

A Review of the Pierre Elliott Trudeau Foundation

Sussex Circle Inc.

James Mitchell

Rick Smith

Andrée Delagrave

June 28, 2013

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	4
Assessment of Programs	4
Resources	4
Possible Adjustments	5
Measuring Success	6
Economy and Efficiency.....	8
Governance	9
Challenges and Opportunities	10
Continued Need and Relevance	11
Recommendations	12
1.0 Introduction	13
1.1 Background.....	13
1.2 Review Scope and Methodology	13
1.3 Review Challenges/Limitations.....	14
2.0 Program Profile	15
2.1. Program Selection	16
2.2. Program Activities and Outputs	16
2.3. Program Resources.....	17
3.0 Evaluation Findings	19
3.1 Relevance.....	19
3.1.1 Continued Need for the Program.....	19
3.1.2 Alignment with Federal Priorities and Strategic Outcomes	22
3.2 Program Design & Delivery.....	22
3.2.1 Alignment with Program Objectives	23
3.2.2 Design and Delivery Elements	23
3.2.3 Suggestions for Change	24
3.3 Performance	26
3.3.1 Performance Measurement Strategy.....	26
3.3.2 Performance Monitoring and Reporting.....	26
3.3.3 Achievement of the Program Outcome	28
3.4 Efficiency & Economy	29
3.4.1 Efficiency	29

3.4.2 Economy	31
3.5 Foundation Governance	32
4.0 Conclusions	38
Appendices	39
1. Logic Model for the Trudeau Foundation’s Programs.....	39
2. Follow-up to the Previous Reviews	42
3. Potential Metrics for the Trudeau Foundation’s Programs.....	53
4. Who We Talked With.....	55
5. What We Asked	58
6. Who We Surveyed	59
7. What We Read.....	60

Executive Summary

Our 60 interviews, the survey results, and our review of Foundation documentation have led us to the following conclusions about the *programs, management and governance* of the Pierre Elliott Trudeau Foundation.

Assessment of Programs

The four programs – Scholarships, Mentorships, Fellowships and Public Interaction – were the areas of greatest interest to most of the people with whom we spoke.

There was a broad consensus among interviewees, which we share, that the Foundation has in almost all respects delivered on the expectations of its founders – it has matured well.

- There was universal support for the value and quality of the *Scholarship Program*. It is underpinned by a rigorous selection process that is seen to be attracting very high-quality students.
- The *Mentorship Program* is a unique and valuable feature of the broader Trudeau program. There were some suggestions from Scholars and Mentors about how it could be improved, though these may have reflected more the challenges inherent in such a program than a call for significant change.
- There was substantial support for the *Fellowship Program*, especially in its current form (i.e., more focused on a demonstrable contribution to the public interest and to the overall Trudeau program). There were some questions about how to optimize the contribution of the Fellows within the Foundation's suite of programs, and the Board is working on this.
- The *Public Interaction Program* with its four core annual events was also regarded positively by virtually all interviewees. These events are seen by participants as an invaluable way to bring members of the Trudeau community together in settings in which all can learn from one another.

We asked what makes the Foundation's programs unique. While the Trudeau Scholarships are regarded as a clear success, it is the Mentorships and Fellowships (particularly the former) that are seen as providing the unique value-added feature, as are the opportunities provided by the Public Interaction Program for interdisciplinary and intergenerational interchange among the Scholars, Fellows and Mentors.

It is this community-building feature of the four programs that is correctly seen as one of the most unique and beneficial aspects of the whole Trudeau enterprise, and also the dimension that offers the greatest potential for further development in support of the mission of the Foundation.

Resources

The Board and the President have done an excellent job of stewardship of the endowment which, notwithstanding the 2008 financial crisis, has grown since its inception from \$125 million

to \$156 million today. Because of the current low-interest-rate environment, interest income from the endowment has fallen from \$6.8 million in 2008 to a projected \$5.3 million in 2013.¹ While this has necessitated a certain belt-tightening in the four programs, to date there have been no major reductions to the programs or changes in program orientation.

Program and operating costs have grown modestly from \$5.8 million in 2008 to \$6.4 million in 2013. If interest rates continue to stay low, if the investment constraints imposed under the Funding Agreement are not changed to allow the Foundation more flexibility to diversify its portfolio, and if there is no additional source of funding, the Foundation would either have to reduce funding for its program activities over the medium term or eat into its capital.² *In our view, this represents the key challenge facing the Foundation.*

Possible Adjustments

When asked whether changes are needed to the Foundation's programs or to the way it operates, interviewees had suggestions touching on both programs and finances.

Programs

There were virtually no suggestions for changes to the Scholarship Program, other than that it be expanded as resources permit.

With respect to Mentorships, it was suggested by some Scholars that there would be merit in giving them more of a voice in selecting Mentors, and generally trying to match Mentors more closely with mentees. While this sentiment is understandable, it fails to take into account the purpose of the Mentorship Program, which is to expand the publicpolicy perspective of graduate students who are typically focused on their specific area of study. A Mentor is not an additional graduate supervisor but rather a senior person whose experience and knowledge will expand the horizons of the mentee and enable the latter to contribute more broadly to Canada in the future. One adjustment that would be desirable, in our view, would be to invest some time soon after their appointment to explain to Mentors and mentees the nature and purpose of the Program.

There were a number of suggestions concerning the design and operation of the Fellowship Program.

- Several people recommended that the Fellowships be made less a “prize-from-the-blue” and more an award given on the basis of specific proposals from potential recipients. The objective should be to use the Fellows in a way that enables them to make a more immediate and visible contribution to the public good and thus to the broader mission of the Foundation.

¹ Total investment income, including realized and unrealized capital gains, has fallen from \$11.3 million to \$7.0 million over the same period.

² One alternative to reducing program funding in a low-interest-rate environment would be to use some of the accumulated capital in the Fund to bridge the programs through to a future higher-rate-of-return environment.

- Another recommendation was to slightly loosen the rules around utilization of Fellowship funds to enable Fellows to optimize their use of the money while contributing to the program.
- Some Scholars regretted having had almost no contact with the Fellows. A recurring recommendation was that, to promote intergenerational learning, the Fellows should be much more integrated into the life of the Trudeau Foundation and community and that this should be made a selection criterion. In a word, there is more value that can be obtained from the presence of the Fellows in the life of the Foundation.

These findings are consistent with those of the Board Committee for the Review of the Fellowship Program, which has developed scenarios for the improvement of the Program for consideration by the Board.

There were almost no suggestions for changes to the Public Interaction Program, beyond taking further steps to enhance the visibility of the events and broader participation in them.

Finances

With respect to finances, there were a number of suggestions about increasing fundraising from the private sector to help offset the recent decline in revenue from the endowment, and also to leverage partnerships with universities and other similar institutions. Several interviewees also raised the idea of seeking relief from the government with regard to the rules on investment income.³ It was recognized, however, that obtaining such an exemption might be difficult.

One question for consideration is whether the Foundation should make short-term use of its increased capital as a bridging mechanism to sustain programs at their current levels until interest rates go up and revenues from the endowment return to more normal levels. (This is something that has been done, for example, by the IRPP during similar periods of low revenue.)

Measuring Success

In considering the issue of whether the Foundation is meeting its objectives, the first question we asked was, what impact have the Foundation's programs had on participants?

Impact on Participants

Virtually all interviewees were highly positive about the impact of their participation in the Trudeau program, whether as Scholar, Mentor or Fellow.

- An overwhelming majority of Scholars stated that the experience had a considerable positive impact on their research, scholarly work and career path. Many Scholars commented on the particular value of the connections made through the Trudeau

³ Like other publicly endowed organizations, the Trudeau Foundation is obliged to keep its money in government bonds and similar high-grade financial instruments. However beneficial this was in enabling the Foundation to weather the 2008 financial crisis, it is now a considerable burden in terms of the consequential constraints this imposes on endowment income in the current low-interest-rate environment.

community and through their contact with Mentors in broadening their perspective and acquiring a sense of the role of researchers in informing public debate.

- Mentors were similarly positive about their experience, though some Mentors (and Scholars) noted that factors such as distance, personal chemistry and/or the absence of common research interests could, in some cases, make the mentoring less useful than it might have been.
- Fellows were positive about the use to which they had put their funds and about the benefits of being a Trudeau Fellow. A Trudeau Fellowship is welcome recognition, but not in all cases something that would dramatically change what they are doing or what they are able to do.

Impact on Canadian Society

The Foundation's fundamental objective is to invest in scholars and researchers today for the longer-term benefit of Canadian society in the future. Determining the connection between the investment in education/community building and the payoff in terms of positive impact on Canadian society is something that can only be done through indicators rather than explicit measures of results.

Against this yardstick, the Foundation's impact to date must be seen as positive but inevitably still modest. While the Trudeau Scholars have been taking their places in Canadian institutions of higher education, and the Fellows have been in virtually every case continuing their high-quality work in a variety of fields, the Foundation itself, and the Trudeau community that is its most important expression, have not had a significant profile in public debates, or in the definition of issues with which Canadians are concerned.

This rather modest impact is not so much a fault as it is a reflection of the scale of the Foundation's programs. Even though the Foundation does an excellent job of identifying and attracting exceptional individuals, it awards only 15 doctoral scholarships per year from among several thousand doctoral students beginning their studies in the social sciences and the humanities in Canada. While its programs can have a significant impact on program participants, given the scale at which the Foundation operates, its direct impact on the larger Canadian community inevitably will be fairly small.

Reaching out to a wider Canadian audience and engaging a broader spectrum of interested Canadians in its programs and events represent, therefore, the major opportunities facing the Foundation, as well as being a critical factor in the Foundation's longer-term success.

Performance Measurement

The Foundation tracks a number of measures that, together, give an indication of program performance. It reports publicly on its plans and accomplishments through annual Business Plans and Annual Reports submitted to Industry Canada and posted on its Internet site. Quantitative information is provided on inputs and outputs, supplemented by more descriptive information on the quality of program participants and their accomplishments. For example:

- Since 2003 the Foundation has granted 143 doctoral Scholarships and 46 Fellowships, encouraged 78 people to serve as Mentors to the Scholars, held 99 major public events and published 4 volumes of Foundation Papers.
- As part of the selection process, in 2012 the Foundation considered 241 applications for Scholarships, 76 nominations for Fellows and 149 nominations for Mentors.
- At least 10 Scholars are expected to complete their doctoral degrees in 2012-2013, adding to a total of 85 degrees obtained since the creation of the program.
- Approximately 95% of Trudeau Scholars complete their PhD programs; the remainder do not complete their studies for personal or professional reasons. Because of the level and depth of the support provided to the students, Trudeau scholars need less time on average than other doctoral students to complete their degree.
- Among scholars, of the Foundation's themes the most explored research topic is human rights and dignity (40%), followed by responsible citizenship (26%), people and their natural environment (21%) and Canada in the world (17%).
- Most of the former Trudeau scholars stay in Canada after they complete their PhD, opting for career paths in higher education (68%), the public service (13%), NGOs (11%), the health sector (4%) and the culture or business sectors (4%).
- As noted, the original \$125 million endowment has grown to just over \$156 million (as of 31 May 2012) despite lower than expected investment returns in recent years.

Regular external reviews are also part of the Foundation's overall performance management strategy. The Foundation established a program evaluation framework in 2004-2005. It links resources to products and then to the short- and longer-term results achieved through the program and the difference it makes in the research and policy worlds, and in wider society.

Economy and Efficiency

The Funding Agreement with the Government of Canada allows the Foundation to spend up to 1.5% of the total value of the Fund on "operating costs", which include investment counsel fees, administrative expenses, all program planning and delivery costs, and costs related to the Foundation's obligations under the *Access to Information* and *Privacy* legislation.

In the review, we considered whether the Foundation's activities could be made more efficient while maintaining or increasing its level of effectiveness.

- Investment counsel fees, which are based on the portfolio's fair-market value, fall within the range typical of fixed-income portfolios. The Foundation has been able to protect the purchasing power of the endowment fund, despite the fact that sizeable amounts are drawn from the Fund every year to support the ongoing programs and activities of the Foundation.

- There was a strong consensus that the administration produces a lot with current resources. Indeed, one of the key findings of the 2009 review was that the administrative and management functions were so lean that the Foundation faced serious operational risks in terms of high workloads, the potential loss of institutional memory and the capacity to deliver its programs. *We share this view.*
- We also heard that there may be opportunities to make greater use of information technology (e.g., web 2.0 systems for processing applications) and free up staff time for other program purposes.

While one could make the case that a Trudeau Scholarship or Fellowship would be as appreciated and as effective if it were, say, 10% less generous, there is no evidence to support this thesis, and the broader prestige of (at least) the Scholarship awards might be threatened if this were done. Certainly any effort to reduce the money invested in travel and conferences would strike at what makes the whole Trudeau program unique and valuable to participants, because it would undercut the core goal of community-building.

Governance

There are two dimensions to governance – first at the Board level and second at the level of the President and his management team.

Board

We looked at whether the Board is provided with the information it needs to approve policies and program direction for the Foundation, and to oversee the President's management of the endowment and the annual operating budget.

We also examined the adequacy of the governance regime at the Board level – i.e., committees, mandates, operating procedures, planning process and documents, minutes, etc. These were all present in the workings of the Foundation and in the files, all documents were of high quality, and all demonstrated a regular, professional dialogue between the Board and the President on all issues of concern to the Board, both programs and finances.

Board members were unanimous in expressing their satisfaction with the quality and timeliness of the materials prepared by the President and his staff for Board consideration. They were also very appreciative of the President's active engagement with the Board on matters of strategic direction and priority-setting, and his regular one-on-one contact with them throughout the year.

Three areas for possible improvement were identified:

- The Board meets twice a year for half a day, while subcommittees (including an Executive Committee) do much of the follow-up work. Meetings of these bodies are at most four times per year and often these are held by means of a short teleconference. The 2009 Review recommended that the Board meet more often. The Board did not take up this recommendation due to constraints on members' time and on operational resources, and decided to do much of its work through committees instead. One remaining issue is timeliness of decision-making on major issues put to the Board.

- While it is useful to keep Members of the Foundation engaged in the life of the organization, the fact that committees include both Board members and Members of the Corporation, and that some people wear both hats, makes the distinction between the two categories rather fuzzy in practice. In purely governance terms, it would be preferable if a clearer line were drawn between the two groups.
- There was also a sense among some interviewees that members of the Board could be more involved in the actual programs and events of the Foundation (as opposed to day-to-day management, which is not the Board's domain). This would help to give Board members a clearer sense of what the Foundation is producing and would inform Board discussion on both current programming and strategic direction.

We were also interested in assessing the Board's effectiveness in setting strategic policy and program direction. While interviewees agreed that the Board had done a good job of stewardship over the past ten years, there was also a general sense that there is now a need to renew the Board with members who bring new perspectives and different experience. This is particularly important as the Foundation seeks to reach out in program terms to the wider Canadian community and in financial terms to potential contributors.

President

The Corporate structure of the Foundation is one in which the President is the Chief Executive Officer, working under the oversight of the Board. It is the President's responsibility to develop plans and strategies for approval by the Board, ensuring that Board approval is sought on major decisions and that the Board is kept informed of any developments in relation to the affairs of the Foundation that would bear on its reputation or its capacity to achieve its objectives and fulfill its broader mission. He is also expected to play a strong and visible role in dealings with the academic and public policy communities that are the Foundation's most immediate constituency.

In all these capacities, the President works with the support of a small management team and staff. As noted above, the people that we interviewed were highly complimentary of the work that they do.

Challenges and Opportunities

Four developments over the past decade are seen as posing particular challenges to the Foundation.

- Interest rates have remained at their lowest levels since the creation of the Foundation, exerting pressure on income and cash flow. If rates continue to stay low, if the investment constraints imposed are not changed to allow the Foundation more flexibility to diversify its portfolio, and if there is no additional source of funding, the Foundation would have to shrink its activities over the medium term. *As noted, it is our view that this represents the key challenge facing the Foundation.*
- The second factor is related. One obvious means by which the Foundation could help to sustain its traditional level of program activity would be to increase its funding from external sources. Yet competition for philanthropic resources is intense, and those

resources tend to come with strings attached. It is not enough that an organization can demonstrate its value, or that it is administratively efficient – donors usually want to contribute to something new, or something to which their name can be attached. And raising money costs money.

- The third factor concerns changes to the size and nature of federal support for higher education. Since the late 1990s a series of government programs and policies were created to foster innovation through expanded support to Canada's universities, academics and students. These initiatives provide important context for the consideration of the relevance and niche of the Foundation's programs as well as the determination of award values. *This makes it all the more important that the Foundation not simply duplicate programs from other sources.*
- Another concern that came up from several quarters was the fact that the Foundation, while visible in academic circles, does not have a strong presence outside that world; it does not yet have the public profile and impact that the founders had no doubt envisaged. And, despite deliberate efforts at increasing its presence outside the Montréal/Ottawa/ Toronto triangle, the Foundation is still seen as an organization focused on Eastern Canada. This may or may not be important in terms of fulfilling the Foundation's core mission (i.e., support for higher education and scholarship), but it is a factor if the Foundation wants to generate more external funding and achieve the broader societal impact originally intended.

Most, though not all, interviewees see the current administrative support rules (i.e., a maximum of 1.5% to administration broadly defined) as putting undue pressure on a small and hard-working staff. There may be room to spend somewhat more money under this heading without exceeding the 1.5% ceiling, and it was suggested that one could reduce costs through automation in areas like the Scholarship application process.

Other challenges that emerged from this review include the risks of operating this high-profile set of programs with a small staff; there is no backup and the organization is vulnerable to sudden departures.

As noted, the major opportunity facing the Foundation is reaching out to a larger Canadian audience and engaging a broader spectrum of interested Canadians in its programs and events. This is something to which management has already turned its attention, through such means as partnerships on events with like-minded organizations and the requirement that Fellows deliver a prominent public lecture that is later published in the *Trudeau Papers*.

Continued Need and Relevance

There was virtual unanimity among interviewees that the Foundation's four programs are of benefit to Canada, for all the reasons declared by the Foundation, and that the overall program should continue. Any needed changes are at the margin, rather than having to do with the Foundation's broad priorities or strategic direction. *No one called for a fundamental re-think of either individual programs or the Foundation's efforts as a whole, nor is such a re-examination called for by the results of the present review.*

Where changes were suggested, they had to do with raising the profile of the Foundation and its programs in all parts of Canada, and involving a broader spectrum of Canadians in the Foundation's intellectual and creative work. On this view, the "Trudeau community" could (and should) extend beyond those who are Trudeau Scholars, Mentors or Fellows to include other young researchers and creative Canadians who would benefit from being plugged into the Trudeau community and its public programs. Another suggestion was to reach out to include young people working in areas beyond the humanities, while still adhering to the essential mission of the Foundation.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1. *The Foundation occupies a unique niche within the social sciences and humanities research community. Although the context for the Foundation's programs has changed since 2001, we recommend that all four programs be continued.*

Recommendation 2. *The Board and the President will need to continue to consider carefully what shape and scale of activities is sustainable over the medium- and longer-term, bearing in mind expected returns on the Foundation's investments and on fundraising opportunities, and what level of programming is appropriate to achieve the mission and enhance the profile of the Foundation. Sustaining an active, credible and visible program should be a priority for the Board and for management.*

Recommendation 3. *Bearing in mind that the purpose of mentoring is to broaden the perspective of the Scholars, the Foundation should take steps to build an early understanding among Mentors and Scholars of the purposes of the Mentoring Program and should treat the Mentors as a shared resource for the Trudeau community.*

Recommendation 4. *As part of the Fellowship selection process, the Foundation should invite proposals from potential recipients on how they would use the award. The objective should be to allow the selection jury to assure itself that its investment of Fellowship dollars will generate new work, enhance intergenerational learning and support the broader mission of the Foundation.*

Recommendation 5. *To extend its reach and impact, the Foundation should consider increasing its investment in the Public Interaction Program to broaden the spectrum of Canadians who are exposed to the Trudeau community and its work.*

Recommendation 6. *In order to reduce the operational risks associated with a small staff, as resources permit additional funding should be devoted to strengthening administrative capacity. Opportunities should be considered for using modern information technology to free up staff time for other program purposes.*

Recommendation 7. *The Board had done a good job of stewardship over the past ten years. There is a general sense that there is now a need to renew the Board with members who bring new perspectives and different experience. This is particularly important as the Foundation seeks to reach out in program terms to the wider Canadian community and in financial terms to potential contributors. In dialogue with the President, the Board should consider its broader priorities and direction for the next decade as it develops its succession plan.*

1.0 Introduction

Sussex Circle was engaged to provide the President of the Pierre Elliott Trudeau Foundation (“the Foundation”) with a comprehensive review of its programs for presentation to the Board of Directors at their April 2013 meeting. This report presents the findings of the review, as well as the conclusions and recommendations that stem from them.

This introductory section of the report provides background information on the Foundation, the scope and methodology used for the review, and the challenges and limitations associated with it.

1.1 Background

The Pierre Elliott Trudeau Foundation was established in 2001 as a non-partisan memorial to former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau. Its purposes are to promote research in the humanities and social sciences, and to foster a fruitful dialogue among researchers, decision-makers and the broader public on crucial social questions affecting Canadians.

In 2002, the Government of Canada, with the unanimous support of the House of Commons, endowed the Foundation with a donation of \$125 million. The Foundation has also benefited from modest private-sector donations in support of specific initiatives. It is a registered Canadian charity.

Under the terms of its incorporation agreement, the Foundation is mandated to develop and manage Scholarship, Fellowship and Mentorship programs and conferences to support Canadian and foreign students wishing to pursue doctoral studies and post-doctoral research in the humanities and the human sciences. Three of the four programs – Scholarships, Fellowships and Public Interaction – were launched in 2003, with the Mentorship program being introduced in 2004.

The agreement also established the governance structure for the Foundation, the terms and conditions for investment and management of the Fund, and reporting requirements. One of those requirements was for an independent assessment every five years, focusing on the relevance of the Foundation/Fund, whether it is meeting its purposes and objectives, and whether adjustments to its programs can and should be made. The present review fulfills this obligation.

1.2 Review Scope and Methodology

In 2005 the Foundation carried out a Preliminary Review of its programs. This was followed in 2009 by the first Five-Year Periodic Review of the Foundation, as required under the terms of the funding agreement. The 2009 study drew on the results of the Preliminary Review and included an examination of the Foundation’s programs, management, finances and related matters, and made recommendations in all those areas.

This review builds on the previous ones, and examines the following issues:

- Program *activities, outputs* and *resources*
- The *relevance* of each of the Foundation’s programs
- The *design and delivery* of the programs

- Program *performance*
- Program *efficiency and economy*, and
- Foundation *governance*.

The review was conducted through a combination of:

- A file review at the Foundation of materials describing and documenting the operations of the four programs and meetings of the Board and its committees
- Interviews with Foundation President and staff, members of the Board and members of the Corporation, a selection of Trudeau Scholars, Fellows, Mentors, individuals who have taken part in selection panels, representatives of other foundations, and government officials
- An internet survey of former and current Trudeau Scholars, Fellows and Mentors, and
- A review of relevant literature and of similar foundations and not-for-profit organizations in Canada

Additional information on the design and conduct of the review is presented in the Appendices.

1.3 Review Challenges/Limitations

The Foundation has established the ambitious goals of informing, shaping and influencing public dialogue on key issues facing Canada. Even after ten years, however, it is too early for this review to measure with any degree of precision whether the Foundation is achieving results commensurate with those goals. (This is a challenge with any “influencer” mandate.)

Rather, this review is intended to provide both evidence and an opportunity for the Board, the President and interested stakeholders to reflect on what has been learned through ten years of experience with the Foundation’s activities and programs, and to determine whether the Foundation is “on track” to achieving its broad goals.

Table 1: The Trudeau Foundation’s Mission

The Mission Statement adopted by the Board of Directors inspires the work of the Foundation and shapes its Business Plans.

The Pierre Elliott Trudeau Foundation promotes outstanding research in the humanities and social sciences, and fosters a fruitful dialogue between scholars and policymakers in the arts community, business, government, the professions, and the voluntary sector.

The Foundation:

- encourages emerging talent by awarding Trudeau Scholarships to the most talented doctoral students in Canada and abroad
- appoints distinguished Trudeau Fellows and Mentors for their knowledge and wisdom, to build an intellectual community to support the work of the Scholars, and
- creates and maintains an international network of Trudeau Fellows, Scholars, and Mentors.

Most of the challenges that we encountered during the course of this review are those inherent to evaluation projects generally, such as limitations associated with the methods used (e.g., interviews, surveys, review of program data, literature review). The survey of current and former Scholars, Fellows and Mentors, for example, had an overall response rate of 37%, with responses skewed towards more recent participants. Results were, therefore, interpreted cautiously, and multiple lines of evidence were used to support the conclusions set out below.

2.0 Program Profile

Through its Scholarship, Fellowship, Mentorship, and Public Interaction programs, the Foundation supports outstanding individuals who make or will make significant contributions to critical public issues in Canada.

- The *Trudeau Scholarship* is Canada's most prestigious doctoral award in the social sciences and humanities. Each year, the Foundation awards Scholarships to 15 doctoral students from Canada or abroad who have achieved academic excellence and who demonstrate an interest in public policy and a willingness to learn in a multidisciplinary setting.⁴ The annual value of the Scholarship is up to \$60,000 per Scholar (including an annual travel allowance of \$20,000) for up to four years.
- *Trudeau Fellows* are recognized leaders in their fields of expertise who have made a significant contribution to the development, enrichment, and dissemination of knowledge. The Fellows enjoy extensive freedom in their use of the funds they are given and are expected to engage in a regular cycle of Foundation events to share ideas and knowledge. Five Fellows are appointed each year. The value of the Fellowship is \$225,000 per Fellow, paid over three years. Those funds are administered through the Fellow's university or research institution.
- Through the *Mentorship Program*, scholarship recipients are paired with eminent Canadian practitioners in all sectors of public life, from arts and culture to public service and journalism and from business and politics to community development and philanthropy. Each year, 12 Mentors are appointed to provide Scholars with practical advice on how to integrate a public policy perspective into their research and how to communicate their results to a broad audience. Each Mentor is offered a \$20,000 honorarium and a \$15,000 travel allowance for the duration of their eighteen-month mandate.⁵
- The *Public Interaction Program* encourages and stimulates interaction among award winners – Fellows, Scholars and Mentors – and a variety of other networks, researchers and the broader public. Four annual events are organized by the Foundation for this purpose:
 - the Annual Conference on Public Policy
 - the Mentor-Scholar Retreat
 - the Summer Institute, and

⁴ The terms of the Funding Agreement allow the Foundation to award up to 25 Scholarships, 5 Fellowships and 15 Mentorships each year.

⁵ A number of Mentors have in fact donated their honorarium back to the Foundation.

- the Trudeau Lectures.

The annual travel allowance for the Fellowship, Scholarship and Mentorship programs constitutes the bulk of the Public Interaction Program budget.

The Trudeau Fellowships, Scholarships and Mentorships are unsolicited awards, in that the Foundation does not accept individual applications. Rather, Canadian and foreign award winners are selected by external review committees through a rigorous nomination and selection process.

2.1. Program Selection

All awards granted by the Foundation follow a rigorous and independent external review process.

- For the Scholarship program, a call for nominations is sent to the presidents and deans of every Canadian and selected foreign universities and institutions of higher education and to their scholarship coordinators. Each university is responsible for holding its own internal selection competition and may submit six to eight nominations.
- For the Fellowship and Mentorship programs, the Foundation has established a list of 300 nominators including the presidents of Canada's universities, heads of research institutes, senior government officials, etc. Under the Fellowship program, university presidents are also invited to nominate a visiting international or national scholar to participate in the university's activities for a period of one year. (This represents one of the five Fellowships.)
- For all three programs, the selection process includes review by the Foundation's internal and external file review committees; endorsement of finalists by the Foundation's Application and Nomination Review Committee; and approval by the Foundation's Board of Directors. The selection process for Scholars also includes an interview. While this selection process may seem onerous, it actually works quite smoothly and efficiently.

2.2. Program Activities and Outputs⁶

Between 2003 and 2012 the Foundation spent \$36.3 million on its program activities, funding 143 Scholars, 46 Fellows, 78 Mentors, 99 major events and 4 volumes of Trudeau Foundation papers.

In recent years there have been approximately 250 nominations for the 15 Scholarships (a 6% acceptance rate), 100 nominations for the 5 Fellowships (a 5% rate) and 200 nominations for the 15 Mentorships (a 7.5% rate). The Foundation's four major events were attended by some 2000 people.

⁶ Source: The Trudeau Foundation

Table 2: Trudeau Foundation Program Outputs

Volumes	Scholars	Fellows	Mentors	Public Interaction
Number each year	Up to 15	Up to 5	Up to 15	4 events, 2000 attendees, Trudeau Foundation Papers
Nominations examined in the selection process each year	250	100	200	--
Number from 2003 to 2012	143	46	78	99 major events, 4 volumes of Trudeau Foundation Papers
Amount spent 2003 to 2012	\$15.6 million	\$8.0 million	\$1.6 million	\$11.1 million

2.3. Program Resources

Income from the Foundation's investments is used to fund its programs. Since its inception, income from the Fund plus donations has totaled almost \$85 million. Of that, 69% has been spent on the Foundation's program and operating costs, and 31% has been retained to increase the value of the Fund. This retention of earnings has represented a conscious policy on the part of the Board to build a hedge against inflation.

Table 3: Evolution of Trudeau Foundation Assets 2002-2013⁷

\$Millions

Original endowment 2002	125.0
Income 2002-2013	84.9
Expenses 2002-2013	59.0
Net value of assets 2013	150.9
Per cent of income disbursed	69%
Per cent of income retained	31%

⁷ Source: Calculated from information provided by the Trudeau Foundation. Income includes donations. Income is calculated as the change in the net value of the Foundation's assets plus disbursements.

The Foundation had expenses of \$6.3 million in 2012 and has a budget of \$6.4 million for 2013. Of the four programs, Scholarships are the largest budget component (28%), followed by Public Interaction (25%), Fellowships (15%) and Mentorships (3%). Administration and program delivery account for 24% of expenses, and investment counsel fees 5%. Those shares have remained fairly constant since the Foundation's programs reached maturity in 2005.

Table 4: The Foundation's Annual Expenses⁸

\$Thousands

Fiscal Year	Total	Scholars	Fellows	Mentors	Public Interaction	Administration and Program Delivery	Investment Counsel Fees
2013 Budget	6,383	1,807	924	224	1,467	1,623	337
2012	6,335	1,759	930	218	1,590	1,505	334
2011	6,062	1,677	944	213	1,506	1,425	296
2010	6,256	1,795	1,082	212	1,345	1,442	380
2009	5,728	1,863	662	212	1,327	1,283	380
2008	5,802	1,898	773	184	1,292	1,294	361
2007	5,234	1,513	760	149	1,271	1,188	353
2006	4,921	1,308	759	181	1,096	1,220	356
2005	4,885	1,272	753	140	1,051	1,311	359
2004	3,926	1,196	757	130	451	1,049	352
2003	3,222	1,255	600	-	125	895	347
2002	225	-	-	-	-	199	26

⁸ Source: The Trudeau Foundation. Note that beginning with 2010 the travel portion of the Fellowship Program is included under that program rather than under Public Interaction. Until 2005 investment counsel fees were netted against investment income in the Foundation's financial statements. They are treated here as an expense for comparability purposes.

3.0 Evaluation Findings

3.1 Relevance

As described in Article II of the Funding Agreement⁹, the purpose of the Foundation is to:

- a) Retain and attract local and international doctoral students and post-doctoral Fellows to Canadian universities in themes of study in the fields of humanities and human sciences of direct relevance to the future of Canada by awarding grants to Eligible Recipients, namely through Scholarships, Fellowships and Mentorships;
- b) Build an innovative network of academic interchange and public engagement;
- c) Promote the study of pressing social and public policy issues in humanities and human sciences affecting the future of Canadian society; and
- d) Further the development and understanding of themes of study in the fields of humanities and human sciences of direct relevance to the future of Canada.

To assess relevance we considered the continued need for the four elements of the overall program, as well as its alignment with the priorities of the federal government.

3.1.1 Continued Need for the Program

The context in which the Foundation operates has undergone a number of changes since it was established in 2001. The most significant external factor has been the change in financial markets and the movement into a low-interest-rate environment. In accordance with the Funding Agreement, the Foundation must preserve its capital, financing its operations from interest earned on its endowment funds. Yet under the Agreement, investments are restricted to a limited class of lower-risk investments, essentially government bonds or the equivalent. These investment restrictions have protected the value of the Fund but at the price of lower returns.

Since 2008, interest rates have been at their lowest levels since the creation of the Foundation, exerting pressure on income and cash flow. If rates continue to stay low, if the investment constraints imposed under the Funding Agreement are not changed to allow the Board more flexibility to diversify its portfolio, and if there is no additional source of funding, the Foundation would either have to reduce funding for its program activities over the medium term or eat into its capital.¹⁰ *In our view, this represents the key challenge facing the Foundation.*

The second external factor is related. Competition for philanthropic resources is increasing, and those resources come with more strings attached. Yet experience (as well as a Foundation study) has shown that fundraising is no easy task. It is not enough that an organization can demonstrate its value, or that it is administratively efficient – donors usually want to contribute

⁹ “Funding Agreement on the Advanced Research in the Humanities and Human Sciences Fund”, Government of Canada, Industry Canada, May 20, 2004.

¹⁰ One alternative to reducing program funding in a low-interest rate environment would be to use some of the accumulated capital in the Fund to bridge the programs through to a future higher-rate-of-return environment.

to something new, or something to which their name can be attached. And raising money costs money.

The 2009 Review noted that the Foundation's growing reputation for excellence in programming made the contemplation of a fundraising initiative realistic. A well-articulated value proposition would help attract support among potential donors who may be less familiar with the Foundation and its work. The Board has assembled a fundraising committee to address this issue.

The third factor concerns changes to the size and nature of federal support for higher education. The late 1990s and the early 2000s saw the formal launch of *Canada's Innovation Strategy*, under which a series of new government programs and policies were created. Examples include:

- an increase in the number of Canada Research Chairs supported since that program was introduced in 2000
- the Canada Graduate Scholarships and the Indirect Costs of Research programs in 2003
- the income-tax exemption for all scholarship, fellowship and bursary income in 2006, and
- the Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarships in 2008.

These and other developments provide important context for assessing the relevance and appropriate niche of the Foundation's programs, and they are relevant as well to judgments about the appropriate size of the awards. After all, not duplicating existing programs was seen by the founders as a key to the mission and value of the Foundation.

Table 5: Related Programs¹¹

Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarship The Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarship was created to attract and retain world-class doctoral students and to establish Canada as a global centre of excellence in research and higher learning. It provides \$50,000 per year for three years and is available to both Canadian and international PhD students studying at Canadian universities. Students must be nominated by a recognized Canadian university. Nominations are forwarded to the appropriate federal research granting agencies—the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. Selection committees recommend the top 55 or 56 candidates (for a combined total among the three granting agencies of up to 167 candidates) to the Vanier-Banting Board based on the nominee's academic and research potential, as well as their leadership skills. The Vanier-Banting Board endorses the recommendations for Vanier Scholarships put forward by the selection committees of the three federal granting agencies and oversees the program's process, policies and results to ensure that the program achieves its objectives. A Steering Committee, which comprises the presidents of the three federal granting agencies and the deputy ministers of Industry Canada and

¹¹ Source: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and Canada Research Chairs.

Health Canada, makes the final decisions on funding.
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Doctoral Awards The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) is the federal research funding agency that promotes and supports postsecondary-based research and training in the humanities and social sciences. Through its Doctoral Awards program SSHRC offers two types of funding for doctoral students: • SSHRC Doctoral Fellowships of \$20,000 per year for 12 to 48 months in Canada or abroad; and • Joseph-Armand Bombardier Canada Graduate Scholarships (CGS): Doctoral Scholarships \$35,000 per year for 36 months at eligible universities in Canada Candidates eligible for both a Joseph-Armand Bombardier CGS Doctoral Scholarship and a SSHRC Doctoral Fellowship will be considered for both awards. All candidates are assigned a rank order on the basis of the selection committees' recommendations. Top-ranked candidates receive an offer of award. Whether the offer is for a Joseph-Armand Bombardier CGS Doctoral Scholarship, a SSHRC Doctoral Fellowship or a choice of either will depend upon the candidate's overall ranking and the relevant eligibility criteria.
Canada Research Chairs In 2000, the Government of Canada created a permanent program to establish 2000 research professorships—Canada Research Chairs—in eligible degree-granting institutions across the country. The Canada Research Chairs program invests \$300 million per year to attract and retain some of the world's most accomplished and promising minds. Canadian universities both nominate Canada Research Chairs and administer their funds. Each eligible degree-granting institution receives an allocation of Chairs. For each Chair, a university nominates a researcher whose work complements its strategic research plan and who meets the program's high standards. Three members of a College of Reviewers, composed of experts from around the world, assess each nomination and recommend whether to support it. There are two types of Canada Research Chairs. Tier 1 Chairs, tenable for seven years and renewable, are for outstanding researchers acknowledged by their peers as world leaders in their fields. For each Tier 1 Chair, the university receives \$200,000 annually for seven years. Tier 2 Chairs, tenable for five years and renewable once, are for exceptional emerging researchers, acknowledged by their peers as having the potential to lead in their field. For each Tier 2 Chair, the university receives \$100,000 annually for five years.

The general view of interviewees, which we share, is that the Foundation's objectives and specific programs continue to be relevant notwithstanding these changes in the Canadian environment. While operating on a different scale from other programs supported by the federal government (the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, for example, invests approximately \$330 million per year in grants, fellowships and scholarships) the Foundation offers a unique suite of programs that are designed to contribute to a broader objective of building a unique community. In addition to promoting research in the social sciences and humanities, the Foundation contributes to the development of research talent through

mentoring, through participation in a network of scholars and through knowledge acquisition, transfer, and exchange between program beneficiaries and the broader public.

There was virtual unanimity among interviewees that the Foundation's four programs are of benefit to Canada, for all the reasons declared by the Foundation, and that the overall program should continue. Any suggested changes are at the margin, rather than having to do with the Foundation's broad priorities or strategic direction. *No one called for a fundamental re-think of either individual programs or the Foundation's efforts as a whole, nor is such a re-examination called for by the results of the present review.*

Where changes were suggested, they had to do with raising the profile of the Foundation and its programs in all parts of Canada, and involving a broader spectrum of Canadians in the Foundation's intellectual and creative work. On this view, the "Trudeau community" could (and should) extend beyond those who are Trudeau Scholars, Mentors or Fellows to include other young researchers and creative Canadians who would benefit from being plugged into the Trudeau community and its public programs. Another suggestion was to reach out to include young people working in areas beyond the humanities, while still adhering to the essential mission of the Foundation.

3.1.2 Alignment with Federal Priorities and Strategic Outcomes

As demonstrated in the program's logic model (Appendix 1), the Foundation's inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes are aligned with federal plans and priorities relating to research and innovation:

- a strong, innovative, and competitive national economy
- an improved quality of life for Canadians, and
- a world-class research environment in Canada.

The Foundation's goals are to help build the next generation of Scholars, to maximize the impact of research and to capture and communicate those impacts as widely as possible.

Recommendation 1. *The Foundation occupies a unique niche within the social sciences and humanities research community. Although the context for the Foundation's programs has changed since 2001, we recommend that all four programs should be continued.*

Recommendation 2. *The Board and the President will need to continue to consider carefully what shape and scale of activities is sustainable over the medium- and longer-term, bearing in mind expected returns on the Foundation's investments and on fundraising opportunities, and what level of programming is appropriate to achieve the mission and enhance the profile of the Foundation. Sustaining an active, credible and visible program should be a priority for the Board and for management.*

3.2 Program Design & Delivery

As noted in Section 2 above, the Foundation has developed a unique network where Scholars, Fellows and Mentors interact around some of the key social policy issues of concern to Canadians. The Foundation's programs are structured around four themes.

- Human Rights and Dignity
- Responsible Citizenship
- Canada in the World
- People and Their Natural Environment

The table below presents the distribution of research topics by theme for each of the Foundation's main programs. Among Scholars, the most prominent topic is human rights and dignity. Responsible citizenship is the most prominent theme among Fellows, and for the Public Interaction Program events. The ongoing relevance of these themes is considered as part of the Foundation's strategic planning process.

Table 6: Trudeau Foundation Program Topics by Theme

Theme	Scholars 2003-2013	Fellows 2003-2013	PIP Events 2008-2013
Human Rights and Dignity	40%	26%	16%
Responsible Citizenship	26%	47%	58%
Canada in the World	21%	18%	18%
People and Their Natural Environment	13%	9%	8%

Source: The Trudeau Foundation

3.2.1 Alignment with Program Objectives

We asked what makes the Foundation's programs unique. As noted, not duplicating existing programs of support to higher education (specifically graduate scholarships) was seen by the founders as an essential condition for the success of the Foundation. While the Trudeau Scholarships are regarded by everyone as a clear success, it is the Mentorships and Fellowships (particularly the former) that are seen as providing the unique value-added feature, as are the opportunities provided by the Public Interaction Program for interchange among the Scholars, Fellows and Mentors. *It is this community-building feature of the four programs that is seen by participants and observers as one of the most beneficial aspects of the whole Trudeau enterprise, and also the dimension that is seen as offering the greatest potential for further development in support of the mission of the Foundation.*

The evidence collected as part of this evaluation supports the conclusion that the Foundation's effectiveness in achieving its objectives is largely related to the alignment between its objectives and its program suite. Thus, it is our view that the basic elements of the overall program should be retained. However, the findings of this review suggest that, to ensure the continued and long-term success of the program, certain elements should be adjusted.

3.2.2 Design and Delivery Elements

There was a broad consensus among interviewees, which we share, that the Foundation has, in almost all respects, delivered on the expectations of its founders – it has matured well.

- There was universal support for the value and quality of the *Scholarship Program*. The program is underpinned by a rigorous selection process that is seen to be attracting students of the highest quality.
- While the *Mentorship Program* is generally perceived as a unique and often valuable feature of the broader Trudeau program, there were some suggestions from both Scholars and Mentors on how it could be improved. Up to twelve Mentors are appointed each year to forge bonds between Canadians with extensive experience in public life and talented doctoral students. While some Scholars saw this as the least valuable element of the program, many others viewed it as integral to the overall Trudeau experience. For their part, Mentors saw the experience as a positive one.
- There was substantial support for the *Fellowship Program*, especially in its current form (i.e., more focused on a demonstrable contribution to the public interest and to the overall Trudeau program). Questions remain, however, about how to optimize the contribution of the Fellows within the Foundation's suite of programs. A Board committee is currently considering this issue.
- The *Public Interaction Program* with its four core annual events was also regarded positively by virtually all interviewees. These events are seen by participants as an invaluable way to bring members of the Trudeau community together in settings in which all can learn from one another.

3.2.3 Suggestions for Change

When asked whether changes are needed to the Foundation's programs or to the way it operates, interviewees had suggestions touching on both programs and finances.

Programs

There were virtually no suggestions for changes to the Scholarship Program other than to expand it as resources permit.

With respect to Mentorships, it was suggested that there would be merit in giving Scholars a voice in selecting Mentors, and generally trying to match Mentors more closely with mentees. This is not a simple process, however, because factors such as distance, personal chemistry and/or the absence of common interests have a bearing on the success of the relationship. Moreover, mentees are often not aware, at least initially, of the value to be gained from a Mentor outside their field, especially one with practical experience of government and policy making.

Recommendation 3. *Bearing in mind that the purpose of mentoring is to broaden the perspective of the Scholars, the Foundation should take steps to build an early understanding among Mentors and Scholars of the purposes of the Mentoring Program and should treat the Mentors as a shared resource for the Trudeau community.*

There were a number of suggestions concerning the design and operation of the Fellowship Program:

- Several people recommended that the Fellowships be made less a “prize-from-the-blue” and more an award given on the basis of specific proposals from potential recipients. It was argued that the objective should be to use the Fellows in a way that enables them to make a more immediate and visible contribution to the public good and thus to the broader mission of the Foundation. One way to do this would be to involve Fellows in the design of the public events.
- Another recommendation was to slightly loosen the rules around utilization of Fellowship funds to enable Fellows to optimize their use of the money while contributing to the program.
- Some Scholars regretted having had almost no contact with the Fellows. A recurring recommendation was that the Fellows should be much more integrated into the life of the Trudeau Foundation and community and that this should be made a selection criterion for the Fellowship program.

There were also suggestions about greater partnering with universities and like-minded organizations in pursuit of the Foundation’s mission and strategic objectives.

Recommendation 4. *As part of the Fellowship selection process, the Foundation should invite proposals from potential recipients on how they would use the award. The objective should be to allow the selection jury to assure itself that its investment of Fellowship dollars will generate new work, enhance intergenerational learning and support the broader mission of the Foundation.*

Finances

The Funding Agreement requires that the Foundation select new Scholars, Fellows and Mentors each year. Consequently, the Foundation has obligations to fund these individuals and cover related operating expenses. Since the Foundation has to preserve its capital, and finance its operations through income earned from the Fund, ways must be found to generate a steady and sufficient income from this source each year.

As noted above, in recent years the Foundation has been making an annual provision of around \$1.875 million to protect the Fund against inflationary pressure. Despite this, a number of the people that we talked with expressed concern that if the current returns on the Fund stay the same, the Foundation could be in a negative spending position very shortly.

With respect to finances, there were a number of suggestions about increasing fundraising from the private sector to help offset the recent decline in revenue from the endowment. Several interviewees also raised the idea of seeking relief from the government with regard to the rules on investment income. It was recognized, however, that obtaining such an exemption from the government would likely be difficult.

One question for consideration is whether the Foundation should make short-term use of its increased capital as a bridging mechanism to sustain programs at their current levels until interest rates go up and revenues from the endowment return to normal levels.

The people that we talked with also drew the link between the Foundation’s current and projected finances and the need to grow the fund through fundraising. This matter has been

discussed regularly with the Board and Members over the past four years. A fundraising committee has been established to address the issue, and the 2010-15 Strategic Plan identifies fundraising as a strategic priority.

3.3 Performance

3.3.1 Performance Measurement Strategy

The Foundation established its Program Evaluation Framework in 2004-2005. A program logic model developed at that time summarized what the Foundation does and what it expects to accomplish (see Appendix 1). The model links resources applied to the Foundation's program to the program process (preparations, management and delivery), and on to the immediate products of these processes (i.e., numbers of awards of different kinds given, numbers and kinds of events held), and then to the short- and longer-term results achieved through the program and the difference made in the research and policy worlds, and in wider society.

3.3.2 Performance Monitoring and Reporting

The Framework served as the basis for the Preliminary Review of the Foundation's programs conducted in 2005. The Review focused on the "front end" work of nomination and selection that is one of the principle means by which the Foundation is able to achieve its desired results.

Recognizing that, at that time, the four programs were still in their early days, the 2005 Review concluded that the programs were operating effectively and that the Foundation was on track in efforts to achieve its desired results. A number of recommendations were made to further strengthen program performance.¹²

As noted, the first full review of the Foundation was undertaken in 2009. While the 2005 Review focused primarily on *inputs* and *processes*, the 2009 Review was designed to address *outputs* and *outcomes*. The 2009 Review Panel concluded that:

- the Foundation had made significant and sustained progress towards achieving its vision
- each of the four programs was well established and contributing effectively to the Foundation's mission, and
- the Foundation and its staff had demonstrated the insight and capacity required to ensure that the programs continued to evolve in ways that are effective, efficient and mutually reinforcing.

Recommendations were made to assist the Foundation in maintaining momentum, expanding its influence and achieving its desired results.

Following the 2009 Review, the Foundation has:

- sought a decision by the Government of Canada on the appointment of Board Directors and Members whose terms had lapsed
- developed a Strategic Plan for 2010-15

¹² A status report on implementation of the recommendations for the 2005 and 2009 reviews is presented in Appendix 2. Most of the recommendations were accepted and implemented.

- established a Governance Committee and formalized the membership and roles of the other committees of the Board
- developed communications tools to publicize the Scholars program, and to enhance the visibility of the association of Scholars and Fellows with the Foundation
- adjusted the selection criteria for the Fellowship program to include potential future research contributions, history of interaction with graduate students and willingness to participate and contribute to the Foundation's activities
- adjusted its processes to ensure that Mentors have the time, interest and ability to act as a mentor to Scholars
- taken steps to encourage the ongoing involvement of Mentors in the Foundation's activities, and extended their terms from 18 to 24 months
- sought partnerships to support its Public Interaction Program initiatives
- created a new full-time position to support programs and administrative activities, and
- held discussions with Industry Canada and the Treasury Board Secretariat on a new investment policy.

Resource limitations constrained the Foundation from responding more fully to the Review's other recommendations, notably to enhance the Foundation's public profile and visibility and to deepen the Foundation's administrative structure.

The Foundation reports publicly on its plans and accomplishments through annual Business Plans and Annual Reports submitted to Industry Canada. In both documents, quantitative information is provided on inputs and outputs, supplemented by more descriptive information on the quality of program participants and their accomplishments.

For example:

- Since 2003 the Foundation has granted 143 doctoral scholarships and 46 fellowships, encouraged 78 people to serve as Mentors to the Scholars, held 99 major public events and published 4 volumes of Foundation Papers.
- As part of the selection process, in 2012 the Foundation considered 241 applications for scholarships, 76 nominations for Fellows and 149 nominations for Mentors.
- At least 10 Scholars are expected to complete their doctoral degrees in 2012-2013, adding to a total of 85 degrees obtained since the creation of the program.
- Most of the former Trudeau scholars stay in Canada after they complete their PhD, opting for career paths in higher education (68%), the public service (13%), NGOs (11%), the health sector (4%) and the culture or business sectors (4%).
- As noted, the original \$125 million endowment has grown to just over \$156 million (as of 31 May 2012) despite lower than expected investment returns in recent years.

As recommended in the 2009 Review, Foundation staff has worked on the development of a balanced scorecard approach to performance measurement. While a useful conceptual exercise, the approach proved more cumbersome and time-consuming to populate and maintain than warranted for management and oversight purposes. A simplified set of metrics with medium and longer-term goals were developed as part of this review, and are presented in Appendix 3.

3.3.3 Achievement of the Program Outcome

Both the 2005 and 2009 reviews cautioned that, given the Foundation's relatively short existence, it is difficult quantitatively to assess its outputs and outcomes. Nevertheless, both reviews concluded that the nomination and selection processes, the evolution of program design, the quality and accomplishments of the individuals recruited to and supported by the Foundation, and the value added by the networking and Mentoring initiatives are fully consistent with the goals that the Foundation seeks to achieve.

In considering the same set of questions in 2013 (i.e., whether the Foundation is meeting its objectives), the first question we asked was, what impact have the Foundation's programs had on participants?

Impact on Participants

Virtually all interviewees were highly positive about the impact of their participation in the Trudeau program, whether as Scholar, Mentor or Fellow.

- An overwhelming majority of Scholars stated that the experience had a considerable positive impact on their research, scholarly work and career path. Many Scholars commented on the particular value of the connections made through the Trudeau community and through their contact with Mentors in broadening their perspective and acquiring a sense of the role of researchers in informing public debate.
- Mentors were similarly positive about their experience, though some Mentors (and Scholars) noted that factors such as distance, personal chemistry and/or the absence of common research interests could, in some cases, make the mentoring exercise less useful than it might have been.
- Fellows were positive about the use to which they had put their funds and about the benefits of being a Trudeau Fellow. It should be noted, however, that to date almost all the Fellows have been successful and relatively high-profile professors or other creative people with established careers. In most cases, these people do not lack for money to pursue their vocation. A Trudeau Fellowship is welcome recognition, but not in all cases something that would dramatically change what they are doing or what they are able to do.

Impact on Canadian Society

This is even harder to measure, not least because the Foundation's fundamental objective is to invest in scholars and researchers today for the longer-term benefit of Canadian society in the future. As in any similar educational endeavor, determining the connection between the

investment in education/community building and the payoff in terms of positive impact on Canadian society is something that can only be done through indicators rather than explicit measures of results.

Against this yardstick, the Foundation's impact to date must be seen as positive but inevitably still modest. While the Trudeau Scholars have been taking their places in Canadian institutions of higher education, and the Fellows have been, in virtually every case, continuing their high-quality work in a variety of fields, the Foundation itself, and the Trudeau community that is its most important expression, have not had a significant profile in public debates or in the definition of issues with which Canadians are concerned. (Indeed, an early problem with the Fellowship program, for example, was that Fellows did not identify themselves as such, which meant the Foundation was not getting the credit it deserved for supporting their work.)

This rather modest impact is not so much a fault as it is a reflection of the scale of the Foundation's programs. Canada's social sciences and humanities research community is composed of 19,000 full-time doctoral students and 22,000 full-time professors.¹³ Every year, several thousand doctoral students begin their studies in the social sciences and the humanities in Canada. Even though the Foundation does an excellent job of identifying and attracting exceptional individuals, it awards only 15 doctoral scholarships per year. While its programs can have a significant impact on program participants, given the scale at which it operates, its direct impact on the overall community inevitably will be fairly small. Outreach and dissemination to the broader community are, therefore, critical to the Foundation's longer-term success.

Recommendation 5. *To extend its reach and impact, the Foundation should consider increasing its investment in the Public Interaction Program to broaden the spectrum of Canadians who are exposed to the Trudeau community and its work.*

3.4 Efficiency & Economy

3.4.1 Efficiency

The efficiency of a program of higher education is also difficult to assess in quantitative terms.

The Funding Agreement with the Government of Canada allows the Foundation to spend up to 1.5% of the total value of the Fund on "operating costs", which include investment counsel fees, administrative expenses, all program planning and delivery costs, and costs related to the Foundation's obligations under the *Access to Information* and *Privacy* legislation.

In the present review, we considered whether the Foundation's activities could be made more efficient while maintaining or increasing its level of effectiveness.

The Foundation seeks professional advice and relies on the expertise of its Finance and Investment Committee and its external auditors to plan and manage its budget and its investment portfolio. We understand that investment counsel fees, which are based on the portfolio's fair-market value, fall within the range typical of fixed-income portfolios. By following the investment strategies of the best managed funds in the sector, the Foundation has

¹³ Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Facts and Figures.

been able to protect the purchasing power of the endowment Fund, despite the fact that sizeable amounts are drawn from the Fund every year to support the ongoing programs and activities of the Foundation.

Administrative expenses and program planning and delivery costs overlap. There was a strong consensus among interviewees that the Foundation's administrative team produces a lot with current resources. We also heard the suggestion that there may be opportunities to make greater use of information technology (e.g., web 2.0 systems for processing applications) and free up staff time for other program purposes. This is something that should be explored by management in consultation with the Board.

The bulk of the Foundation's program money is directed to Scholarships, Fellowships and Public Interaction. As noted, these programs are really an investment in the longer-term creative output of Canadian researchers, both present and future. One could make the case that a Trudeau Scholarship or Fellowship would be as appreciated and as effective if it were, say, 10% less generous, but there is no evidence to support this thesis, and the broader prestige of these awards might be threatened if this were done. Certainly any effort to reduce the money invested in travel and conferences would strike at what makes the whole Trudeau program unique and valuable to participants, because it would undercut the core goal of community-building.

Table 7: Foundation Operating Expenses¹⁴

\$Thousands

Fiscal Year	Investment Counsel Fees	Administration	Program Delivery	Fundraising	ATIP	Operating Costs	
						Total	Per cent of Fund Value
2013 Budget	337	452	1,125	25	20	1,959	1.31
2012	334	491	951	59	4	1,839	1.19
2011	296	658	695	71	2	1,721	1.10
2010	380	764	672	3	3	1,821	1.24
2009	380	598	675		10	1,663	1.16
2008	361	630	618		46	1,655	1.18
2007	353	525	634		29	1,541	1.12
2006	356	604	616			1,576	1.11
2005	359	628	685			1,670	1.26

¹⁴ Source: The Trudeau Foundation. Note that beginning in 2012 some administration expenses were reclassified as program delivery expenses.

Since the revised Funding Agreement was signed in 2004, Foundation expenses on operating costs have been well below the 1.5% cap.

With regard to the program's administration, most of the people we talked with said that the Foundation's processes were well managed and efficient, with some effective improvements having been made during the lifecycle of the program.

3.4.2 Economy

As the Foundation's programs have matured, operating expenses – which include investment counsel fees, administrative expenses, all program planning and delivery costs, and costs related to the Foundation's obligations under the *Access to Information* legislation – have stabilized at about 30% of total expenses.

Both the 2005 and 2009 Reviews concluded that the administrative and management functions of the Foundation are very lean, a sentiment that was also expressed by the people we interviewed. The 2009 Review also stated that the constraint on operating costs resulting from the 1.5% cap carried with it serious operational risks in terms of high workloads, the potential loss of institutional memory and the capacity to deliver its programs if key personnel were to leave. We share this view.

Table 8: Foundation Program and Operating Expenses¹⁵

\$Thousands

Fiscal Year	Program Expenses	Operating Expenses	Total Expenses	Operating Expenses as a Per cent of Total Expenses
2013 Budget	4,424	1,959	6,383	30.7
2012	4,497	1,839	6,335	29.0
2011	4,341	1,721	6,062	28.4
2010	4,435	1,821	6,256	29.1
2009	4,064	1,663	5,728	29.0
2008	4,147	1,655	5,802	28.5
2007	3,692	1,541	5,234	29.4
2006	3,344	1,576	4,921	32.0
2005	3,215	1,670	4,885	34.2
2004	2,083	1,401	3,484	40.2
2003	1,855	1,242	3,097	40.1
2002	-	225	225	100.0

¹⁵ Source: The Trudeau Foundation

Recommendation 6. *In order to reduce the operational risks associated with a small staff, as resources permit additional funding should be devoted to strengthening administrative capacity. Opportunities should be considered for using modern information technology to free up staff time for other program purposes.*

3.5 Foundation Governance

The governance structure of the Foundation is set out in the General By-laws of the Corporation (2002)¹⁶ and in the Funding Agreement with the government of Canada (2004)¹⁷.

The Foundation has a governance structure that includes the Corporation Members, the Board of Directors and the President/CEO. While it was established as a private non-for-profit corporation, the Foundation remains publically accountable and must report to the government of Canada on an annual basis. It is subject to the *Access to Information* and *Privacy Acts*.

The Corporation

According to the By-laws of the Corporation, the membership of the Foundation consists of up to 30 Members in three membership classes:

- three Members are the Executors and Liquidators of the Estate of the late Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau and are referred to as the “Family Members” ;¹⁸
- six *Government Members* are to be recommended by the Minister of Industry. Of the six Members initially appointed in 2003, three left at the end of their term in 2008. The three remaining Members are still active in the Corporation;
- other Members are referred to as the “Regular Members”.

There are currently 22 Members of the Corporation, over 80% of whom are founding Members. The term of office of Regular and Government Members is five years.

Corporation Members are seen as the guardians of the original purpose and vision of the Foundation. They provide general oversight of the Foundation and advice to the Directors and the Foundation staff. Their main responsibilities include appointing Regular Members of the Corporation, naming regular members of the Board of Directors, and hiring external auditors for the Foundation.

Three Members elected from among all of the Corporation Members constitute the Nominating Committee that receives applications for potential Foundation Members and Board Directors and makes recommendations.¹⁹ The Chair of the Board and the President are ex-officio members of the Nominating Committee. In response to the 2009 Review, the Nominating Committee now meets twice a year.

¹⁶ General By-laws of the Corporation –By-Law number 2002-3 adopted June 17, 2002. The Foundation is currently preparing By-laws for renewal in 2013 of its charitable organization status.

¹⁷ Funding Agreement on the Advanced Research in the Humanities and Human Sciences Fund, Government of Canada, Industry Canada, May 20, 2004.

¹⁸ This class will be broadened in the new statutes of the Foundation to ensure sustainability.

¹⁹ Under the new *Canada Not-for-profit Corporations Act* that came into force in 2012, all Members and Directors must be elected by members of their class.

The Corporation Members hold an annual meeting once a year in November to receive the annual financial statements of the Foundation and the auditor's report. The meeting is well attended and there is never a problem with quorum.

The Board of Directors

The role of the Board is to:

- ensure that the Foundation adheres to and carries out the goals set out in its articles of incorporation and that long-term objectives are set in accordance with these goals;
- establish policies;
- ensure that competent leadership is in place, that financial and legal responsibilities are carried out effectively, that assets are protected, that risks are identified and managed appropriately; and
- see that the Foundation's performance is assessed.

The Corporation By-laws provide that the Foundation is governed by a Board of a maximum of 18 Directors from the same three membership classes as the Corporation Members. Two Directors are appointed by the Minister of Industry, two are appointed by the Family Members and the others are elected by the Regular Members of the Corporation for a two-year renewable term. Directors are not paid. At the time of this review, 16 Directors comprise the Board that oversees the Foundation's more than \$150 million in assets and annual operating budget of \$6.3 million.

Board members are a group of distinguished Canadians. Membership has been extremely stable. Regular members are named for a renewable term of two years and are renewed automatically, even if they may have been relatively inactive, until they indicate a wish to leave the Board. Half of the Directors, including the former Chair (2002-2013) have been on the Board since its inception in 2001-2002. Since 2008, five new Directors including a new Chair have been appointed to the Board. The average age of the Board is relatively high.

The initial appointment in 2002 of the Clerk of the Privy Council and the President of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) as government appointees on the Board was lauded for the positive synergies it created with government-funded social sciences and humanities research and the practice of public policy in government. The Foundation also believes this was an important factor in the Foundation's early success.

However the terms of the Government members ended in April 2004 and they have not been replaced. The former Clerk of the Privy Council has since resigned as government representative and was later reappointed in 2009 as a regular Director. The other government Director, the former President of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), is still sitting on the Board.

Since the 2009 Review, the Foundation has consistently conveyed to the Minister of Industry that it would welcome the Clerk of the Privy Council – or alternatively, someone with the respect and confidence of the Clerk – and the current President of SSHRC on the Board. The Minister of Industry has yet to communicate a decision in this regard. It is not known whether the Government has any intention of proposing new Directors or Foundation Members.

Board membership reflects a mix of skills, with several members cumulating expertise in more than one field:

- Seven Directors are associated with the academic community, nine with the business/legal community and seven of the Directors have government experience.
- The newly appointed Chair brings to the Board extensive national and international foundation experience.

This is a good balance of skills for a Board overseeing an educational foundation with goals of promoting leading-edge social research and informing public dialogue on key issues facing Canada. The Board also has a fair balance of men and women, Anglophones and Francophones. Regional representation is much weaker, with all but two Directors coming from Central or Eastern Canada. This is an issue for an institution with a national mandate.

Functioning of the Board

Generally, the Board meets twice a year for a half day, once in the spring to approve the budget and the nominees for the Scholars, Mentors and Fellows programs, and once in the fall to review and approve the financial statements. The running of the programs, and issues such as the themes and location of the Foundation's public events are appropriately left to management. The Board has repeatedly expressed its trust in the Foundation President and its appreciation for the work of the Foundation staff.

A review of Foundation files shows a Board that has been closely engaged in stewardship of resources and oversight of management but perhaps less actively engaged in strategic discussion of the future priorities and direction of the organization.

Board attendance is satisfactory and is monitored by the Executive Committee. Most similar Boards meet more often than the Board of the Foundation, and the 2009 Review recommended at least one additional meeting per year of the full Board. The Board sees this idea as both unnecessary and impracticable given that the Directors are volunteers with very busy agendas, and given the financial and administrative burden this would impose on the Foundation. However, the role of the Executive Committee has been reinforced in recent years and a monthly communication tool now informs Board members of the ongoing activities of the Foundation and provides them with information relevant to their decision-making and monitoring responsibilities.

Notwithstanding these steps, the relative infrequency of meetings has consequences for the Board's capacity to provide timely direction and decisions. For example, while the issue of thematic scholarships was first presented to the Board in 2008, it was only in 2011 that the Foundation was allowed to begin negotiating with universities. Nimbleness and responsiveness remain issues for the Board.

At each meeting, the Board is fully informed by the President of the activities of the Foundation and the challenges it is facing. The Board receives abundant and well-prepared documentation to support its discussions and decisions, including minutes of all the committees. The President is also in contact with individual Board members before each meeting to brief them on the agenda and canvass for issues. All this contributes to efficient and productive meetings.

Committees

The Board has five standing committees:

- Executive Committee
- Audit Committee
- Finance and Investment Committee
- Application and Nomination Review Committee, and
- Governance Committee

The Committees elect their Chair. Committee recommendations are sent to the Executive Committee, often for information, before going to the full Board.

A review of the Minutes of the Board shows that, in general, the Board ratifies the recommendations of the committees with a minimum of debate. Being much smaller, (three to six members), the committees are more agile and easier to convene, and are well attended. By all accounts, this is where the bulk of the Board's work is done, issues debated, divergent views expressed and options weighed for the Board. The staff provides the Committees with extensive information and advice on major issues, as well as advice on strategic direction and priorities. For example, in preparation for the Board decision on the 2011-2012 Budget, eight budgetary scenarios were developed by staff for the Finance and Investment Committee and were fully discussed in several meetings before a proposal was presented to the Board.

The Executive Committee, the most active Standing Committee, has been meeting up to four times a year, for fairly short meetings, to deal with strategic matters between the regular meetings of the Directors (e.g., financial commitments not included in the budget).

In response to the 2009 Review recommendation that the Board develop a risk identification and management strategy, the Finance and Investment Committee now conducts a yearly review of portfolio performance, assesses the risks and proposes adjustments to the investment strategy. Also in response to the Review, the Board has taken several measures to strengthen its governance by creating a Governance Committee to oversee and enhance the Board's organization, procedures and performance, and the integrity of Foundation governance.

All standing committees including the Executive Committee now issue formal minutes to inform the Board. Formal terms of reference have been drafted and approved for the committees and Board members have to sign an annual conflict of interest declaration. All of these measures reflect modern precepts of good corporate governance.

Also in response to the 2009 Review, a Strategic Plan (2010-2015) was developed by the President for approval by the Board. This was based on extensive consultations with stakeholders and input from both the Executive and Governance Committees. The strategic directions, initiatives and budget proposed in the Strategic Plan were unanimously approved by the Board in April 2010 after a short discussion and the authority to implement the plan, once funding was secured, was delegated to the President, with the Executive Committee monitoring.

The Board also creates *ad hoc* committees to work on strategic issues. At the time of this evaluation, two *ad hoc* committees were in operation: the Fund Raising Committee and the Committee on the Review of the Fellows Program. Both issues were raised in the 2009 Review and form part of the Strategic Plan.

Membership in committees is uneven, with some Board members taking part in almost all the committees and others in none at all. The Chair of the Board sits on the Finance and Investment Committee, the Governance Committee as well as the *ad hoc* Fund Raising Committee, ensuring that he is fully aware of the Foundation's financial challenges and opportunities. The President is an *ex-officio* member or a guest on all committees except the Audit Committee.

The Board does not conduct self-assessments and may thus overlook opportunities to improve its operation. Board members generally do not participate actively in the life of the Trudeau community and rarely attend any of the Foundation events.

There is substantial overlap between Board and Corporation membership. Six Corporation Members are also Board Members. Corporation Members, other than Board Members, also now sit on all Board committees except for the Executive Committee. While Corporation Members have a limited role formally, they are in fact fairly influential in setting directions for the Foundation and the distinction in roles and responsibilities of each group has become somewhat fuzzy.

Assessment

It is our view that the Board has fully delivered on its essential mandate. The Foundation adheres to the governance structure stipulated in the by-laws. It has ensured that:

- competent leadership is in place in the person of the President/CEO
- quality information is provided to the Board for decision-making
- financial and legal responsibilities are carried out effectively, and
- assets are protected, risks identified and managed appropriately.

The Foundation's governance and use of committees has been strengthened in the period since the last Review. A Strategic Plan is in place; studies, analysis and evaluations of programs have been conducted and adjustments made; results are tracked; *ad hoc* committees of the Board have been created to address major strategic issues such as fund raising and the future of the Fellowship Program. Overall, it is our assessment that the Foundation has been very well run.

The Challenge: Renewal

There was a sense among a number of interviewees that the Board could be more involved in the setting of strategic direction and that it needs to engage in a sustained strategic conversation with management about directions for the future. As noted, greater involvement of Board members in program events would help give the Board a clearer sense of what the Foundation is producing and could be producing.

But the most fundamental challenge facing the Board is renewal. This is an important issue for any Board, but it is a strategic issue for the Foundation. Many of the Directors can be expected to step down from the Board within the next few years. Board renewal will become a pressing issue. The same can be said with respect to Corporation Members.

The stability in Board membership since the Foundation's beginning has brought valuable steadiness and continuity in direction. The Foundation has now matured and ensuring the capacity to innovate and rethink approaches to achieving the Foundation's goals will be important to its future success.

The 2009 Review recommended that a succession plan be formulated and adopted by the Board. The Board has no comprehensive succession plan at this point. However, since the 2009 Review, terms of reference have been adopted for the Nominating Committee, which now meets twice a year. While the Committee has identified a number of priority areas for the recruitment of new Members and Directors, the process is still somewhat informal and tends to reproduce the same membership profile the Board had since its inception.

In our view, it is time to proceed with a more structured and forward-looking approach, and to develop a comprehensive succession plan. These steps are particularly important given the Foundation's high expectations of its Board members and the resulting challenge of finding appropriate candidates, as well as the need to preserve the independent, non-partisan nature of the Board.

In this regard, a key task for the Foundation will be to define the optimal future composition of its Board. In our view, this would mean:

- seeking members with an interest in cutting-edge social science research and a commitment to informed public policy
- ensuring an appropriate geographical, linguistic, cultural and gender balance for a national institution
- finding the right mix of skills to move the Foundation forward to its next level of development, and
- developing an effective strategy to recruit persons who fit this description.

Meeting these criteria will require a clear vision of where the Foundation needs to go next.

Members and Directors

This process of reflection will also be a good time to review structural issues and determine whether the current overlap between Corporation Members and Members of the Board is the most effective way to organize for the future, or whether it might be preferable to draw a clearer line between the roles and responsibilities of each group.

The *Canada Not-For-Profit Corporations Act* provides an explicit description of the role and responsibilities of Directors and, to a somewhat lesser extent, of Members who in this kind of corporate entity are the equivalent of shareholders. While each class of person within the governance structure fulfills an essential role, the two roles are inherently distinct – one (the Director) carries a fiduciary responsibility for the corporation; their interest is the corporation. The other (the Member) brings a range of interests to bear on the affairs of the corporation. While it is not uncommon for Members to be involved in the work of the Board (especially where Members have particular expertise or value to add) good corporate governance would suggest that the two roles ought to be kept reasonably distinct.

Moreover, as the Foundation thinks about its next decade it will be important to ensure that the “fidelity-to-the-original-vision” role of the Members does not have the effect of impeding the forward evolution of the Foundation.

Recommendation 7. *The Board did a good job of stewardship over the past ten years. There is a general sense that there is now a need to renew the Board with members who bring new perspectives and different experience. This is particularly important as the Foundation seeks to reach out in program terms to the wider Canadian community and in financial terms to potential contributors. In dialogue with the President, the Board should consider its broader priorities and direction for the next decade as it develops its succession plan.*

4.0 Conclusions

The Foundation is at a point of transition. In the next few years more and more of the founding Members who personally knew the late Prime Minister Trudeau will retire, to be replaced by people with a looser connection to the origins and initial vision of the Foundation. The Foundation will be challenged to remain true to its purpose while coming up with a renewed and dynamic Board, one that is engaged in developing innovative ways to deliver on the Foundation’s mission and goals over the next ten years.

As the Foundation enters its second decade of program operations, it has demonstrated fidelity to the original vision of its founders, a commitment to excellence and efficiency in operations, and a readiness to adapt and improve its programming wherever necessary.

The Foundation was created to build a community of scholars and creative people who are committed to a better Canada. This is perhaps the most valuable expression of the four individual programs. The challenge for the future is to sustain the quality of the programs while strengthening the synergy among them, and extending the reach and raising the visibility of its contributions across Canada.

Appendices

1. Logic Model for the Trudeau Foundation's Programs

Inputs	• Endowment fund income • Donation income • Management and staff time, office space and equipment • Voluntary contribution of expert knowledge and advice to the nomination, review and selection processes, and in the form of guidance by the Board of directors, Members and others • The contributions of Fellows, Scholars and Mentors to meeting the intellectual and administrative needs of the Foundation
Activities	• Application (Scholars program only), nomination, review and selection processes for Scholars, Fellows and Mentors • Management and delivery of the Foundation's Scholarship, Fellowship, Mentorship and Public Interaction programs • Providing opportunities for award-holders to contribute to wider public debate • Facilitating events, bringing together award-holders with decision-makers, opinion-leaders and representatives of the public policy community • Communicating the results of award-holders' research work to the public policy community, as well as the interested public • Leveraging the support/cooperation of other institutions
Outputs	• Scholarships, Fellowships, Mentorships awarded and continued • Trudeau Conference and other events held • The Foundation facilitates a range of opportunities for award-holders to engage effectively in public debate • The Foundation's web-site engages award-holders in ongoing exchange and discussion
Short-term impacts	Scholars • Demonstrate the ability to produce research and creative work of outstanding quality • Demonstrate a consistently high level of engagement with public issues through a combination of their research, writing, other creative work and involvement in public activities and networks • Participate actively in inter-disciplinary networks; such networks are integral

	to implementing their research plans Fellows • Demonstrate continuing research and creative excellence, along with the capabilities to actively and effectively engage in public dialogue • Participate actively in interdisciplinary networks; such networks are integral to implementing their research plans Mentors • Play a bridging role in facilitating more effective linkages between: (i) the worlds of research and creative endeavour, and (ii) those of policy and the application of knowledge • Enhance the attentiveness of other award-holders, particularly Scholars and the Foundation in general, to broader public dialogue, challenging awardees and the institution to integrate public preoccupations into their/its ongoing work Public interaction • The Foundation demonstrates its ability to strengthen interdisciplinary cooperation among award holders, and among award-holders and broader networks • Scholars and Fellows have an enhanced sense of their effectiveness and capacity to contribute to, and influence, public discourse • The Trudeau Conference is recognized for its contribution to informing and shaping public discourse on selected issues and themes
Medium-term impacts	• Outstanding research and creative work is produced, is made available to the wider community, and receives peer and public recognition, for both its quality and its connection to important societal issues • The Foundation is recognized within the academic, research and artistic/creative communities for its ongoing contribution to strengthening the visibility and vitality of the social sciences and humanities, and for underscoring the broader social relevance of work in these fields • The Foundation is recognized by those in the public policy, academic and creative spheres for its contribution to supporting and maintaining informed debate, and facilitating public engagement, on issues of social significance in Canada and/or internationally • The Foundation is highly regarded by those engaged in, and interested in, public policy, for having brought a body of pertinent knowledge, drawn from research and creative work in the social sciences and humanities, to bear on critical societal issues, and for having contributed to connecting the Scholarly and public policy communities in Canada

Long-term impact	• Those who have been Trudeau Scholars come to play leading roles in the Canadian academic sphere, and in the broader society • The Foundation generates and enhances public debate on some of society's major issues • The Foundation provides citizens of Canada and the world with a deeper experience of, and commitment to, democracy
-------------------------	--

2. Follow-up to the Previous Reviews

	2005-2006 EXTERNAL CONSULTING FIRM RAWKINS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATES		2008-2009 DISTINGUISHED REVIEW PANEL CHAIRD BY WILLIAM C. LEGGETT	
	Response	Implemented	Response	Implemented
GOVERNANCE				
The Government should replace two Government Board Members.			✓ Foundation invited the Minister of Industry to appoint the Clerk of the Privy Council and the President of SSHRC to its Board.	✗ No development.
A succession plan should be formulated and adopted by the Board of Directors.			✓ The nominating committee was asked to prepare a comprehensive succession plan.	✓ Done. Committee is meeting on a regular basis, twice a year.
Foundation should review its 2002 strategic plan and develop a balanced scorecard.			✓ The Foundation developed a new Strategic Plan for 2010-2015 and balanced scorecards.	✓ Strategic plan in place; scorecard developed, implementation dependent upon resources.
Board should ask management to develop a risk identification and management strategy.			✓ Board will develop a risk identification and analysis; implementation oversight by audit committee.	✓ Audit Committee, Finance and investment Committee, and Governance Committee are coordinating.
Board should implement a regular Board performance assessment at the corporate, Board			✓ A board committee will be appointed to develop instruments and	✓ Governance Committee established in 2010. Terms of reference for each

	2005-2006 EXTERNAL CONSULTING FIRM RAWKINS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATES		2008-2009 DISTINGUISHED REVIEW PANEL CHAIRIED BY WILLIAM C. LEGGETT	
	Response	Implemented	Response	Implemented
and individual director level.			procedures.	committee adopted.
Formalise the operations of the Executive Committee.			✓ The Committee will meet six times a year and decisions will be recorded in minutes, which will be shared with the Board.	✓ Done. Terms of reference also developed for the committee.
Adding at least one meeting of the Board.			✗ The Foundation will revise the mandate of the Executive Committee for it to operation in between the two full Board meetings.	✓ Done. Terms of reference were also developed for the different committees of the Board.
SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM				
Approach the CAGS to make a presentation on the Scholarship Program.	✓ A meeting will be arranged.	✓		
Establish a working group to investigate barriers to participations of candidates from Humanities.	✓ A committee will be assembled by the President.	✓		
Examine the apparent shortage of Francophone candidates.	✗ Not necessary. Monitoring in place.			
Increase the maximum number of candidate from six to eight for	✓ Research-intensive universities will be allowed to	✓		

	2005-2006 EXTERNAL CONSULTING FIRM RAWKINS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATES		2008-2009 DISTINGUISHED REVIEW PANEL CHAIRIED BY WILLIAM C. LEGGETT	
	Response	Implemented	Response	Implemented
larger institutions.	nominate up to eight scholarship candidates.			
Require that a formal internal selection committee be set up at each participating university.	✗ Foundation should not be seen to meddle in the internal processes of universities.			
Record all stages of internal selection.	✗ Foundation will continue to maintain a written record of all positive decisions.			
Present a complete annual report on the selection proves and results to the Board.	✗ Not necessary. President already reports to the Board on every selection process.			
Review the guidelines on ranking to be followed by the FRC and staff.	✓ Guidelines will be reviewed and prepared for the 2006 competition.	✓		
Increase the size and diversity of the FRC membership.	✗ Not necessary.			
Formalize the discretion in determining the composition of the finalist pool to ensure adequate representation.	✓ Guidelines will be added to the Program Manual before the next competition.	✓		
Increase the size of each interview	✗			

	2005-2006 EXTERNAL CONSULTING FIRM RAWKINS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATES		2008-2009 DISTINGUISHED REVIEW PANEL CHAIRIED BY WILLIAM C. LEGGETT	
	Response	Implemented	Response	Implemented
panel from three to five to broaden the base of experience of the panels.	Not necessary. Already been increased from three to four.			
Encourage a conversational approach in the interviews.	✓ The President will brief each panel before they begin interviews.	✓		
Adopt a 40-minute to one-hour interview norm.	✓ Implemented in 2006.	✓		
Include a former Fellow among the interviewers in each panel.	✓ Previously implemented.	✓		
Request panel members to use an agreed numeric ranking system.	✓ Implemented in 2006.	✓		
Assess candidate rankings across the two panels.	✓ Implemented in 2006.	✓		
Ask the two chairs and the two fellows to review all files.	✓ Implemented in 2006. Each panel will receive full files for all the students to be interviewed.	✓		
Extend the duration of the final stage of the selection process.	✓ Two-day selection panel implemented in 2006.	✓		
Trudeau Scholars must be encouraged to highlight their			✓ We will develop a new identification	✓ Done. Policy developed;

	2005-2006 EXTERNAL CONSULTING FIRM RAWKINS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATES		2008-2009 DISTINGUISHED REVIEW PANEL CHAIRIED BY WILLIAM C. LEGGETT	
	Response	Implemented	Response	Implemented
affiliation to the Foundation.			policy to increase the visibility of the Foundation through its program beneficiaries.	introductory session in place for incoming scholarship recipients.
Make greater efforts to ensure that the program is widely known within universities.			✓ Management will develop an information campaign.	✓ Implemented with resources available.
Emphasize the non-financial aspects of the Scholarship.			✓ Will continue to emphasize this aspect if resources are available to do so.	✓ Implemented.
FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM				
Separate letters should be sent out for the fellows and mentors nominations.	✓ Implemented in 2006.	✓		
Discuss with universities the opportunity of changing the confidentiality providing in the nomination process.	✗ Not necessary. Nomination confidentiality is a trademark of the Foundation.			
Assess the nomination and file preparation process.	✓ Progressively implemented.	✓		
Strengthen and professionalize the Fellowship nomination	✗ Not necessary. There is nothing unprofessional			

	2005-2006 EXTERNAL CONSULTING FIRM RAWKINS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATES		2008-2009 DISTINGUISHED REVIEW PANEL CHAIRIED BY WILLIAM C. LEGGETT	
	Response	Implemented	Response	Implemented
process.	about nominations being drawn from more than one source.			
Require that a nominator secure the support of a seconder.	✖ Not necessary. May consider instituting a new process of invited second letters to canvass the experience of the MacArthur Foundation.			
Establish a separate group of nominators from the creative fields.	✓ Agreed in principle, but research is needed.	✓		
Hold face-to-face deliberations for the FRC.	✓ This process will continue.	✓		
Reflect of what Fellows are expected to contribute as intellectual leaders and guide to the work of the Foundation.	✓ This can be enhanced.	✓		
Provide an opportunity for the Fellows to meet as a group.	✓ The Fellows will participate in the Summer Institute in 2006.	✓		
Ensure that Trudeau Fellows are selected [...] on: a) their potential future contributions; b) their history of			✓ Implemented.	✓ Implemented.

	2005-2006 EXTERNAL CONSULTING FIRM RAWKINS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATES		2008-2009 DISTINGUISHED REVIEW PANEL CHAIRIED BY WILLIAM C. LEGGETT	
	Response	Implemented	Response	Implemented
interaction with graduate students; and c) their willingness to participate in and contribute to the activities of the Foundation.				
Trudeau Fellows should be encouraged to highlight their affiliation to the Foundation.			✓ This will be stipulated in the three-party agreement for the fellowship.	✓ Implemented.
MENTORSHIP PROGRAM				
Strengthen the existing program, by giving more attention to willingness, ability, and availability,	✓ Will be implemented during the 2007 selection process.	✓		
Provide an opportunity for new scholars to meet with "veterans" to discuss mentorship.	✓ Agreed in part. A Mentor-Scholar meeting was inaugurated in 2006.	✓		
Consult with scholars to discuss what they hope to gain from mentorship.	✓ Already implemented in 2005. Will continue.	✓		
Hold a one-day meeting of all mentors with staff.	✕ Not necessary. Mentor-Scholar meetings implemented in 2006.			

	2005-2006 EXTERNAL CONSULTING FIRM RAWKINS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATES		2008-2009 DISTINGUISHED REVIEW PANEL CHAIRIED BY WILLIAM C. LEGGETT	
	Response	Implemented	Response	Implemented
Consider the options for a remodelled mentorship program.	✓ Agreed in principle. Will assess whether the working group is needed after the 2007 evaluation.	✓		
Consider the option that mentors be viewed as a resource to the Foundation as a whole.	✓ Agreed. Implemented in modified form so that mentors engage with the entire group of scholars.	✓		
Assign priority to the candidate's ability to be an effective mentor.	✓ Guidelines will be reviewed and revised as necessary.	✓		
Conduct an exit interview with mentors.	✓ To be implemented in 2007.	✓		
Ensure that the individuals identified as Mentors have the time, interest, and ability to act as mentors.			✓ Implemented.	✓ Implemented.
Encourage and facilitate the active continuing engagement of the most effective and interested Mentors.			✓ Implemented.	✓ Implemented.
Create greater flexibility in the timing and duration of the mentoring			✓ Will identify ways to do so.	✓ Extension of mentorship to 24 months included in

	2005-2006 EXTERNAL CONSULTING FIRM RAWKINS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATES		2008-2009 DISTINGUISHED REVIEW PANEL CHAIRIED BY WILLIAM C. LEGGETT	
	Response	Implemented	Response	Implemented
period.				the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan.
PUBLIC INTERACTION PROGRAM				
Form a PIP advisory committee to help building the Trudeau community.	✓ Agreed in principle. It is a little too early to create such an advisory group. Possibly during 2008.	✗		
Produce an annual high-quality publication to enhance its visibility and influence.	✓ To be considered as part of a wider reflection on publications in conjunction with its private fundraising initiatives.	✓		
Continue experimentation with innovative and creative models for involving the full cross-section of disciplines.			✓ Within our budgetary constraints, will continue to expand the program.	✓ Strategic Plan 2010-2015 suggests establishing Trudeau Network Projects, pending fundraising.
MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION				
Review the 1.5% limit of operating expenses.			✓ Foundation requested more flexibility.	✗ No development.

	2005-2006 EXTERNAL CONSULTING FIRM RAWKINS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATES		2008-2009 DISTINGUISHED REVIEW PANEL CHAIRIED BY WILLIAM C. LEGGETT	
	Response	Implemented	Response	Implemented
Efforts should be made to: a) deepen the administrative structure [...]; and b) increase the outreach [...].			✓ If sufficient resources are available, the Foundation will re-evaluate its human resources requirements and communications.	✗ New administrative position created in 2010, but scarce resources prevented the achievement of “appropriate and effective redundancy.”
While we did not conduct an audit of the Foundation’s compliance to the ATIP, we heard evidence that this new responsibility requires approximately 0.5 full-time equivalent.			✓ Request exemption from the regulations that apply to government institutions.	✗ No development.
PUBLIC PROFILE AND VISIBILITY				
The Foundation should develop a communications and engagement strategy.			✓ The Foundation will develop a strategy provided that resources are available.	✗ No development due to limited resources.
FOUNDATION THEMES				
The Foundation should periodically revisit the four themes.			✓ Include this concern in the Board’s strategic sessions.	✓ Addressed informally from time to time.
FUNDRAISING				
The recommended strategic planning			✓ The Board will	✓ Strategic Plan

	2005-2006 EXTERNAL CONSULTING FIRM RAWKINS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATES		2008-2009 DISTINGUISHED REVIEW PANEL CHAIRMAN BY WILLIAM C. LEGGETT	
	Response	Implemented	Response	Implemented
exercise would [...] provide a strong basis for moving forward on a fundraising initiative.			establish a committee to look at private fundraising.	proposes the undertaking of a fundraising campaign.

Source: Prepared by the Trudeau Foundation

3. Potential Metrics for the Trudeau Foundation's Programs

The metrics that follow are for discussion purposes only. They represent a small number of measures that may be useful for management and oversight of the Foundation's programs over the medium and longer terms. They have not been validated with the Foundation's Board.

		2012 (actual)	In another 5 years (target)	In another 10 years (target)
Inputs	Annual spending	\$6.3 million	\$6.5 million	TBD
	Disbursement quota	3.7 per cent	3.5 per cent	3.5 per cent
	Administration and program delivery	1.0 per cent	1.0 per cent	1.0 per cent
Rationale As part of the Bridge Plan to the Long Term, the Foundation will maintain its current spending level to the end of 2016 while it seeks to attain perpetual sustainability through fundraising and working to obtain a less restrictive investment mandate. The longer-term activities, outputs and impacts that follow are aspirational and dependent upon success on both fronts.				
Activities	Scholar applications	241	250	400
	Fellow nominations	76	75	95
	Mentor nominations	149	150	225
Rationale To maintain the quality of its program participants, the Foundation is seeking a stable ratio of acceptances to applicants. An increase in applications meeting the Foundation's selection criteria suggests a growing awareness of the Foundation's programs and their benefits.				
Outputs	Scholars	15	15	25
	Fellows	4	5	5
	Mentors	10	10	15
	Major events	10	10	10

Rationale

- Under the current funding agreement with the Government of Canada, the number of participants is capped at 25 Scholars, 5 Fellows and 15 Mentors per year. For financial reasons, the number of participants – particularly Scholars and Mentors – has been below those maximums. As resources permit, the Foundation would like to expand the number of participants to the maximum permitted by the agreement.
- For its Public Interaction Program, the objective is to reach out to larger and more diverse audiences through broader event participation and information dissemination rather than to increase the number of major events.

Impacts	Scholar PhD completion rate	95 per cent	95 per cent	95 per cent
	Scholar time to graduation	5.2 years	5.2 years	5.2 years
	Fellow plan completion rate	New measure	TBD	TBD
	Public interaction sponsors	New measure	TBD	TBD

Rationale

- Approximately 5 per cent of Trudeau scholars do not complete their PhD studies for personal or professional reasons.
- Because of the level and depth of the support provided to the students, Trudeau scholars are expected to need less time on average than other doctoral students to complete their degree (even though they are expected to engage regularly in Trudeau events throughout their scholarship).²⁰
- With recent changes to the Fellowship program, Fellows will submit a plan indicating how the award will be used. Performance against those plans will be measured through exit interviews.
- The Foundation is seeking sponsorships for dialogue and discussion of specific, significant issues. Appropriate metrics will be developed as experience is gained with delivery of those events.

²⁰ The most recent SSHRC survey reports a 96 per cent completion rate for former SSHRC Doctoral Fellowship award holders and a median time-to-completion rate of five years and eight months, rates higher and faster than reported in other surveys. It notes, however, that these findings should be interpreted with caution since the survey likely excluded those who did not complete their graduate studies. See *SSHRC Scholarships and Fellowships Survey Final Report*, Corporate Performance and Evaluation Division, January 2011.

4. Who We Talked With

2009 Review Panel Members

- William C. Leggett (Chair)
- Elizabeth Dowdeswell
- Gilles G. Patry

Current Board Members and Members of the Foundation

- Roy L. Heenan
- Chaviva Hošek
- Edward Johnson
- Paule Leduc
- John McCall MacBain
- Bruce McNiven
- Patrick Pichette
- Marc Renaud
- Sean E. Riley
- Alexandre Trudeau

Foundation Management

- Élise Comtois, Director of Corporate Services and Public Affairs
- Pierre-Gerlier Forest, President and CEO
- Jennifer Petrela, Program Director—Mentorship, Fellowship and Public Interaction
- Josée St-Martin, Program Director—Scholarships

Foundation community

- Sara Angel, Scholar 2012
- Isabella Bakker, Fellow 2009
- Elizabeth Beale, Mentor 2012
- Guy Berthiaume, Mentor 2010
- Cindy Blackstock, Mentor 2012
- Margaret Bloodworth, Mentor 2011
- Nathan Bennett, Scholar 2010
- Andrée Boisselle, Scholar 2008
- Joseph Caron, Mentor 2011
- Isabelle Chouinard, Scholar 2009

- Sujit Choudhry, Fellow 2010
- Christopher Cox, Scholar 2009
- Beverley Diamond, Fellow 2009
- Simon Harel, Fellow 2009
- Frances Lankin, Mentor 2012
- Daniel Lessard, Mentor 2012
- Steven Loft, Visiting Fellow 2010
- Jason Luckerhoff, Scholar 2006
- Maureen McTeer, Mentor 2011
- Haideh Moghissi, Fellow 2011
- Kate Parizeau, Scholar 2007
- Jeremy Schmidt, Scholar 2009
- Marina Sharpe, Scholar 2011
- John Sims, Mentor 2012
- Jeremy Webber, Fellow 2009
- Daniel Weinstock, Fellow 2004
- Jodi White, Mentor 2010

Academic community

- Graham Carr (President, Canadian Federation of Social Sciences and Humanities)
- Claude Corbo (Rector of the Université du Québec à Montréal)
- Peter McKinnon (Former President of the University of Saskatchewan)
- Indira Samirasekera (President and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Alberta)
- Stephen J. Toope (President and Vice-Chancellor of the University of British Columbia, Former President of the Pierre Elliott Trudeau Foundation)
- Judith Woodsworth (Former President of Concordia University and of Laurentian University)

Others

- Kathy Assayag (Former President Concordia Foundation)
- Tim Brodhead (Former president of McConnell Foundation)
- Duncan Cameron (Former Chair of the Fellows File Review Committee)
- Chad Gaffield (President, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council)
- Patricia Hassard (Former Privy Council Office)
- Stephen Huddart (Current president of McConnell Foundation)

- Andy Noseworthy (Chair of the Mentors File Review Committee)
- Iain Stewart (Industry Canada)
- Mitchell Temkin (CEO Garth Homer Society)

5. What We Asked

1. Could you please describe your experience with the Trudeau Foundation?
2. What do you think have been the significant changes in the context in which the Foundation operates since its inception in 2001?
3. What do you think makes the Foundation's programs unique?
4. What do you think are the current challenges and opportunities facing the Foundation?
5. Do you think that the Foundation is meeting its original objectives? If yes, what examples would you cite? If not, why not?
6. Do you believe that there is a continued need for each of the Foundation's four programs? If not, why not?
7. What changes (if any) would you suggest being made to the Foundation's programs or to the way it operates? Should it stay on its present course or is there a need for an adjustment in strategic direction?
8. Are there any other comments that you would like to make about the Foundation and its work?

In addition to these questions, the following questions were asked of Board Members

9. Do you think that the Board is provided with the information that it needs to set policies and program directions for the Foundation, and to oversee its endowment and annual operating budget?
10. How effective is the Board at setting strategic, policy and program directions?
11. What has the Foundation done to respond to the recommendations and observations made in the 2009 Five-Rear Review?
12. What has the Foundation done to implement the strategic directions set out in the most recent (2010) strategic plan?

6. Who We Surveyed

As part of the review, we conducted an internet survey of all current and former Scholars, Fellows and Mentors listed in the Foundation's database. We sought their views on their experience with the program and the events associated with it. We were particularly interested in discovering what impact being a Scholar or a Fellow has had on their scholarly or other creative work, and what impact Mentoring has had on Scholars.

As the table below illustrates, a total of 99 survey forms were completed, representing an overall response rate of 37%. The response rate among Scholars and Fellows was higher at 45% and the rate for Mentors was lower at 19%. For Scholars, the responses were skewed towards more recent participants, while for Fellows responses were more evenly distributed across cohorts.

Trudeau Foundation Survey Responses

Year	Scholars	Fellows	Mentors	Total
2003	1	2	0	3
2004	7	2	1	10
2005	3	4	1	8
2006	2	1	0	3
2007	2	3	1	6
2008	7	2	1	10
2009	7	2	2	11
2010	11	1	1	13
2011	11	3	2	16
2012	12	1	5	18
Unstated	0	0	1	1
Responses	63	21	15	99
Population	143	46	78	267
Response Rate	44%	46%	19%	37%

7. What We Read

External Documents

Environmental Scan for SSHRC Doctoral Fellowship Program, Science-Metrix Inc., Submitted to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, May 31, 2006.

Canada Graduate Scholarships (CGS) Program and Related Programs Review, Executive Summary, Evaluation and Analysis Branch, Canadian Institutes of Health Research, February 2009.

Tenth-Year Evaluation of the Canada Research Chairs Program Final Evaluation Report, Science-Metrix Inc., Submitted to the Evaluation Advisory Committee of the Canada Research Chairs Program, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, December 8, 2010.

SSHRC Scholarships and Fellowships Survey Final Report, Shannon Clark Larkin, Abderrahim El Moulat and Mom Yem for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, January 2011.

Canadian College Research in the Social Sciences and Humanities: A Focused Environmental Scan, Marti Jurmain and Jim Madder for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, September 2011.

Internal Documents

Funding Agreement on the Advanced Research in the Humanities and Human Sciences Fund, Government of Canada, Industry Canada, May 20, 2004.

Framework for the Programme Evaluation of the Trudeau Foundation, Rawkins International Associates, March 2005.

Preliminary Review of the Trudeau Foundation, Rawkins International Associates, November 2005.

Trudeau Foundation Preliminary Programme Evaluation: Management Response and Recommendations for Action, Stephen Troope, President Pierre Elliott Trudeau Foundation, April 2006.

First Five Year Periodic Review of the Foundation, William C. Leggett (Chair), Elizabeth Dowdeswell and Gilles G. Patry, March 2009.

The Foundation Response to the Report of the Distinguished Review Panel, Pierre Gerlier Forest, President and Roy L. Heenan, Chair of the Board of Directors, March 2009.

Annual Reports of the Foundation, 2002-03 to 2011-12.

Business Plans of the Foundation, 2007-08 to 2012-13.

Strategic Plans for the Foundation, 2002, 2007, 2010.

Background information prepared by Foundation Staff for the 2009 Review, including

- Briefing Book 1: Administrative Issues
- Briefing Book 2: Scholarship Program
- Briefing Book 3: Mentorship Program

- Briefing Book 4: Fellowship Program
- Briefing Book 5: Public Interaction Program

Other background information prepared by Foundation Staff, including

- Five Year Review Implementation, 2013
- Reflection Paper: Review of the Fellowship Program, 25 February, 2013