURVEY OF 46 FUNDED PROJECTS

| Weaknesses of this program | Number of occurencies <br> (out of 98) | \% <br> (out of <br> 46) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Too short duration of mobilities | 28 | $61 \%$ |
| Length of support too short | 28 | $61 \%$ |
| Financial means insufficient for the expenditure of mobility (transport) | 15 | $33 \%$ |
| Financial means insufficient for the expenditure of mobility (per diem) | 15 | $33 \%$ |
| Difficult to continue the collaboration | 7 | $15 \%$ |
| Lack of transparency in the selection process | 3 | $7 \%$ |
| Insufficient financial means to cover a project | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Administrative complexity | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Too long duration of mobilities | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Too low number of mobilities | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Insufficient communication on the evaluation's results | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Heaviness of the process of applications | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Other | 2 | $4 \%$ |
| Total number of occurencies | 98 |  |

## PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS

Preliminary conclusions suggest that the funding scheme has efficiently contributed to create (or to maintain) fruitful and long-term cooperation, despite the relatively low financial support, which is to be considered as "seed money".

France-Chicago program initiates 67\% of new collaborations
Increase in the number of applications since 2015
Applications by young PIs (39\%) better than the general mean (25\%) but below the mean USA (43\%)
Average scientific production close to the mean ( 1,01 vs 0,90 )
Good percentage of continuation of the cooperation (85\%)
Performant financing during continuation of the projects (H2020, ERC, ANR)
Low implication of PhDs in the projects ( $41 \%$ vs general mean : 67\%) and of young researchers in the mobilities
Almost half of the funded projects producing no co-publications
Capacity of involving new partners during continuation of the cooperation (only $26 \%$ of the projects)
57\% of young researchers involved in the projects are still on a postdoctoral position

## PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FRENCH PIS

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- Increase the participation of PhD students in the projects and the mobilities

French national ministries (MESR / MEAE) will provide a complete analysis of the survey. It will be sent to the recipients of the funding and participants in this symposium.

## CONTACTS

robert.gardette@recherche.gouv.fr nadine.van-der-tol@recherche.gouv.fr christophe.delacourt@recherche.gouv.fr

Thank you for your attention
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