

**PRELIMINARY REVIEW
OF THE TRUDEAU FOUNDATION**

Prepared for the Foundation by

Phillip Rawkins

Rawkins International Associates

**Presented to the Board of Directors
November 2005**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	4
A. <u>INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE REVIEW</u>	11
1. Introduction to the Foundation.....	11
2. The Evaluation Framework and the Preliminary Review.....	12
3. Evaluation Issues and Methodology.....	14
4. The process of Undertaking the Preliminary Review.....	15
B. <u>PROGRAMME ASSESSMENT</u>	16
1. A Description of Programmes, with a Note on Staffing and Finance.....	16
2. The Scholarship Programme.....	22
2.1 <i>Introduction</i>	22
2.2 <i>The Applicants, the Application Process, and Fields of Study</i>	23
2.3 <i>Selecting the Trudeau Scholars</i>	29
2.4 <i>Issues Concerning the Nomination and Selection Process</i>	33
2.5 <i>A Listing of Major Issues Concerning Selection at the Foundation</i>	41
2.6 <i>Reporting by Scholars, and Progress in their Doctoral Programmes</i>	45
3. The Fellowship Programme.....	46
3.1 <i>Introduction</i>	46
3.2 <i>The Nominators and Nominees</i>	46
3.3 <i>The Selection Process at the Universities</i>	48
3.4 <i>Selection at the Foundation: Selecting the Semi-Finalists</i>	49
3.5 <i>The File-Review Committee: Selecting the Finalists</i>	50
3.6 <i>Fellows and their Progress</i>	52
3.7 <i>Issues Concerning the Fellowship Programme</i>	52
4. The Mentorship Programme.....	55
4.1 <i>Introduction</i>	55
4.2 <i>Nominating and Selecting the Mentors</i>	55
4.3 <i>Selecting the Mentors Part Two: The Role of the File Review Committee</i>	57
4.4 <i>The Mentoring Process</i>	59
5. The Public Interaction Programme (PIP).....	65
5.1 <i>Introduction</i>	65

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

5.2 The Range of Activities of PIP..... 67
5.3 Assessing What Has Been Accomplished to Date.....70
5.4 Towards a Trudeau Community.....76

6. Summing Up Interim Achievements and Results.....84

7. Strategic development and Management issues..... 89

8. Summary of Recommendations.....90

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, (Including Recommendations)

The Preliminary review of the Foundation is one element of the Programme Evaluation Framework adopted by the Board in March 2005. The Review assesses all of the Foundation's programmes, while also taking an initial look at results and directions taken in pursuit of overall goals. The work leading up to the presentation of this report took place between January and September of this year. The findings are based primarily on interviews and a review of documents.

While acknowledging the many accomplishments of the Foundation, as well as the outstanding quality of its award-holders, the Review offers a reflection on what has been learned through three years of experience of the programme cycle, as well as of scholarly and public engagement. It also provides an opportunity for reconsideration of programme design issues, as well as of all facets of programme operations and management.

The Review is concerned with the three core award programmes supported by the Foundation: Fellowship Prizes; Scholarships; and, Mentorships. It also gives attention to a fourth area of programming, the Public Interaction Programme, which seeks to complement the award programmes by bringing the awardees together, and to link them to specialized external partners and audiences, as well as a broader public, while also enhancing the capacity of the Foundation, through its programming, to achieve the desired impact in contributing to, and influencing, public debate.

A particular focus of the report is the nomination and selection process for the awards programmes. Of the three, it is **the Scholarship Programme**, with a complex application and selection stage at the university level, which receives the most detailed examination. It is noted in the report that, within three years from inception, the Programme has established itself as a highly-regarded, elite competition.

A total of 371 nominations were received during the first three years of the Programme with candidates originating in all regions of Canada and abroad.

<i>Scholar Nominations by Region</i>		
Ontario	113	30%
Quebec	54	15%
British Columbia	40	11%
Alberta	19	5%
Nova Scotia	13	4%
New Brunswick	12	3%
Manitoba	10	3%
Other regions of Canada	17	5%
International	51	14%
Unknown	42	11%
	371	100%

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

The application form, with supporting materials, is found to be effective in attracting the attention of a small number of outstanding doctoral students, while discouraging those who do not fully meet the requirements. Scholars from a wide variety of disciplines within the humanities and the pure and applied social sciences, as well as environmental studies, public health and other inter-disciplinary fields, have succeeded in being nominated by their universities. The character of the four themes, the emphasis on links between student research topics and public policy, and the concern with public engagement, taken together with patterns of study in the relevant disciplines, have placed scholars from the humanities at a disadvantage in winning recognition as top candidates for the award at either university or Foundation level. Some proposals are made for further investigation of the issues, but there is no immediate remedy.

A number of recommendations are put forward concerning selection within the universities, and on matters to be discussed by the Foundation and university authorities. While no criticism of current arrangements is intended, on the basis of a very thorough, step-by-step examination of selection procedures at the Foundation, and the work of the File Review Committee and the Finalist Interview Panels, a series of recommendations is put forward concerning adjustments to procedures and selection methodology to further strengthen provisions for transparency, fairness and equity in decision-making. Attention is given, in particular, to extending the duration of the interviewing process for Finalists at the Foundation, with provision for a longer, more standardized, interview format to be followed for all candidates.

As with the Scholarship Programme, though with a much smaller numbers of nominees, candidates for **the Fellowship Prize** also came from a wide variety of disciplines and fields of study. Although no difficulties have been experienced in identifying exceptional candidates as Finalists for selection, there are some problems with the selection and nomination process at the universities which the Foundation would do well to address.

It appears that the distinctive characteristics of the Programme have yet to be fully appreciated by some universities, and this is reflected in the approach taken by these institutions to selection of nominees. This would seem to have had some impact in restricting the range of candidates put forward for consideration. While Trudeau Fellows are more likely than their peers to be engaged with public issues, some issues are raised in the report concerning the degree of attention given in selection to the dimension of public engagement, probable interest in working with Scholars, and in contributing to setting the intellectual agenda for the Foundation. For candidates for Fellowships (and for Mentorships), it is suggested that a greater investment by the Foundation is required in building a stronger and broader base of information on these matters in the candidate files.

Fellows have been active in a variety of ways in the life of the Foundation. However, they cannot be said to be setting its intellectual agenda. Under present circumstances, much of the burden of intellectual leadership for the Foundation is carried by the President. To date, he has managed the task with considerable acumen, but the arrangement does not provide a sound or sustainable basis for future development. The Fellows and others must play a stronger role in this respect.

The Foundation Board and management have given careful thought to what may be required to enhance the effectiveness of **the Mentorship Programme**, which, all agree, is the most innovative of the three award programmes and the most elusive to design and implement. After a challenging beginning, a number of adjustments have been made to the Programme this year, and these are already making a difference. The report offers encouragement to the continuing efforts of the Foundation to strengthen the Programme. It notes continuing difficulties in weighing the “virtues” which, together, add up to a formula, or formulae, for a successful Mentor. The complexities of the mentoring process are examined, and it is suggested that, in selection, greater attention be given to ensuring that nominees have the right mix of experience aptitude and attitude, to enter into a mentoring relationship, and that this is given equal consideration, alongside professional credentials and overall experience. For the longer term, a process is suggested whereby the Foundation might consider some alternative options for the Programme, perhaps moving away from a focus on the one-to-one mentoring relationship.

The report gives a very positive assessment of the **Public Engagement Programme (PIP)**, and notes the substantial steps which have been taken in the past year to build up an impressive number of activities, while also shaping a programme for 2006, based on a sequence of signature events. The most important single event held so far, the first Trudeau public Policy Conference, was found to have been a critical success, with any negative features outweighed by its achievements. Most participants found it to have been a memorable occasion. One concern noted by a number of those who took part, particularly public policy practitioners, was a weakness in making a connection between academic dialogue and practical issues of public policy and the worlds of government and business.

As yet, the report notes, none of the three categories of awardee have fully found their place in the emergent “Trudeau Community”, but it also recognizes that plans for new forms of activity and modes of engagement should contribute to changing this situation. A number of suggestions are made on ways to enhance the role of, in turn, Fellows, Scholars, and Mentors, in the broader life of the “Trudeau Community”, while strengthening the bonds to hold that community together. It is suggested that efforts of this kind, should take precedence, in the short term, to investment in broader forms of public engagement.

In the area of **management**, the report emphasizes the exemplary quality of the management and administration of programme operations, noting also the high degree of satisfaction of all awardees interviewed with the support provided. Some concerns are raised about staff overload, and the need for consideration to be given to improved staffing levels and adjustments to ways of working.

Overall, for the most part, the Foundation is found to have produced the outputs and the short-term results to which it has committed itself. A minor weakness in performance identified is the area of communications and the establishment of the “Trudeau Virtual Community”, but the report notes that plans are underway to address this gap in the near future.

Major Recommendations (A more Complete and Detailed List is Set Out at the Conclusion of the Main Report)

The Scholarship Programme

1. It will be worthwhile for the Foundation to conduct some further investigations of barriers to participation of candidates from the Humanities (possibly for the Fellowship, as well as the Scholarship, Programme). Accordingly, **it is recommended** that a small Reference, or Working, Group, with an advisory function, be established.
2. On the apparent shortage of Francophone candidates, as in the case of the Humanities, **it is recommended** that the Foundation contemplate undertaking a further assessment of the issue with the support of a small Working Group, drawn from relevant stakeholders. In the “Francophone case”, it will be helpful if the Group first consider whether there really is a “problem”, or whether, in fact, the numbers are more-or-less as they should be.
3. **It is recommended** that the Foundation give consideration to increasing the maximum number of candidates from six to eight for a few, larger institutions, to be identified on the basis of the graduate enrolment in all relevant disciplines. Taking into account the apparent concentration of talent at a small number of institutions, and given the objective to include the most outstanding applicants in the pool, some adjustment here would seem warranted.
4. One of the findings of the Review is that there is a need for more detailed guidelines on how universities should undertake internal selection. **It is recommended** that the Foundation indicate a requirement that a formal Selection Committee be set up at each participating university. Beyond this, guidelines would be couched as recommendations, rather than as mandatory. Despite this, every effort should be made to encourage their adoption.
5. In order to provide complete assurance to all concerned of fairness in **internal selection procedures** at the Foundation, it will be advisable for the Foundation to maintain a more complete record of its procedures. **It is further recommended** that, on an annual basis, the President present a complete report on the selection process and results to the Board (possibly following prior consideration at the ANRC), and that this report be reviewed and then attached to the minutes for future reference.
6. **It is recommended** that the Foundation increase the size of the FRC to six, and that steps are considered to increase the diversity of the background of the membership.
7. **It is recommended** that the size of each of the two interview panels for the Scholarship award finalists be increased from three to five, with one of the members designated as a chair. This will also provide the opportunity to broaden the base of experience of the panels. A current or former fellow should be included in the membership of each panel.
8. **It is recommended** that the Foundation adopt a 40-minute to one-hour interview for finalists as the norm, following a consistent format. With the process facilitated by a chair, this will

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

permit each candidate to provide an explanation of her or his research and its relationship to larger issues, while also giving the panel the opportunity to get to know all of the candidates.

9. In order to make for shared information on all candidates and a fairer process of assessment at this last stage, **it is recommended** that the two chairs and the two Fellows be asked to review all files, including those assigned to the panel in which they will not participate, in advance. A meeting would then be held on the conclusion of the interview process involving the two chairs and the Foundation team, led by the Executive Programme Director, along with the two Fellows who have served as panel members, to make decisions among marginal candidates.

10. To complete the package of proposals for adjustment to the selection process for the Scholarship Programme, as discussed above, **it is recommended** that the Foundation plan an extended selection process at the final stage, beginning early on Friday evening, and concluding on Sunday afternoon. This would provide the enabling environment in which all the other recommendations might be implemented effectively.

The Fellowship Programme

1. It is recommended that the Foundation hold discussions with the universities (at the VP and Dean's level, and not merely through consulting University Presidents) on the confidentiality provision in the nomination process.

2. It is recommended that the Foundation make a thorough assessment of the nomination and file preparation process, with a view to considering how best to further enhance the quality, detail and relevance, of the materials to be included in the nomination files for Fellowship candidates.

3. A related issue concerns the List of Nominators and the nomination process. Under the present arrangements, academic candidates considered by the universities as potential nominees must go through an internal selection process, while others may be proposed by one individual, who might or might not be an academic, acting alone. **It is recommended** strongly that the Foundation give further thought to ways of strengthening and professionalizing the Fellowship nomination process, and that it take the immediate step of requiring that, in proposing a candidate, each nominator secure the support of a seconder, drawn from the list of nominators.

4. If there is a desire by the Board and management to include candidates from "the creative fields" whether inside or outside universities, **it is recommended** that a separate group of nominators be established, and that there should be a requirement for nominations to be supported by a second member from within the group. A sub-committee of the File Review Committee of a further five members with the necessary expertise would then review any nominations submitted, and be asked to arrive at the recommendation of one or two names to be included among the final pool.

The Mentorship Programme

1. For the short term, it is recommended that the Foundation be encouraged to continue with its imaginative efforts to strengthen the existing Programme. **For the medium term, it is recommended** that, during 2006-7, the Foundation consider forming a small Working Group to assist the President in considering the options for a remodelled Mentorship Programme. It will be important that a broad perspective be adopted in looking at options, and, with this in mind, it is suggested that the group might also include, as well as former Mentors, other individuals drawn from the Trudeau Community who would have an active interest in thinking through alternative directions for the future

2. One possibility which might be examined at some point is a “mixed” model, where different individuals may be selected to make different kinds of contribution to bridging the gap between research and policy and practice, viewed broadly. Some might be selected as “conventional” Mentors, while others might be viewed as a resource to all Scholars and the Foundation as a whole, perhaps with a third group contributing through one or two quite intensive activities organized to open up new possibilities and ideas for Scholars. **It is recommended** that consideration of options along these lines be included in the Working Group’s terms of reference.

3. It is recommended that the Foundation consider introducing an informal consultation with Scholars on an annual basis to discuss with them, on an individual basis, what they hope to gain from a Mentorship relationship and to provide the opportunity for a frank exchange of views. Their views would then be taken in to account in Scholar-Mentor assignments.

4. It is recommended that in the guidelines for both nomination and selection, priority is assigned to the candidate’s ability to be an effective Mentor, Further, the Foundation might give greater attention in the preparation of nominee files to the particular capacities of the candidate as a potential Mentor

The Public Interaction Programme and the Role of Fellows, Scholars and Mentors in the Life of the Trudeau Community

1. It is suggested that, while Fellows have been active in the life of the Foundation, it will be necessary for them to play a stronger role in setting the intellectual agenda for the Foundation to achieve its goals. Accordingly, **it is recommended** that the Foundation reflect carefully on its approach to Fellows, and on what they may be expected to contribute as intellectual leaders and guides to the work of the Foundation.

2. Fellows themselves note that there has been no opportunity for them to meet as a group, and **the Reviewer recommends** to the Foundation that to provide for such an opportunity once or twice each year would provide a forum where the Fellows themselves may be able to consider ways to take on a more pro-active role in working with the Foundation in setting intellectual directions.

3. As a contribution to obtaining valuable feedback on the Fellowship Programme and on the role of fellows in the Foundation, **it is recommended** that formal Exit Interviews be introduced for all Fellows completing their tenure as awardees. A similar process might also be considered for Mentors.

4. **It is recommended** that the Foundation give consideration to forming a small Advisory Group with a continuing role to provide advice from time to time, or respond to concerns raised by the President or the Board relating to the Scholarship programme, with particular reference to “the scholarship experience” and balancing the desire for broadening the intellectual horizons of Scholars with the concern that they complete their academic programmes as expected. While ensuring that the topic of Scholar engagement is central to the group’s concerns, with future needs in mind, the Foundation might be well-advised to give the group a broader advisory mandate regarding the PIP as a whole. On this basis, **it is further recommended** that the group be designated *the PIP Advisory Committee*, with a broader role in offering advice on how to move forward the agenda on building the Trudeau Community.

5. Funds permitting, **it is recommended** that the Foundation give consideration to the idea of producing a high-quality, annual publication to enhance both its visibility and influence.

A.INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE REVIEW

1. Introduction to the Foundation

As is stated in its official documents, The Pierre Elliott Trudeau Foundation seeks to address pressing social and public policy issues by creating an innovative network of study and intellectual exchange. The Foundation identifies and supports creative individuals who want to make a difference to the world and the communities in which they live. The Foundation is entirely non-partisan in its approach, and strives to give voice to a broad variety of perspectives. Its programmes emphasize four themes, widely recognized as central to Canada's present and future, and which reflect the personal and public preoccupations of Pierre Trudeau:

- Human Rights and Social Justice;
- Responsible Citizenship;
- Canada and the World;
- Humans and their Natural Environment.

The philosophy and aims of the Foundation are set out in its Mission Statement:

The Pierre Elliott Trudeau Foundation seeks to promote outstanding research and creative work in the social sciences and humanities, and to foster a fruitful dialogue between the humanities and social sciences, and policymakers in government, business, the voluntary sector, the professions and the arts community.

- *The Foundation will encourage emerging talent through the awarding of Trudeau Scholarships to the most talented doctoral students in Canada and abroad.*
- *Distinguished Trudeau Fellows and Mentors will be appointed for their knowledge and wisdom to build an intellectual community supporting the work of the Scholars.*
- *The Foundation will create and maintain an international network of Trudeau Scholars, Fellows and Mentors.*

All the work of the Foundation is directed to explorations of four distinct, but inter-related themes: Human Rights and Social Justice; Responsible Citizenship; Canada and the World; and Humans and their Natural Environment.

The Foundation is committed to supporting work of excellence that helps to promote public discussion on issues of great societal importance to Canada and the world.¹

The Foundation began its operations in March 2002, on receipt of a \$125 million endowment from the Government of Canada. Its first President and CEO, Professor Stephen J. Toope, who was appointed after a formal search process, took up his position at the beginning of August,

¹ As reproduced in the Foundation's *Business Plan for 2004-5*, July 2004, p.1.

2002. Within its first year of activities, the Foundation became fully operational, and inaugurated three of its four core programmes. These are the Trudeau Fellows, Trudeau Scholars and Trudeau Mentors Programmes. The three are unified by a common commitment to advanced research and policy development on current issues of major concern. Through its programmes, the Foundation provides support to awardees in the form of prizes (Fellowships), Scholarships, and honoraria (Mentorships).

A fourth programme, different in kind from the other three, but supportive of the same broad objectives and intended to strengthen the overall impact of the Foundation's work, was formalized somewhat later, in the Spring of 2004. Entitled 'Public Interaction Programme', (formerly known as "Academic Interchange and Public Engagement", AIPE) it brings together all Trudeau award winners – Fellows, Scholars and Mentors – to generate informed and lively debates on major issues of public policy affecting Canadians and global society. The Foundation describes the Programme as offering a means for it to work to "build its own community of creative and critical thinkers, while providing ways for them and the wider public to work together to generate and communicate ideas that matter." As it stands currently, PIP fosters six major annual events – the Trudeau Conference, the Trudeau Lecture, the Trudeau Fellows meeting, the Trudeau Scholar-Mentor meeting, the Trudeau Scholars Workshop, and the Trudeau Summer Institute. In addition, members of the Trudeau Community are encouraged to organize events linked to one or several of the Foundation themes with a view to generating a richer public debate on important societal issues.

Under the terms of the funding agreement between the Government of Canada and the Foundation, it has been established as a private foundation, fully independent of the Government. It is directed by a Board of Directors, whose membership includes many distinguished Canadians. Unlike other foundations established by the Government, and in accordance with the funding agreement, the Foundation preserves its capital, financing its operations from interest earned on its endowment funds.

2. The Evaluation Framework and the Preliminary Review²

The Programme Evaluation Framework was developed in response to requirements set out in the funding agreement. It was prepared by the author of this Report and finalized, following approval by an External Evaluation Steering Committee and discussions with the Board of Directors and Foundation management, in March 2005³. It sets out the mechanisms and plan of activities through which the success of the Foundation's programme will be assessed. There are three linked components to the evaluation plan. A *summative evaluation* (or "Five-Year Review") is planned to take place in 2007, towards the end of the first five years of operation

² See Framework for the Programme Evaluation of the Trudeau Foundation, November 2004, with revisions, March 2005.

³ The members of the Steering Committee are as follows: Mr. Tim Brodhead, President and CEO, McConnell Foundation, Chair of the Committee; Mr. Robb Conn, Audit and Evaluation Branch, Industry Canada; Dr. Chaviva Hosek, President and CEO, Canada Institute for Advanced Research (Board representative); Ms. Daphne Meredith, Analyst, Treasury Board; Mr. Peter Sahlas (Foundation staff representative); and, Dr. Phillip Rawkins (Senior Evaluation Consultant). Mr. Sahlas, who has completed his term at the Foundation, has been replaced by Ms. Johanne McDonald.

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

under the funding agreement between the Foundation and the Government of Canada. As an interim step, it was agreed that a formative assessment, *the Preliminary Review*, would take place, beginning in January of 2005. Finally, the Foundation is carefully documenting all aspects of its work, as a means to ongoing “self-assessment”.

The Evaluation Framework puts in place the basis for all components of programme performance assessment. It does so by providing a clear conceptual model of the *programme logic*, that is, the links in the chain running from (i) inputs of financial and human resources, to (ii) activities, (iii) the outputs of those activities, and on to (iv) the results achieved by the programmes through their outputs, or – to put it simply - the difference the Foundation’s programmes have made, in the light of its overall goals and its mandate.⁴

The Framework was designed on the basis of the Funding Agreement between the Foundation and the Government of Canada of March 2002, and the Foundation’s First Strategic Plan, adopted by the Board of Directors in October 2002, as well as the Annual Report for 2002-3, the initial year of operations, and the PIP Programme document, as adopted by the Board.⁵

In the formulation of the Framework, careful attention was given to the advice provided by Industry Canada, which has been designated as the Government of Canada’s representative in the agreement with the Foundation, and to following the Treasury Board guidelines on the development of results-based management and accountability frameworks.⁶ At the same time, particular consideration was given to ensuring that the Evaluation Framework is appropriate to the particular circumstances, characteristics and requirements of the Trudeau Foundation.

The objectives of the Evaluation Framework are to provide the conceptual foundation, structure and overall plan to review the programmes, operations, governance and management systems of the Foundation, with a view to:

- (i) Providing assurance to major stakeholders that the Foundation is conducting itself appropriately on the basis of its mission and declared strategy, and that it has deployed its resources effectively, efficiently and creatively, in support of its programme and their specified goals;

⁴ The programme Logic is employed directly as the basis for Chapter 6 in Part B of this Report.

⁵ According to the Funding Agreement (Clauses 10.07 and 10.08, p.24):

The Foundation agrees to an independent evaluation before 31 March 2007, and every five years afterwards, in order to assess the relevancy of the Fund in terms of realistic and actual needs, whether the Fund is successful in meeting its purposes and objectives, and, to the extent possible, whether adjustments to the programme can and should be made. The periodic evaluation will focus on the administration of the Fund and provide commentary on results achieved by the date of the evaluation.

Further, according to the Agreement: “The Foundation agrees, as part of the evaluation process set out (above) to develop an evaluation framework.” The Framework, it specifies, will be used by the Foundation for the monitoring of its programmes, and for “the interim and final evaluations of its objectives.” The Framework, developed earlier, and the Preliminary Review, presented here, represents a response to these stipulations.

⁶ See: Treasury Board Secretariat, [Guide for the Development of Results-Based management and Accountability Frameworks](#), August 2001. Other documents from the Treasury Board Evaluation Web-Site were also consulted.

- (ii) Assessing the performance and achievements of the Foundation's programmes; and,
- (iii) Making recommendations to the Board of Directors and the President of the Foundation on adjustments or changes which might be considered in order to enhance the quality of its work and strengthen its capacity to achieve its goals.

3. Evaluation Issues and Methodology

Through the development of the Programme Logic Chart, lengthy discussions with Foundation staff, the Chair of the Board and others, as well as an initial scan of documentation, and of evaluation frameworks developed for similar purposes, it became possible to identify a series of evaluation issues. In consideration of methodology, it must be emphasized that, given the relatively small numbers of individuals involved in the Foundation's activities and the limited number of awards provided, as well as the short period which has elapsed since it began operations, any statistical analysis will be limited to simple description. The numbers are not sufficient to facilitate any meaningful application of tests of statistical significance.

Both the Preliminary Review and the 5-Year Programme Evaluation will include the assessment of activities, as well as "results". Two focal concerns of any evaluation are "effectiveness" and "efficiency". Performance on these dimensions can be assessed, in part, by examination of results achieved, in comparison with those projected, and taking into account the resources employed. However, this will only tell part of the story. In order to give a full appreciation of the work conducted by the Foundation, it has been thought essential to devote detailed attention to the programme process and management arrangements, which, taken together, provide the framework which facilitates delivery of the Foundation's programmes. Indeed, it is the "front end" work of nomination and selection, as well as the design of the mechanisms through which it takes place, which, together, constitute the principal means by which the Foundation is able to act to influence the achievement of its desired outcomes.

Such matters are given particular attention in this **Preliminary Review**, which reports extensively on issues relating to the programme cycle and selection processes. Insofar as the Review devotes attention to *results*, it does so with a focus on confirming that, after three years of operations, the Foundation and its programme are on track to meeting broader objectives, and, through aggregate analysis, to ensure that selection processes are providing awards to those who meet or exceed expectations.

At its meeting in October 2004, there was a consensus among members of the Evaluation Steering Committee that it should be recognized that for the Foundation to be seen to have broad "impact" in shaping public dialogue on critical issues, it may be unrealistic to make a rigorous assessment before ten or more years have elapsed. For the present, what is of greater concern is to make an appraisal of whether the Foundation, through its programmes, and through directions taken, is "*on track*" to achieving its goals.

4. The Process of Undertaking the Preliminary Review

The completion of this Review takes place at a time when the Foundation has completed three cycles of selection of its Fellows, Scholars and Mentors. The capacity and vigour demonstrated by such a small organization in putting in place the three programmes with professional selection processes and full support systems in such a short time following the start of business has been extraordinary. The Fellowship and Scholarship Programmes have won general acceptance in academic and other circles, and the profile of awardees selected in each of the three years is impressive, epitomizing the excellence for which the Foundation is becoming known.

While acknowledging the many accomplishments of the Foundation, as well as the outstanding quality of those receiving its awards, the Review provides an opportunity to reflect on what has been learned through three years of experience of the programme cycle, and of scholarly and public engagement. It also allows for a reconsideration of some of the “design issues” concerning the programmes, as well as some of the mechanics of operations. It would be surprising if there were not lessons to be learned at this point, and it is hoped that the findings and recommendations presented here are helpful to the Foundation as it adjusts its initial strategy in order to fulfil its mandate

The work on the Review began in January 2005 with a series of meetings with Foundation staff in Montreal. Through his earlier work on the development of the Evaluation Framework, the consultant had already developed a reasonable understanding of the Foundation, its purposes and its programmes, and the research conducted for this Review built on that knowledge. Some sixty interviews/meetings, some brief and some of longer duration, were completed between January and August. A few additional telephone interviews were completed in late August and early September, as the author attempted to clarify some questions where the information collected previously proved to be incomplete.

In anticipation of the requirements of the Review, under a previous contract, the consultant had been invited to attend the first Trudeau Conference, held in Montreal in November 2004. In addition, he was able to attend the workshop held in Ottawa in May 2005, bringing together selected Mentors and Scholars.

Interviews were built around a check-list of questions, and were mostly conversational in style, with different sets of questions relevant to each group interviewed. Those interviewed included: Board members and Members of the Foundation; the President of the Foundation, staff and consultants; Fellows, Mentors and Scholars; Interviewers and File Reviewers; University Presidents and administrators, as well as representatives of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council; and, representatives of the Foundation community. Several interviews were held with respondents who performed more than one role, relevant to the concerns addressed here. As a result, it was also possible to talk with a number of individuals who are actively engaged in public policy work of one kind or another. Finally, a few additional respondents

were interviewed because of the particular contribution they made to the establishment of the Foundation.⁷

For reasons of time and budget, it was not possible to ensure full geographical representation in building the sample of those to be interviewed, nor was it possible for the Reviewer to travel outside central Canada. In a few cases, it proved possible to extend the geographic range of the sample by arranging to meet people while they were visiting Ottawa or Montreal. Thus, for example, the Reviewer's presence in Ottawa for the Scholar/Mentor workshop enabled him to complete a long series of "off-hours" interviews with participating Scholars. In a few other cases, long telephone interviews were used to reach additional interviewees.

Universities have a special place in the Foundation's world, but, for reasons stated above, it was not possible to include a broad-based sample in the research conducted for the Review. In any case, at this point, it is more relevant to explore issues concerned with programme processes and outputs in depth, rather than breadth. The time for a broad, national review will be in the course of the Five-Year Programme Review. For present purposes, it was agreed to include three institutions only, but with at least a day devoted to interviews with a range of relevant officials in each case. The three selected were: The Universities of Montreal, Toronto and Waterloo – the third as a representative of medium-sized institutions.

The Reviewer wishes to acknowledge his appreciation for the extraordinary level of cooperation he has received from all those approached for interviews or with requests for information. The extent and the spirit of cooperation provided have much to say about the good will felt towards the Trudeau Foundation and those associated with it. The President, Professor Stephen Toope and the management and staff of the Foundation, Johanne McDonald, Executive Programme Director, and her predecessor, Peter Sahlas, Executive Assistant and Office Manager Linda Fibich, Programme Officers Bettina Cenerelli and Josée St-Martin, and Receptionist Stéphanie Forest, have gone out of their way to be helpful and accommodating, often preparing or supplying detailed information at short notice. It has been a pleasure to work with them. Finally, acknowledgement is due to my colleague and associate, Véronique Lamontagne, who kindly agreed to plan and complete a series of interviews for the Review with the President and staff of the Université de Montréal.

B. PROGRAMME ASSESSMENT

1. A Description of Programmes, with Notes on Administration and Finance⁸

As noted earlier in this document, there are three core award programmes supported by the Foundation: Fellowship Prizes; Scholarships; and, Mentorships. A fourth area of programming, the Public Interaction Programme, seeks to complement the award programmes by bringing the

⁷ It is not possible to do justice to the material gathered on the formation of the Foundation and the shaping of its mandate in the context of this document. It is hoped that it will be possible for the author to produce a separate document, different in style and purpose, on this topic.

⁸ This section is primarily descriptive and is presented in order to provide a basis of information for reference and to enable a more direct discussion of issues in the chapters of the report which follow, and which present an assessment of the programme in operation.

awardees together, and to link them to specialized external partners and audiences, as well as a broader public, while also enhancing the capacity of the Foundation, through its programming, to achieve the desired impact in contributing to, and influencing, public debate.

Fellowships: Trudeau Fellows are established academic scholars and researchers, as well as those engaged in other creative fields. All are well-known in their respective fields of study, and often beyond. The award recognizes outstanding achievement by those who display “creative thinking to the highest international standards of a given discipline.” The award is not a prize recognizing the completion of a life’s work (which is the goal of the Molson Prize). Rather, it provides support to those individuals selected “to continue to make outstanding contributions in their fields”, which range across the spectrum of the social sciences, humanities and other fields of creative endeavour.⁹ It is anticipated that most Fellowships will be awarded to academics. However, other professionals and creative artists will also be selected.

The Fellowship Programme is described as “setting the intellectual agenda for the Foundation.” In the letter from the President of the Foundation to nominators, dated August 1, 2005, requesting nominations for the 2006 competition, it is noted that Fellows are recognized “for their desire and capacity to engage in public debate...., (and for their) ability to communicate with other gifted thinkers and with the general public.”

Candidates may not apply for the Fellowship Prize. The process is intended to be confidential, and nominations are sought from a broad-based nominating panel of external advisors, each of whom is a recognized leader in the academic sphere, government, business, the voluntary sector, or the arts. For the 2006 competition, other than university Presidents, there are 107 names on the list of nominators, of whom 45 are related to academia. Others are drawn from the voluntary sector, the private sector, the public sector, and the media. Also included are distinguished individuals from other backgrounds.¹⁰

Nominators are required to prepare a Letter of Nomination of one or two pages. The nominator is asked to address the following topics: the intellectual gifts and creative thinking of the candidate; her/his ability to communicate with other leading thinkers and a broader public; how the prize might enable the nominee to advance his or her work; and, the nominee’s commitment to work on one of the Foundation’s four themes. The letter to nominators makes it clear that “the integrity of the process depends upon receiving frank and thoughtful opinions from nominators.” The names of nominators, aside from those of university presidents, are strictly confidential, and nominators are requested not to contact the nominee concerning the nomination.

Since a substantial majority of candidates are likely to come from the university sector, university presidents have a special role as nominators, in that they act as guarantors of an

⁹ The wording of the Funding Agreement was somewhat vague on the Fellowship Programme, referring to awards to those at the “mid-career” stage. Through its Strategic Plan, the Foundation clarified the terms of reference for the Fellowship Prize.

¹⁰ The concept of a list of external nominators was borrowed from the practice of the McArthur Foundation in the US and its Fellows Programme.

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

internal selection procedure, leading to the nomination of a small number of outstanding candidates. The submission of the candidatures by the president signifies the formal support of the institution for the names presented to the Foundation for its consideration.

Nominations are due in mid-November. The nominations are then researched and reviewed by the Foundation. By contrast with the Scholarship Programme, where it is the Scholars themselves who take responsibility for compiling the dossiers supporting their applications, it is Foundation staff who must compile the files for Fellowship and Mentorship candidates. This requires locating CVs, biographical summaries, publications written in accessible style, and reports on public engagement.

The first step in the selection process is taken by members of the Foundation staff, who meet in mid-December to review all files, using an assessment grid, to determine a short-list of “semi-finalists” of about 25 names. The next step is submission in mid-January of the files for the semi-finalists to the members of a five-person File Review Committee, who are given a month to study the files, using the same ranking system as for the earlier internal review. In mid-January, the members meet in person to discuss their assessments of the nominations, and to agree on a list of recommended candidates. The list of nominees is then presented at the beginning of March to the Application and Nomination Review Committee (ANRC), a sub-committee of the Board of Directors, for review, in advance of a final decision by the Board.¹¹ In the meantime, the President will contact the individuals who have been nominated to enquire as to their willingness to accept the award, should it be offered.

The ANRC is given four weeks to review the files, which it receives, accompanied by a letter from the President, explaining the nomination process, and summing up the merits of the finalists. The letter also provides some background information on the other semi-finalists. The list presented to the Committee will include, in addition to names of those recommended as recipients, two alternate candidates. A conference call to make a decision on the final list takes place in March or early April, and the ANRC ratification goes to the full Board of Directors in mid-April.

The Fellowship Programme provides support for up to five awards to be granted each year. The award makes available financial support for a three-year period, with a stipend of \$50,000 per year and a further \$25,000 per year for approved research travel and networking expenses. Four Fellowships were awarded in 2003, and five in each of 2004 and 2005.

Scholarships: The most visible and best-known of the Foundation’s areas of programming is the Trudeau Scholarship Programme, which provides support for up to fifteen outstanding doctoral students annually. Twelve scholarships were awarded in 2003, a further fourteen in 2004, and fifteen in 2005. Scholarship awards may be held for a period of three or four years, with a stipend of \$35,000 per year, and an additional \$15,000 each year for approved travel and networking. Scholars receiving other awards may retain \$10,000 from the other funding programme in addition to the Trudeau Scholarship. In terms of the value of the award, the level

¹¹ The role of the ANRC in this regard is to act as the guarantor of the selection process and to verify that the Foundation may have confidence that decisions are being made in an appropriate manner.

of support provided to each Scholar ensures that the programme is at the highest international level.

Scholars are selected from among doctoral candidates undertaking research “of compelling interest”, relating to one or more of the Foundation’s four themes. Trudeau Scholars are active in their fields and are selected with the expectation that they will become leading figures in their respective areas of research. Nominees may be applying for the first year of doctoral studies or be registered in the first or second year of a doctoral programme.

The annual Scholarship award process begins with the posting of Application Guidelines on the Foundation’s website in July, with the updated Application Form in PDF format posted a month later. A letter calling for nominations is sent out to all Canadian University Presidents, Rectors and Principals, during the first week of October, along with a memo to Scholarship Officers, accompanied by Trudeau Scholarship posters. The Foundation follows up ten days after the mailing to the Scholarship officers with a phone call. The call for nominations letter that is sent to the University Presidents, Rectors and Principals, is also distributed by the Canadian Association of Graduate Studies to its membership (47 universities are members of the Association; normally the Dean of Graduate Studies is the University’s principal representative.)

Successful candidates are selected through a multi-step process. After candidates have completed a comprehensive application form, it is then submitted to the university where they are enrolled as doctoral students. The next step involves a competitive process at the level of the individual universities.¹² Applications which succeed at this level are then submitted by the university to the Foundation, under the signature of the President, Principal or Rector, accompanied by letters of reference and academic transcripts. The deadline for receiving applications at the Foundation is mid-January. Following a preliminary scan and review by Foundation staff to ensure that candidates meet the stated criteria for acceptance, beginning in the third week of January, an internal review is then undertaken by staff. Candidates are assessed using a grid, as with Fellowship nominees.

Following the internal selection process, a long list (“Semi-Finalists”) of some 60 selected applications is prepared and forwarded to a five-member external File Review Committee for their consideration. All files are sent to all members of the committee, along with guidelines and an assessment grid. On the basis of their recommendations, a short list of the most eligible candidates is drawn up. There then take place formal interviews at the Foundation by members of an external Interviewing Panel.

The practice of the Foundation has been to nominate six members for the Interview Panels, with one English-language and one bilingual panel, capable of interviewing in French, of three members each. The interview and final selection process (subject to approval of nominated

¹² A quota for the maximum number of applicants to be presented is established for each university. As of the 2005 application process, the number has been set at up to six for each institution.

candidates by the Board of Directors) is completed in one day.¹³ Interviewees may choose the language in which they will be interviewed. The panellists rank those candidates they have interviewed. On completion of the interviews, the members of the two panels meet together to come to a consensus on the list of preferred candidates. The list of those recommended to receive Scholarship Awards is then submitted first to the ANRC for review, and then to the Board of Directors for approval.

The selection criteria for Scholars are similar to those for Fellows, with adjustments to take into account the fact that the candidates for Scholarships are at a much earlier stage in their academic careers than candidates considered for Fellowships. The Scholarship Programme is investing in the nurturing and realization of potential, while the Fellowship Programme provides support and recognition to established leaders in academic research and other creative fields.

Mentorships: Trudeau Mentors stand a little apart from those receiving support from the other two award programmes, in that the Mentors Programme has a special and distinct role in supporting the other programmes, and in contributing to the achievement of the Foundation's overall objectives. The Programme is described as "the principal means by which the Foundation brings together outstanding professionals who pursue policy analysis and implementation in their daily work with exceptional researchers and scholars." The initial practice was for up to twelve mentors to be selected annually for a one-year term year, extendable to a second, in some cases. In October 2003, seven Mentors were appointed, with a second group of eight appointed in November 2004. In 2005, a decision was made to modify arrangements for Mentors, with each individual selected to serve a non-renewable, eighteen-month term. It is normal practice for one or two Scholars be assigned to each Mentor, with considerable care taken in the matching of interests.

Those selected as Mentors continue to undertake their normal professional responsibilities, but are linked to the network of Fellows and Scholars, and have a special role in acting as non-academic advisors to Scholars. The first two cohorts of Mentors receive an honorarium of \$20,000 per year, with an additional \$15,000 made available for approved travel and related expenses, incurred in relation to Foundation activities. With the adjustments introduced in 2005, the honorarium is now \$20,000 for the 18-month term without possibility of renewal; travel funds remain as before, but for the extended term.

Nominations for Mentors are invited from members of a trans-Canada nominating panel of distinguished Canadians (the same group as for Fellows). Formal nominations, which, as in the case of Fellows, are intended to be confidential, are researched and reviewed by the Foundation, and then evaluated by an external File Review Committee, prior to final selection by the Board of Directors.

Criteria for selection include: outstanding creativity in policy analysis and implementation in government, business, the voluntary sector and the arts; a strong ability "to engage in lively

¹³ In principle, each interview is to be of 25 minutes in duration, with a gap of five minutes between interviews. In practice, because the panels have not been able to keep to schedule, many interviews have lasted for only 15-20 minutes.

exchange with other policy professionals”; a commitment to work directly with Scholars; and, an interest in one or more of the Foundation’s four themes, along with a desire to contribute to public dialogue around these themes. In the letter inviting nominations sent out in August 2005, it was noted that the “primary responsibility of Mentors will be to provide concrete intellectual and career advice to Scholars”, complementing but not undermining the role of the academic supervisor. It is also noted that the participation of Mentors in Foundation-sponsored events “will ensure that issues that are actually confronting policy-makers will be given their due attention.”

The Public Interaction Programme (PIP), formerly known as the Academic Interchange and Public Engagement Programme (AIPE), takes in all activities and expenditures relating to facilitation of interaction among awardees, as well as those dedicated to promoting opportunities for engagement by awardees with “the public policy community” and a broader, informed public. Under the programme, the “Trudeau virtual community” was created through the Foundation website, linking awardees and allowing for a sharing of information and ideas. In addition, regular meetings and workshops are held, inviting all awardees. There are also regional meetings and other activities involving smaller groups of awardees. Expenditures under awardees’ travel and research stipends are recorded under the PIP budget line.

The Trudeau Public Policy Conference – the first of which was held in Montreal in October 2004 – is the focal activity through which the Foundation will link itself and its Fellows, Scholars and Mentors, with the wider world of public policy and public dialogue. In addition, joint activities are held with other institutions, as a means to provide regular opportunities for Trudeau awardees to take part in public dialogue with representatives of “the policy community” (to be understood in the broadest sense), drawn from government, business, the voluntary sector and the arts.

Projected Numbers of Awards by Year, and Budgetary Implications

With new awardees being added every year, the Foundation is in expansion mode, in terms of the number of active awards held, as well as corresponding levels of expenditure. With by far the largest number of awards, annually and overall, the Scholarship Programme accounts for the largest share (among programmes) of the budget. It is expected that the Programme will reach a plateau, with a full complement of active awards, in 2006-7, with the overall numbers of active awards continuing at this level in future years, as “graduating” Scholars are replaced by those beginning their periods of award tenure. The Fellowship Programme is expected to be operating at full capacity in 2005-6. The Mentors Programme is likely to operate at maximum levels of expenditure in 2007. Given that the PIP (AIPE) budget reflects, in large measure, the number of active awardees, the trend in expenditure levels here is likely to reach a plateau in 2006-7.¹⁴

Managing Expenditures: The Board of directors has acted to ensure that the Foundation’s budget is managed conservatively, allowing for a substantial (though declining) surplus of revenues over expenditures, even as it projects future spending requirements as it reaches

¹⁴ The PIP budget may be expected to vary from year to year depending on the number of events being held and whether or not the Foundation is organizing the Trudeau Conference in partnership with another institution.

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

maximum expansion of all its awards programmes. Total programme expenditures include the costs of all four programmes, as well as those associated with planning, management, delivery and administration.

The Table below summarizes the figures on revenues, expenses and excess of revenue over expenses:

	<u>2005</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2003</u>	
Income				
Interest Income on investments	5,623,541	5,551,263	5,212,085	*1
Gains (losses) on sale of securities	2,500,007	785,917	1,521,133	*2
Private Donations	0	154,188	0	
Other	0	1,183	0	
Total Revenues:	8,123,548	6,492,551	6,733,218	
Expenses	4,883,691	3,583,501	2,876,071	
Excess of income over expenses	3,239,857	2,909,050	3,857,147	

Note 1: Quite stable, increases only to the extent that the surplus would have been reinvested in subsequent years. Note the drop from 2004-2005, compared to 2003-2004. Cash use is accelerating.

Note 2: One-time deals, unpredictable. The variation is due to the volume of trading, which follows from market conditions & cash-flow needs.

As is noted above, the substantial increase in revenues for FY2005 is explained by gains on sales of securities. Interest income from investments remains relatively stable, with some increase from 2003-2004-2005, which is accounted for largely by the reinvestment of surplus revenues:

Staffing:

The Foundation has a full-time staff complement of six. The six positions are: President; Executive Programme Director; Programmes Officers (2); Executive Assistant/Office Manager; and Receptionist. Other services are provided on a part-time or consulting basis. At the time of writing, the hiring of a part-time communications consultant has been completed.

2. THE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMME

2.1 Introduction

It is for the Scholarship Programme that the Foundation is most widely known. As is noted above, it is also the programme which absorbs by far the largest share of operating funds.

Scholars also dominate through their numbers. The selection cycle for Scholars has been completed three times now, and there are now 41 Trudeau Scholars. The first Scholars are expected to complete their studies during the current academic year (2005-6). Hence, the Scholarship programme is reviewed in this report in considerable detail.

Programme Management and Human Relations

For the purposes of this Review, nine of the twenty-six Scholars selected in the first two years were interviewed. All indicated a very considerable degree of satisfaction with the Programme and all expressed genuine appreciation for the way they have been treated by the Foundation. As one Scholar put it, “it’s like a family”. Without exception, all felt that they had been treated with great respect, as well as kindness, that any messages, and concerns raised by them, have been responded to swiftly. All felt that their role in the Foundation was valued. Particular mention might be made of the special consideration given by management and staff to the situation of a number of young women among the Scholars who have young children. This was mentioned spontaneously, without cueing, by most of the Scholars, including the young men, as typifying the human face of the organization. The Foundation has gone out of its way to be flexible and accommodate special needs.

No concerns of any kind were raised about **management, administration or finances**. It is a tribute to the work of the President and all Foundation staff, as well as the support of the Board, that such a positive state of affairs exists. It is a pleasure to be able to give such a positive report on all aspects of programme administration. The professionalism of the Foundation’s programme and administrative staff (not to forget the part-time Finance Officer) in supporting the smooth running of all four programmes and the core operations that help sustain them is a vital aspect of the organization’s overall effectiveness. Such professionalism should not be taken for granted.

2.2 The Applicants, the Application Process and Fields of Study: Self-Selection within a Wide Range of Disciplines and Topic Areas

From the time of its launch, the Scholarship Programme has been viewed by the university community in Canada, as had been intended by the Foundation, as an elite competition. This has positive consequences in terms of the prestige attached to the awards. Less positively, the lofty image of the Scholarship programme appears to discourage many candidates from applying. It was pointed out to the Reviewer that the fact that the Trudeau Scholarship selection process involved an interview for the “finalists” signalled to the universities that this was an elite award. The image of the award, as with the Rhodes Trust Scholarship, is such as to make winning it a primary objective for a very small group of students, while discouraging many others, some of whom might seem well-qualified, from applying.

The Programme is viewed as prestigious, and, accordingly, is assigned a high priority for attention in those universities visited in the course of the Review, as well as, apparently, by most, though not all, others. Considerable care is given to the management of the application and selection process by the Scholarship and Awards Offices at Montreal, Toronto and Waterloo; these offices are the key point of contact and information for graduate students on

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

the availability and relevance of academic awards. In two of the three cases, the Dean of Graduate Studies is also involved personally; at the University of Toronto, with its 12,000 graduate students, Scholarships fall within the portfolio of the Vice-Deans.

Who are the Candidates?

The distribution of major universities across the country, particularly those with substantial research capabilities and large numbers of graduate students, reflects population concentration, the existence of large cities, and well-established patterns of the distribution of wealth. Accordingly, it is not surprising to find that applications received by the Foundation in nomination for the award reflect these patterns. For the first three years of the Programme, 30 per cent of applicants originate in Ontario, 14.5 per cent come from Quebec, 11 per cent from BC, and 5 per cent from Alberta. Nova Scotia accounts for 3.5 per cent, New Brunswick for 3 per cent and Manitoba and Newfoundland for 2.7 per cent each. There have been very few applicants from those originating in other provinces and territories. It should also be noted that 13.7 per cent of qualified applications have been from foreign students, who, as students enrolled in doctoral studies at Canadian universities, are eligible for consideration.

A second way to consider “the geography of the Scholarship Programme” is to categorize applicants in terms of the province where they are registered for doctoral studies. As might be expected, the representation of smaller provinces, and even that of BC, falls off when numbers are viewed this way, with the representation of Ontario and Quebec increasing to, respectively, 33 and 16 per cent. The percentage of those who have elected to study in Alberta is also higher than for those originating in the province, with 7.3 per cent enrolled in doctoral studies in the province’s universities. The percentage for those studying at US universities is also 7.3 per cent, with 15.4 per cent enrolled in institutions in the UK.

Canadian doctoral students studying at institutions outside Canada are also eligible for the award. In 2005, 39 foreign universities put forward nominations for Trudeau Scholarships. Twenty of the applications were from universities in the United Kingdom and 14 from American institutions.

As to other demographic characteristics of the candidate pool, data is available on gender and mother tongue. The predominance of women and of English-Speakers is striking, although, it should be noted, the percentage distribution by language is consistent with national patterns.

Profile of Scholarship Applicants since Inception

Women	245	66%
Men	126	34%
	<hr/>	
	371	

English	261	70%
French	48	13%
Bilingual	26	7%
Other	36	10%
	<hr/>	
	371	

In the 2005 competition, 77 candidates were selected as “Semi-Finalists” (files for 45 were then sent on for external review, as discussed below). Of the 77 top candidates, 75 per cent were English-Speakers, 22 per cent French-Speakers, and 5 per cent bilingual. Of this group, 56 per cent were women.

Application and Selection: Overview

The number of applications which are complete and which have met the Foundation’s requirements is relatively small. For the first three years of competition, there have been 371 completed applications received by the Foundation (114 in 2003, 115 in 2004 and 142 in 2005). In part, numbers are kept down because of the restriction on the maximum number of applications to six for any one university. There is no doubt that this limits the number of applications received from the Universities of British Columbia, Montreal and Toronto, the only three institutions which have been obliged to reduce significantly the number of internal nominations in order to meet the limit of six nominations to be forwarded to the Foundation.

In 2005, UBC produced 15 nominations, while the Université de Montréal had 19, and the University of Toronto 17, applications to deal with. Elsewhere, York submitted 6 of 9 applications received, Carleton 4 of 7, Dalhousie 4 of 5, UQAM 3 of 6, Laval 3 of 4, and HEC Montreal 2 of 5. Regina and Victoria each submitted 2 of 4, Waterloo 1 of 3, Queens and UNB 1 of 2, and Memorial and Trent each 1 of 1. The Universities of Alberta, Ottawa, Western Ontario and Concordia all received six internal applications and forwarded all to the Foundation. In total, universities from the Maritimes and Newfoundland received 8 internal nominations and forwarded 6 to the Foundation.¹⁵

No doubt some universities are better-organized than others to support their graduate students in applying for major competitions. One leading institution which will not be named failed to send in its nominations for the 2005 competition before the deadline, with the result that all its nominees, through no fault of their own, were disqualified. In some cases, particularly given the strong reputation of an institution’s programmes in relevant core fields, the numbers do seem surprisingly low. However, other forces are at work in explaining the relatively low number of applicants received.

First, as with other “prestigious” competitions aimed at the academic community, whether at the level of graduate students or any other, universities and individual candidates are reluctant to put forward nominations where the chance for success is not seen to be high. This is particularly the case where alternative sources of funding may be available. Associated with this phenomenon is a risk-reward calculation, where applicants must calculate how best to use the limited resources of time they have to devote to award applications.

¹⁵ The numbers used here are those given by the universities in response to an enquiry from the Foundation. In the opinion of the reviewer, based on discussions with officials at three universities, these figures should be treated as approximate only.

As a comparison, it might be noted that SSHRC received only 447 applications for the 415 awards available under its elite CGS Doctoral Scholarships Programme. For the mainstream Doctoral Scholarships Programme, 1755 applications were received, with a success rate of one in three.¹⁶

The Trudeau Scholarship enables applicants to use some material (for example, the research plan) which could also be adapted to the requirements of other competitions. It also has a unique set of requirements to be met. This is a positive factor in terms of the value of the application form as a selection device, and attracts the interest of a certain sub-set of doctoral students, whose characteristics are discussed below. However, it may be a disincentive to others, who will gravitate elsewhere. The purpose of the application process is to encourage only qualified applicants, and so the fact that many doctoral students in relevant fields may not proceed with applications to the Foundation is precisely what is intended. However, it will be of concern if significant numbers of those who are discouraged are, in fact, well-qualified to meet the requirements of the award.¹⁷

All of the current Scholars interviewed for the Review indicated that completing the application was a time-consuming, though worthwhile, task. All were intrigued with the “personal statement” section of the form, but indicated that this was something quite new for them, and that it took a great deal of time to complete. The requirement for the personal statement, taken in conjunction with the other components of the application, was apparently a clue for many applicants as to the makeup of the ideal candidate. As one current Scholar explained, “I think they were looking for a particular kind of person – someone who was rounded, interested in debates and ideas, and not afraid of debates and discussion: Trudeau’s idea of counterweights – and people interested in policy, and I thought I fitted the bill.”

Many of those involved with selection at different stages commented to the Reviewer that, as a group, the scholars and the candidates for the Scholarship were “somewhat different” from those applying for other major awards. One of those who have served on the Finalist Interview Panel commented that “one is looking for people, as in the Rhodes, who have displayed a kind of commitment, a sense of initiative and leadership – not following the beaten path of research. Each one we selected was not just an excellent Scholar, but original and dynamic.”

While the SSHRC CGS award (the highest level award offered by the Council) also requires completion of a demanding application form, the whole application is about research, with no emphasis on extra-curricular activities or on personal goals and interests. Both the Scholars and the university representatives interviewed viewed the Trudeau Scholarship application form as fair to applicants and appropriate, given the stated goals of the Scholarship programme.

¹⁶ Information obtained by Josée St-Martin of the Foundation for the Review. These perhaps surprising figures have been confirmed a second time.

¹⁷ As is discussed below, a larger number of current Scholars made their applications on the basis of personal guidance from faculty members in their departments, rather than simply as a response to general information on the award. The issue may not be so much that potential Scholars are “discouraged”, rather that they are lacking direct advice from their departments. Further research will be required to examine this and related issues.

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

Discussions at the three universities and with current Scholars suggested that perhaps a majority of those who apply do so only with the prodding and guidance of their universities and individual members of faculty. It remains for the applicants themselves to do most of the work required in preparing the application themselves.

It appears to be the case that a reading of the requirements set out in the application form, reinforced by information which may be obtained from the Foundation's website, and the advice of university officials, offers interested candidates a picture of what an "ideal" Trudeau Scholar might be. The universities are careful to encourage only those candidates for whom they believe the award represents "a good fit."

The four themes, the emphasis on inter-disciplinary approaches, and the requirement that the individual have a record of public engagement, taken together, have a strong impact on the filtering process which goes on at the university level. Hence, although the total number of applicants received by the Foundation is not large, at least in the case of those universities included in the review, as well some other institutions for which information is available, it represents the end-product of a selection and self-selection process, which is not captured adequately in adding up numbers of internal candidates, or of nominations submitted to the Foundation.

It is quite apparent that some institutions have taken great care in their internal selection, and, as noted above, have forwarded to the Foundation only those applications which reach what they perceive to be "the gold standard". Without undertaking detailed studies at the departmental level with a representative sample of universities, it is impossible to generalize and to be sure of exactly how this process works. However, as an example of the process at work, it might be noted that Dalhousie put forward only four candidates for the 2005 competition, but that two of the four succeeded in winning the award. It is more than a numbers game.

In terms of filling a need for funding, the Trudeau Scholarship is viewed as adding something to the mix. The total value of the awards as a part of the overall funding pool for doctoral studies in the social sciences and humanities is not significant. However, in most cases, for the universities, for individual departments, and for the successful Scholars, the awards are very significant in their recognition of excellence of a special kind.

At the individual level, it is worth noting that, while most current Scholars had lined up alternative sources of funding, and many hold other awards concurrently, this is not the case for all candidates. For a variety of reasons, some were not eligible for major national awards. Those students in inter-disciplinary fields, who do not fit squarely into the domain of SSHRC, may face particular difficulties in locating major scholarship possibilities outside their own universities. In these cases, the Trudeau Scholarship has a particular appeal.

Disciplines and Fields of Study

The focus on the four themes has set boundaries for fields of study eligible for the Scholarship award, and has channelled applications in particular directions. At the same time, it has also

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

allowed for inclusion of students from a rich variety of disciplines. It is worthy of note that the universities have encouraged applications from students enrolled in departments other than those traditionally included in faculties of Arts, Social Sciences and Law. Environmental Studies has been reasonably well-represented, while a number of applications have come from planning fields, including natural resource management and public health, as well as management and administration. Twenty-four of 371 applicants are enrolled in Inter-Disciplinary Studies doctorates.

In terms of what might be regarded as core disciplines and cross-disciplinary fields, there has been a wide diversity of applications, with no one or two disciplines predominating.¹⁸

The distribution of all applications and awards winners has been as follows:

Disciplines	Applicants		Scholars	
Administration	15	4%	1	3%
Anthropology	26	7%	3	8%
Communications	8	2%	1	3%
Criminology	4	1%	1	3%
Education	25	7%	1	3%
Environment	23	6%	8	20%
Geography	15	4%	4	10%
History	19	5%	1	3%
Interdisciplinary	24	6%	2	5%
Int'l. Studies	29	8%	2	5%
Law	27	7%	6	15%
Literature	11	3%	2	5%
Political Science	29	8%	3	8%
Philosophy	11	3%	1	3%
Psychology	25	7%		0%
Public Health	6	2%	2	5%
Religious Studies	7	2%		0%
Sociology	19	5%	2	5%
Other	48	13%		0%
Total	371	100%	40	100%

For the humanities, overall, as might be expected, given the four themes and the emphasis on policy relevance, there has been a lesser number of applications than for the social sciences and applied fields. However, as noted above, History accounts for 5.1 per cent of applicants, with 3 per cent each for Philosophy and Literature, and 1.9 per cent for Religious Studies.

Looking at a more selective group of candidates, the 77 Semi-Finalists for 2005, 56, or 72 per cent, were drawn from the Social Sciences (including Law and Communications), 9, or 11.7 per cent, from the Humanities, and 12 (15.6 per cent) from Inter-Disciplinary Studies and other

¹⁸ 41 scholars have actually been selected to date. Alexis Lapointe was selected as a 2005 Scholar, but his scholarship was delayed by one year. His research is on the history of politics.

fields. Of the 15 Scholars selected as Trudeau Scholars for 2005, 12 are from the core Social Sciences, one is from Humanities, and two are from other fields.

The table above also provides figures on the distribution of successful candidates by discipline, with Scholars from Environmental Studies, Law and Geography, being over-represented, and Psychology and Religious Studies, significantly under-represented, as measured by the percentage of awards compared with the percentage of applications. For both sub-groups, the results probably tell us something about the degree of fit of research work in those fields with the four themes. Beyond this, the reader is cautioned from reading much into the data. Until we have five or more years of results, and preferably ten, along with a far more detailed knowledge of internal processes at universities, it is premature to come to any conclusions. In any case, the purpose is to identify the most outstanding Scholars, not to ensure representation by discipline.

2.3 Selecting the Trudeau Scholars

The Internal Selection Process in the Universities

In all three universities included in the Review, the Faculty of Graduate Studies bears responsibility for publicizing the Trudeau Scholarship competition, contacting departments and ensuring that eligible doctoral students are made aware of the award and application deadlines. As noted above, the Scholarships and Awards Office within Graduate Studies has responsibility for facilitating the application and internal selection process, and for quality control (i.e. ensuring that requirements have been met, and verifying the completeness of the applications). Internal procedures vary considerably among the three institutions. In the opinion of the Reviewer, to ensure fairness and equity of treatment of candidates, it will be helpful for more specific guidelines to be given to the universities on recommended procedures.

Of the three universities included in the Review, **the University of Toronto**, with its 12,000 graduate students, has the most formal and elaborate process. Applications are limited to no more than three for any department, with candidates to be nominated by the department. For 2005, there were 17 nominations, but very few of these came from the humanities. Internal selection decisions are made on the basis of recommendations from a four-person committee, consisting of two Associate Deans, one for social sciences and one for humanities, along with two “University Professors” (professors bearing this title make up no more than 5 per cent of the faculty complement, and are viewed as the most distinguished in their fields). One professor is drawn from the humanities and one from the social sciences. Six names were selected for submission to the President as nominations to be forwarded to the Foundation as candidates from the University.

At the **Université de Montréal** (2,000 graduate students), the Division of Scholarships (one of five divisions within the Faculty of Graduate Studies) is responsible for contacting the academic units, who, in turn, advise students of the Trudeau Scholarship Programme. There are no restrictions on the number of candidates from individual departments who may be proposed. In fact, departments play no formal role in the process, with applications being sent directly to the Scholarships Division. The list of internal candidates (19 for the 2005 competition) then goes to the Secretary of the Faculty, who is responsible for the selection of those candidates

whose applications will be forwarded to the Foundation. There is no formal selection committee, but, in arriving at the decision, the Secretary consults with the relevant Vice-Deans (there are three), and with senior academics, as may be required.

In the case of the **University of Waterloo**, candidates from six relevant faculties are encouraged to apply. There is a more active process of working with applicants than at the other two universities included in the Review. All applications are reviewed in Graduate Studies, and comments are sent back to applicants, with recommendations for adjustments and additions. The final applications go forward to a more detailed review. A large committee is involved in selection, with a representative from each of six relevant faculties invited to participate, along with The Dean and the Manager of the GS Financial Aid Office, and two Associate Deans. What is distinctive about the Waterloo process is the fact that the committee meets with all candidates for “friendly” interviews. This year, seven applications were received, and all candidates were interviewed. Only one name was submitted, through the President, for selection.

Although larger universities have developed more elaborate infrastructures for supporting graduate bursaries and awards, they also have substantial demands on their time. Among current Scholars, some of those from smaller institutions indicate that they received a significant amount of support at institutional, as well as departmental, level. One Scholar reported having a long meeting with the university president to discuss her application.

At **the University of Toronto**, the Dean of Graduate Studies notes that, with such a large graduate student body, distributed across 17 faculties, it is simply impossible for the four administrative staff members of Graduate Studies to become involved actively in the recruitment of candidates. As a result, as elsewhere, but to a far greater degree, much depends on the degree of commitment at departmental level to support their graduate students in the effort to secure high-level awards.¹⁹

Typically, it is the departments which are most active and successful in attempting to secure the recruitment of top graduate student which are also active in encouraging their best students to apply for the major scholarship programmes. Law, Political Science and, less relevant to the Foundation, Mediaeval Studies, are among the most engaged on these matters. In addition, because the departments are active and successful in their recruitment efforts, they are also more likely to have a group of outstanding students on which to draw. It may well be that there are suitable candidates in departments where the academic leadership and individual members of faculty are less committed to supporting their graduate students in this way. Difficult though this might be, unless the Foundation can find a way to attract and engage the interest of such departments and of individual faculty members within them, it is unlikely to be able to increase the numbers of qualified candidates in the recruitment pool.

For **the University of Waterloo**, recruitment of top graduate student talent and securing major academic awards is viewed as an essential part of institution-building, and these matters – important at all institutions - have become an active corporate priority. As a result, the

¹⁹ As in many other universities, there is a substantial decentralization of responsibilities. Thus, in the Life Sciences, the major dedicated scholarship programmes are handled entirely at departmental level.

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

University and the Faculty of Graduate Studies take a more pro-active role in identification of suitable candidates for the Trudeau Scholarship and other leading awards programmes than is possible at Toronto.

At this point, it cannot be stated with any certainty that there are a significant number of potential candidates who remain outside the orbit of the application process, but neither can the possibility be excluded. It is worth bearing in mind that, using 2005 numbers as a base, the identification of an additional fourteen qualified candidates for Canadian universities as a whole would represent a 10 per cent increase in the size of the pool.

It is probably reasonable to argue that the primary responsibility for taking the issue further rests primarily with the universities themselves. A useful initiative for the Foundation to take in moving matters forward will be for it to request the opportunity to make a presentation to the Canadian Association for Graduate Studies (CAGS), followed by a discussion period, on the question of scope for applications and ensuring adequate reach into all relevant corners of the universities. There would also be the possibility of following up directly with those universities expressing an interest in doing so at the session.²⁰

It is recommended that the Foundation approach the Canadian Association for Graduate Studies (CAGS) with a view to requesting the opportunity to make a presentation on the Scholarship Programme and issues relating to the candidate pool, with a discussion period to follow the presentation.

Selection at the Foundation: a Four-Step Process

The first step in selection is taken by the Director of Programmes and the Scholarships Programme Officer, who undertake a first review of the applications submitted. It is, perhaps, a statement about the limited pool of top candidates, as measured by the combination of the criteria summarized in the assessment grid, that it is relatively easy at this stage for Foundation staff to winnow down the list to around 70-80 applications. It is probably not so much the case that the universities have had difficulty in identifying competitive candidates, but rather it is the combination of required assets in a candidate that is so elusive. The criteria for selection, as summed up in the grid for the “pre-selection” phase, emphasize the following categories of indicator:

- Academic achievement (50%);
- Communication skills and public engagement (30%); and,
- Thematic Relevance of the candidate’s research (20%)

Under each category, there are several sub-items, allowing for ranking of applications and discrimination among the candidates on the basis of their academic qualities and achievements, capabilities and commitments. With the removal of the less qualified candidates, the remaining applications are then reviewed by the President, Director of Programmes and the Scholarships Programme Officer, ranking candidates A, B or C, again using the grid.

²⁰ The separate, but related, issue for the Foundation of how to reach the broader academic community is taken up later in the Report.

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

For the 2005 competition, there were 142 valid applications. An additional 12-15 candidate files received were incomplete, all of which were submitted by foreign universities. These were eliminated. This year, the first cut resulted in the removal of 65 applications, with 77 going forward as Semi-Finalists for the detailed review.²¹

The three members of the management team then meet, comparing rankings, and arrive at a consensus on the 40-60 names of the best of the “Semi-Finalists” to be sent to the **File Review Committee (FRC)**. For 2005, the files for 45 semi-finalists were sent to the members of the Committee for their consideration (60 files is regarded, informally, as a maximum).

There are five members of the Committee, whose members work in isolation and do not meet to review their findings. The members are all experienced academics who have had prior experience in reviewing applications for major academic competitions. To give an example of the kind of experience the Foundation is able to draw on, it may be helpful to cite the case of one senior academic who has served on the Committee for the past two years. She advised the Reviewer that she had performed a similar function for SSHRC, the Commonwealth Foundation, the Killam Prize, and the Canadian Institute for Health Research.

In the letter sent by the President of the Foundation to the members of the Committee in January 2005, it was indicated that the Foundation had sought “doctoral candidates pursuing research of compelling present-day interest in areas touching on one or more of the four themes of the Foundation.” It is also observed that “Trudeau Scholars will have an outstanding academic record and will be actively engaged in their fields. They will be cast as the academic and policy leaders of tomorrow.”

Employing an assessment grid, each member of the Committee is asked to select 25 “Finalists”, with the top 5 in Group A, the next 10 in Group B, and the next 10 in Group C.²² The File reviewers are asked to make brief comments on their top 25 candidates, while not ranking the remaining candidates.

The Foundation management team then receives the rankings of the Committee and compiles an overall rankings sheet, with the scores for each candidate (A,B,C, or unranked) recorded against the name for each candidate. These scores are then compared with those arrived at through the internal ranking process at the Foundation, which preceded the work of the FRC. The President exercises some discretion at the margin to ensure that all the strongest candidates are included in the final pool of 24 or 25, while also paying attention to the linguistic balance among the candidates.

The remaining files are then submitted to the members of the **Interview Panels for the Finalists**. The six interviewers are divided into two panels, one of which is bilingual, and will interview in French and English, while the other will interview only in English. Each interviewer receives in advance the grid and instructions on ranking, along with the files for

²¹ It has been normal practice to include in the Semi-Final pool a few candidates who are on the margin of elimination, giving them the benefit of the doubt.

²² The assessment grid employed is the same at all stages of the process.

only the 12 candidates to be interviewed by his or her panel. Each panellist will have access to the files for the 12 candidates to be interviewed by the members of the other group, but only on the day of the interview. Given the time constraints under which the Interviewers must work, realistically, there will be no time for them to do more than glance at the second group of files.

Interviews take place at the Foundation's offices on one day, a Saturday, in March. The interviewers arrive at 8.30 A.M. and take part in a short orientation session with the Foundation's President. Interviews begin at 9 A.M., and continue, with a break for lunch, until 3.15 P.M. The members of the two panels then meet together for an hour, in the presence of the Executive Director of Programmes, who may act as a resource person, to compare notes and then to determine a joint ranking of the candidates. The final decision on the top 14 or 15 candidates, whose names will be placed in nomination for the award of the Trudeau Scholarship, is made and the day's deliberations are completed by 4.30 or 5.00 P.M.

The profile of the Interviewers is different from that of the Members of the File Review Committee. Academics make up no more than one third of the six members, and in 2005, there was only one academic among the six, although a former university president was also included in the group. For each year of the competition, there have been four male and two female Interviewers.²³ Over the three years, a number of senior government officials and of those engaged actively in public policy have been involved, as have senior representatives of the private sector, including law firms. Two judges have also served as panellists. There has also been one representative of the voluntary sector and two CEOs of "think-tanks", one focussing on public policy and another on human rights and democracy. Current Fellows and Members (but not Directors) have also participated.

Overall, the profile is of a distinguished group of senior and influential figures drawn from leading circles of Canadian decision-makers and opinion-leaders. Many of the members of the Interview Panels are well-known in their own right and for a broad range of interests and forms of engagement in the public realm, and not merely as incumbents of their current professional roles.

2.4 Issues Concerning the Nomination and Selection of Trudeau Scholars

Overview

In a short time, the Scholarship Programme has been established as a major academic award at the highest level. The Scholars who have been selected are an outstanding group of young thinkers and doers, with enormous potential. The Foundation, its Board and its management and staff can take great satisfaction in what they have accomplished. In this section of the Report, a number of issues are raised concerning the Programme. They are not raised as criticisms of what has been done to date. Rather, they represent considerations of what may be learned from experience, and as a basis for proposals concerning changes which might be contemplated now that the Foundation has been through its annual programming cycle three

²³ It should be noted that the Foundation has made a consistent effort to increase the percentage of women among the panel members, but many highly-qualified women have declined the invitation to serve as panellists.

times. The basic structures put in place are strong. It is hoped that the proposed adjustments will reinforce the quality of what has been tried and tested.

The Candidate Pool

As noted above, the pool of candidates for the competition is not large. A concern for the Foundation is to ensure that it is reaching all qualified candidates. Judging by the ease with which Foundation staff members have been able to identify the “Semi-Finalists” from among the overall list of candidates, it would appear to be the case that there is only a limited number of young men and women who meet in full the exacting criteria for selection. Under current arrangements, it will not be helpful to encourage, in a general way, marginal candidates to apply, or to suggest to universities that they increase the number of nominees.

What is at issue is whether or not certain groups of qualified candidates are being excluded, are excluding themselves, or are simply unaware of the possibilities which the Programme offers. Without an exhaustive review of current procedures and practices at a substantial sample of universities across the country, going down to the level of individual departments and schools, it is not possible to give a definitive answer to this question. For all that, on the basis of information collected in the course of the Review, it is possible to make some preliminary observations.

Perhaps not surprisingly, it is immediately apparent is that the approach adopted for the identification and selection of candidates varies enormously from one university to another. Generally, with the possible exception of some ambitious, smaller universities, with a small number of doctoral candidates, the Office of the President does not play more than a pro forma role in the process. The role of Graduate Studies (GS) is essential, as is that of the Scholarship and Bursary Office, or its equivalent, within the GS administration. Yet the existence of a robust GS administration is not a sufficient condition for attracting applications from the best qualified students.

It must also be borne in mind that universities are relatively “flat” organizational structures, with much responsibility vested in discipline-based faculties, departments and schools. Although encouraging messages may be sent from above, with information on programmes and procedures, it is the academic units and those individuals within them concerned with graduate studies which play the most critical role in encouraging individual doctoral students to apply for particular competitions. It is this level which the Foundation must reach, if it is to ensure that it is attracting the best candidates to the pool.

As will be discussed later in the Report, the level of knowledge of the Foundation in the academic community at large is not great. As one university president has commented, it is not yet part of “the academic folklore.” Enhancing visibility and detailed knowledge of the Foundation and its programmes at this level is likely to translate into more interest among faculty members and individuals responsible for supervising graduate studies at departmental level in promoting the Programme to potential applicants.

In some universities, a particular effort has been made to ensure that **non-traditional social science and humanities departments** are included in the communications net. This is second nature at a university such as Waterloo, where applied and cross-disciplinary fields are particularly strong. This may not happen in all cases, and it could be that the non-core fields are a sector of potential growth.

The question of how to encourage more applicants from the **Humanities** fields is a taxing one. The problem is also a familiar one to SSHRC. In many areas of study in the Humanities, more so than in other fields, it appears that research is conducted in relatively small academic sub-cultures, relatively isolated from broader concerns within the discipline, or from related disciplines.²⁴ Further, it is suggested that Scholars from the “text-based” disciplines are those who will have the greatest difficulty in meeting the criteria concerned with the relevance of their work to major public issues.

It is also suggested by some respected academics in the Humanities that, with some minor changes to the criteria, there would be an enhanced opportunity for larger numbers of leading doctoral students in the relevant disciplines to present themselves as strong candidates. With this in mind, rather than starting with the criteria, the Review gave serious attention to the possibility of recommending a change to the Mission Statement, to better accommodate scholars from the Humanities. Consideration was given to de-emphasizing “public policy” and to the insertion of wording on the lines of “contributing to public life and the generation and dissemination of new ideas and perspectives.” Beyond this, it would probably be necessary to make adjustments to the four themes, and, thus, proposing changes to the Funding Agreement. While the Board may wish to give this further thought, from an evaluation perspective, it was concluded that to move in this direction would be counter-productive, blurring the focus of the Foundation’s programmes and diminishing the prospect that, over time, it could make a noticeable difference in enriching public debate on major issues.

The issue remains, however, and it will be worthwhile for the Foundation to conduct some further investigations of barriers to participation of candidates from Humanities (possibly for the Fellowship, as well as the Scholarship, Programme). **It is recommended** that a small Reference, or Working, Group, with an advisory function, be established.

The Group might be chaired by a member of the Foundation, or a Director. Those invited to participate might include some who have served as file reviewers or interviewers, and others recommended by university Presidents or Deans of Graduate Studies. SSHRC might also be invited to nominate a representative, or, alternatively, to meet with the Group. Those from the Humanities who serve on internal selection committees for Scholarship nominees at the university level would also be a good source of candidates.²⁵ It would be very helpful to include a Fellow among the members, but this may be difficult because of time pressures, and

²⁴ It is not suggested that the “silo effect” is limited to the humanities, but that the nature of scholarship in many humanities fields may encourage a greater degree of specialist-field isolation.

²⁵ The Reviewer spoke with a distinguished Professor of English Literature at the University of Toronto, who has served in this capacity, and who expressed an interest in exploring further ways of encouraging more candidates from the Humanities to apply.

because there may be other areas where the contribution of Fellows may take on a higher priority.

In conjunction with the work of the Group, the Foundation might consider working with Deans at a small sample of universities to organize (relatively informal) focus groups on campus to discuss the issue. It might also be worthwhile to consider retaining the services of a consultant to work with the reference group, to follow up with the universities, conduct the focus group meetings, and to work with the Chair and the members to prepare the report.

The issue is an important one, but one for which a “quick fix” is unlikely to recommend itself. The Foundation would be well-advised to allow the Group plenty of time (at least 12 months) to consider the issue and to reflect on the information and opinions gathered, prior to the preparation of its report and conclusions. This would also make it easier to secure positive answers to invitations to participate, and also make it possible for Foundation management and staff to be involved as appropriate.

The problem of what may appear to be rather low numbers of applicants from **Francophone candidates** is one that greatly concerns the Foundation, which has made a special effort to ensure that universities in Quebec are fully aware of the Programme. It is suggested that numbers are low as the result of several factors, beyond basic demographic trends, where the percentage of Francophone Canadians continues to decline as a percentage of the Canadian population. These include the characteristic organization of graduate student research in the universities of Quebec on a collective, rather than individual, basis. This tends to make it more difficult for the top students to stand out, or to present their research as a groundbreaking or distinctive piece of work. In addition, in some universities in Quebec, as well as some departments within universities, there may be a lack of enthusiasm for encouraging students to apply for the award because of what they may view as the particular personal and political connotations of the Foundation’s name. Further, it has been noted above that the critical mass of students on a national basis, capable of meeting the criteria at the required standard for selection by the Foundation, may be rather small. Hence, a third factor may be the restricted size of the pool of potential applicants in Quebec, and among Francophone students more generally.

There is no simple solution to the problem. As with “the Humanities issue”, it may be something the Foundation must live with. In any case, any improvement in this regard is likely to be modest. For all this, as is discussed below under **Selection**, there are other related concerns to be considered. As in the case of the Humanities, **it is recommended** that the Foundation contemplate undertaking a further assessment of the issue, again perhaps with the support of a small Working Group, composed on similar lines, and drawn from relevant stakeholders. In the “Francophone case”, it will be helpful if the Group first consider whether there really is a “problem”, or whether, in fact, the numbers are more-or-less as they should be. This will be important for the Foundation, as a first step, before it considers investing further resources in systematic efforts to facilitate enhanced participation.

One small change which the Foundation might consider is to increase the maximum number of candidates who may be put forward by a small number of larger institutions (as ranked in terms

of numbers of registered doctoral students in relevant fields). Such institutions might be given the option of proposing up to 8 candidates. Further, guidelines to universities should make it clear that applications from students in inter-disciplinary studies, and of qualified candidates from non-core fields of study, will be welcomed. It should also be emphasized that international students are eligible for inclusion. Despite the fact that this has been signalled by the Foundation, it is a piece of information that has not registered, in at least some cases. One rather puzzling predicament that the Foundation finds itself in stems from the fact that, despite the issuing of clear guidance on many areas of concern, in many cases, the information simply fails to register with a number of the universities.

It is recommended that the Foundation give consideration to increasing the maximum number of candidates for a few, larger institutions, bearing in mind the enrolment in all relevant disciplines. Without wishing to disadvantage smaller institutions, taking into account the apparent concentration of talent at a small number of institutions, and given the objective to include the most outstanding applicants in the pool, some adjustment here would seem warranted. However, the Review fully acknowledges that it is for the Foundation to make its own determination of whether it is able to respond to this recommendation.²⁶

The Selection Process in the Universities

One of the findings of the Review is that there is a need for more detailed guidelines on how universities should undertake internal selection. Some other major competitions specify what is required, and such advice seems to be welcomed, rather than resented. A particular concern is the ad hoc nature of arrangements employed by certain universities. For the sake of individual candidates and the Foundation, it is important that the selection process is, and is seen to be, objective and fair. Without a Committee, there is always the danger of favouritism or discipline bias, or the appearance of either or both.

It is understood that the Foundation has a quite reasonable aversion to bureaucracy, but formal arrangements are sometimes a requirement of a professional and objective process. Clearly, there are limits to what the Foundation can ask of the universities. However, some additional steps would seem to be necessary. **It is recommended** that the Foundation indicate a requirement that a formal Selection Committee be set up at each participating university. Beyond this, guidelines would be couched as recommendations, rather than as mandatory. Despite this, every effort should be made to encourage their adoption. The guidelines would indicate that the committee should meet, even where there is only one candidate, to ensure that the university has confidence in the nominations proposed, and to decide on the candidates whose names will be proposed to the office of the President of the university.

Some guidance on membership and the appointment of a committee chair might also be provided. The practice of the University of Waterloo in interviewing candidates is a healthy innovation. While it should not be specified as mandatory, it is an innovation which might be

²⁶ If such a step were taken, as a balancing measure, it would also be reasonable to adopt a policy of giving special consideration to candidates from smaller institutions and institutions in smaller provinces at the Semi-Final stage, with particular attention given to adding marginal candidates from such institutions to the pool of those who clearly meet all criteria to a high degree.

mentioned as an example of a good practice others may be invited to consider. It is suggested that the university be asked to provide a one-page memo (perhaps on a standard form) about the Committee, its membership and the selection process followed. The memo would accompany the University's nominations.

Earlier in this section of the report, in considering issues relating to Internal Selection by the Universities and the possible enlargement of the candidate pool, the Reviewer recommended that the Foundation seek the opportunity to address the annual meetings of the Canadian Association of Graduate Studies. Such a session would also be an appropriate setting for the Foundation to emphasize (delicately) its concerns regarding the *process for selection* adopted by the universities, and to encourage a discussion on the topic. The Foundation might seek such an opportunity at least bi-annually.

Selection at the Foundation: Selecting the Semi-Finalist Pool

The Reviewer is satisfied that the selection grid has proved itself to be an effective instrument for deciding on those who will be included in the pool of Semi-Finalists. It is apparent that great care is taken in giving particular attention to those on the margins of inclusion.

There is no suggestion that there is any fault in internal procedures. However, In order to provide complete assurance of fairness to all concerned, it will be advisable for the Foundation to maintain a more complete record of its procedures, with a rationale for decisions, at this point, with a summary note on what transpired. The same observations apply at the stage where further reductions in numbers are made prior to the forwarding of files to the FRC.

In order to avoid repetition, this may be the appropriate point in the narrative to include **the firm recommendation that** the Foundation make it a priority to prepare and maintain on file an appropriately detailed summary record (within the constraints of any legal advice provided) of what transpires at *each stage* in the selection process where candidate names are removed. This includes the distinct stages in internal selection, where decisions are made by Foundation staff: the component of the process where the foundation may be judged to be most vulnerable to external questioning of its procedures. A rationale should be provided for the inclusion of each candidate whose name is carried forward to the next stage.

For long-term credibility, it is essential that the Foundation demonstrate exemplary consistency and full transparency in its procedures, and that its records be sufficiently complete to satisfy future evaluation and audit requirements. It will be most important, in this regard, to produce separate reports on each step of the internal process. **It is further recommended** that, on an annual basis, the President present a complete report on the selection process and results to the Board (possibly following prior consideration at the ANRC), and that this report be reviewed and then attached to the minutes for future reference.²⁷

²⁷ It is understood that, on legal grounds, the Foundation has taken a cautious approach to maintaining records on selection decisions. It is believed that following the procedures suggested above will satisfy concerns for transparency and give assurance to those concerned that the Foundation is following rigorous procedures at all stages of selection, without giving rise to legal jeopardy.

The Semi-Finalists and the File Review Committee

The further reduction in numbers at the point of deciding on those files to be sent to the File Review committee requires more attention. For 2005, there were 77 members of the Semi-Final Pool, but only 45 were forwarded to the Committee members for their review.

The procedures adopted for ranking by the members of the FRC do not yield conclusive results. While it is apparent that there is little difficulty in using the rankings to determine the top candidates, there is more ambiguity in the case of candidates where the Committee members offer rather different assessments of candidates.

With the recommendation on consistency and transparency of procedures in mind, it will be helpful for the Foundation to develop clear guidelines on how it will interpret and act on the rankings of the FRC, in order to ensure consistency from year to year. It is understandable that the Foundation may wish to retain some flexibility at the margins, but some clear rules should be established on the ranking of candidates. For example, one candidate may be ranked “B” by 4 reviewers and “C” by another; a second may have 3 scores of “A”, and yet be unranked by two other Reviewers. What are the rules under which the Foundation compares and ranks the candidates? The application of a numeric ranking for each candidate by the Reviewer might be helpful in this regard.

The request to Reviewers to rank only their top 25 candidates might also be reconsidered. In 2005, 21 of the 45 candidates who were ranked by at least one Reviewer were not ranked by one or more of the other members of the Committee. This was also the case for 8 candidates who received at least one “A” ranking. Further, given the importance of the work of the FRC, it may be worth asking the members to participate in a conference call to assist the Foundation with its decision on the final group of marginal candidates - those for whom there were divided opinions.

It is recommended that the Foundation review the guidelines on ranking procedures to be followed by the FRC with a view to ensuring a straightforward way of assigning a ranking to each candidate. Further, **it is recommended** that the Foundation adopt detailed guidelines on its own decision-making on the basis of the work of the FRC, and that these guidelines are recorded in the Programme Manual.

It may also be helpful to consider increasing the size of the Committee by one or two, to add members who may offer a wider array of opinion and perspective. The members of the FRC over the three years of its existence have all been highly qualified and committed to the seriousness of the task they have been asked to take on. However, it is apparent that they are all somewhat alike in terms of their profile. This may have consequences in terms of the candidates who are most favoured, and of those who receive less consideration. Accordingly, it will be helpful that steps be taken to increase the diversity of backgrounds of the members of the committee.

It is not suggested that the Foundation dispense with the services of such an excellent group of Reviewers. However, given the concern of the Foundation to ensure consideration of some

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

equally worthy, but less conventional or predictable, candidates, it may be useful to bring into the Committee one or two additional members, with different profiles, and somewhat different perspectives. They might be academics, or former academics, with a professional resume that includes substantial experience outside an academic milieu, and who continue to play important non-academic roles. They might be individuals, possibly in the arts, or with links to the voluntary sector, with environmental or legal or human rights NGOs, or with business or government experience. It is understood that it is desirable to have Reviewers who have experience of ranking candidates for major awards. This limits the options available. So far as may be possible, **it is recommended** that the Foundation increase the size of the FRC to six, and that steps be considered to increase the diversity of the membership.

On a separate matter, despite the issuing of clear guidelines by the Foundation, there is a possibility that the FRC members, in classic Canadian fashion, have attempted to “balance the slate” of those that they recommend. It is suggested that even firmer guidelines be provided to ensure that ranking is done purely on merit. It will be for the Foundation management, if it believes it to be necessary and justifiable, to introduce other means of structuring the selection process after the Committee has done its work. However, if, after three years of experience, this kind of procedure is seen as necessary, an indication of what may take place during selection procedures should be given in the Instructions to Applicants and in the notifications sent to universities. As discussed above, it is essential to its reputation and credibility that the Foundation is entirely transparent in its selection procedures at all steps in the process, and that applicants and nominators are advised of what to expect.

In the medium term, the Foundation should be prepared for questions from institutions about its ranking and selection methods. As at earlier stages in selection, it will be advisable for the Foundation to maintain quite detailed notes on its procedures and on what was actually done in arriving at particular decisions in the year in question. This is particularly important where factors of representation, or a desire to include an unusual, but challenging, application, are brought to bear on decisions on who to include among the final few candidates to be added to the list of Finalists.

Interviewing the Finalists

There are a number of issues to be addressed in considering the appropriateness of the final stage of the selection process. In the opinion of the Reviewer, in order to address the issues discussed below, it will be necessary for the Foundation to increase its level of effort and investment in the Final Interview stage.

A major source of difficulties is the compressed duration of the process. To attempt to interview 24 candidates in one day and to make decisions before the Interviewers leave at the end of the afternoon imposes a number of constraints on the character and depth of both the interviewing and decision-making process.

The pool of Finalists may be thought of as a collection of rare jewels. The Interviewers are the appraisers. It is essential not to discard valuable pieces by acting in haste before the appraisers see them, or by imposing unrealistic time constraints on the appraisal process. It is also

important that each piece is appraised methodically, using the same techniques. Through circumstances largely outside the control of the Interviewers, some of the conditions necessary to ensure a fully satisfactory process are not in place.

2.5 A Listing of Major Issues Concerning Selection at the Foundation

- i. First, the size of the Finalist pool is rather small. The Foundation has exercised some discretion in determining the composition of the pool to make sure that certain groups are adequately represented. At the same time, the Board is on record as indicating that the best candidates, regardless of their background, must be selected. It is understandable that there should be a concern with adequate representation of particular groups. This issue is best addressed at the level of the composition of the overall pool of candidates, and working to increase participation of under-represented groups, and not at the final stage of selection. The Reviewer notes that, by and large, this is the approach which the Foundation has adopted. It is encouraged to ensure that this continues to be the case, and **it is recommended** that it include guidelines on such procedures in its Programme Manual

If, for policy reasons, it is necessary to add a small number of additional candidates to ensure a balance, on linguistic, disciplinary or regional grounds, their inclusion should not be at the expense of those who have qualified with the highest rankings at the Semi-Final stage. Rather, these additional candidates should be added to the number of those who have qualified, and a larger number included in the Finalist pool. Once again, this appears to be the approach the Foundation has adopted. It is encouraged to continue this practice, to formalize it in the Programme manual, and to report on what has transpired in the annual report on the competition.

- ii. The Interview itself is too short in duration. For a competition of this importance to make its final decisions based on an interview as short as 15 minutes in some cases, when a panel is behind schedule, seems surprising. As discussed below, the length of time available for an interview will determine the kind of strategy adopted by the interviewers. While having a positive view of those who have interviewed them, many of the current Scholars (and bear in mind that these were the successful candidates) commented that the length of interview was insufficient to allow for a satisfactory explanation of his or her research project and range of interests, or to let the panel get to know them.

An account of one Scholar's recollection of the (English) interview experience will serve to illustrate the problem: "They were running late; it was like a firing range. I had to make eye contact...the format could have been intimidating. Some questions were quite long and there was little time to answer. I felt that if I paused for breath in my answers, another question might come in."

A member of the Interviewing Panel (bilingual) commented that "candidates really had to hit the ground running. We gave them twenty minutes. What can you do in twenty minutes? We can get at someone's ability to think on their feet and argue for the

importance of their ideas and concerns, their views...” Asked to reflect further on the structure of the interview, the respondent indicated that “it would be valuable to be able to develop conversations over a longer period of time.”

- iii. A related issue is equity of treatment of the candidates. Because of shortage of time, the panellists must focus in on only a few issues in the 15-20 minutes available to them with each candidate. Comparing accounts by Scholars and Interviewers of their experience, it becomes apparent that this results in a situation where one individual may be asked questions almost exclusively relating to her or his research project, while others may be questioned about broader interests and experiences. Further, some interviewers have adopted a rather aggressive style, particularly in questioning candidates in a discipline, or with a topic area, close to their own interests. By contrast, other candidates report that the interview was relaxed and almost “like an anointment”.
- iv. The limitation of the number of panellists to three members also makes it more likely that there will be unevenness of treatment of candidates.
- v. The division of the candidates between the two panels means that each panel sees only 12 of the 24 Finalists. On completion of the interviews the six interviewers meet together to decide the fate of those interviewed. Thus, each interviewer is being asked to compare 12 candidates whom he or she has seen with another 12, about whom they know very little. This does not seem to be a wholly satisfactory arrangement.

Addressing the issues

The limiting factor to changing the format for selection at the Finalist stage would appear to be the time availability of the distinguished cast of interviewers. The Reviewer had the opportunity to meet with several of those who had participated in the Interview Panels. When asked about their views on the subject, all indicated a willingness to take part in a more extended selection process. Although none felt that any injustice had been done to candidates under existing arrangements, all recognized the value of holding a longer interview.

A number of those interviewed for the Review referred to the Rhodes Trust and their familiarity with the selection practice for the Rhodes Scholarship Competition in Ontario and Quebec. While there are limitations to the value of a comparison of the two award competitions, there are some elements of the Rhodes process that may recommend themselves for adoption, or adaptation, by the foundation as it adjusts its selection procedures.

In the Rhodes competition, candidates are interviewed by a larger panel of six members, one of whom is designated in advance as chair, over a one-hour period. There is only one panel, allowing the interviewers to see all candidates. This allows for a thorough discussion with each candidate of all aspects of the application. In the opinion of the Reviewer and others with whom the issue was discussed, the Foundation would do well to follow the practice employed by the Rhodes Trust, both in setting up interview schedules, and in the number of panellists. This would allow for a more extended conversation for the panel with each candidate, while going some way to ensure equity of treatment of all candidates.

The interviewers for the Rhodes Programme are, like those engaged by the Trudeau Foundation, a very distinguished group, drawn from the highest level of the professions, business, government and academia. They are asked to review a large number of applicant files in advance, and to meet together on two weekends to make their decisions. On the basis of the information collected for the Review, it may be observed that the Foundation can safely ask more from its Interviewers, and, in this way, remove what may be the principal constraint to extending the interview process.

It is recommended that the size of panels be increased to five, with one of the members designated as a chair. This will also provide the opportunity to broaden the base of experience of the panels. In identifying panellists, it is strongly recommended that the Foundation bear in mind that those who are the leaders in their field are not necessarily the best qualified as interviewers for the Foundation's purposes.

It is not necessary that all panellists are of such public prominence as has been typical with the Interviewers engaged so far. Broadening the range in terms of professional and occupational background, including some Interviewers who are at mid-career stage, and closer in age to the candidates, will not weaken the quality of the process. It will also facilitate achieving a more equitable gender balance among interviewers. As noted above, despite the efforts of the Foundation to attract more women as panellists, while women have constituted a majority of candidates, they have made up only one third of the membership of the interview panels.

Where the character of interviewing is concerned, in determining what is the most appropriate approach, much will depend on what the objective of the exercise is. As noted above, the structure of current arrangements has surely had a considerable influence on the approach to interviewing adopted in some cases. If the purpose of the interview is to put the candidate at ease and to learn as much about her or him as possible, a quick-fire, challenging style of interviewing will not be helpful. If time is limited, and if the purpose is to see how well candidates stand up to pressure, a more assertive style may be appropriate. Lengthening the time available for each interview will remove the need for a focus on eliminating the weakest. **It is strongly recommended** that, with the support of panel chairs, the Foundation emphasize in its guidance to panellists that the preferred approach to the interview is conversational.

It is recommended that the Foundation adopt a 40-minute to one-hour interview as the norm, following a consistent format. With the process facilitated by a chair, this will permit each candidate to provide an explanation of her or his research and its relationship to larger issues, while also giving the panel the opportunity to get to know all of the candidates. To provide for this will require a stretching out of the selection process over a weekend, beginning on Friday evening, and continuing through until the end of Sunday afternoon.

Ideally, all candidates should be interviewed by all panellists. Regrettably, since there will be 24 or more candidates to be interviewed by the panellists, it seems unlikely that this ideal requirement will be met. As an alternative, **it is recommended** that two larger panels of 5-6 be employed, each with a designated chair. **It is also recommended** that there be a Trudeau Fellow, or former Fellow, among the interviewers in each panel, as has often been the case in

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

practice to date. The Fellows should be selected from those who have been most active in Foundation activities, since they will have greater experience with the various qualities of successful Scholars. To ensure fairness, each interview would follow approximately the same procedure and sequence

It is also recommended that the Foundation ask individual members of the panels to rank each candidate and to record the assigned rating, using an agreed numeric ranking system. Each interviewee would be ranked separately by each member of the interviewing panel. A member of staff should be present to assist the chair and to keep a general record of proceedings, enabling that individual to act as a resource person and a “prompt” to the chair in the final discussions to decide on the fate of marginal candidates.

Instead of maintaining the current group process, which may encourage a rather subjective assessment of candidates, **it is recommended** that at the close of interviews, in collaboration with the panel chairs, the Foundation staff members who have assisted the two chairs calculate the average rankings for each candidate, and determine an order of merit based on these figures. A meeting would then be held involving the two chairs and the Foundation team, led by the Executive Programme Director, along with the two Fellows who have served as panel members, to make decisions among marginal candidates.

In order to make for shared information on all candidates and a fairer process of assessment at this last stage, **it is recommended** that the two chairs and the two Fellows be asked to review all files, including those assigned to the panel in which they will not participate, in advance. To make this request more reasonable, it may be that the staff will have additional work to do in preparing more detailed summaries of the file for each candidate.

The other members of the interview panels will be free to leave on completion of the interviews. With a selection process extending over a weekend (see below), there will have been ample opportunity for the Foundation to offer hospitality to the panellists as a gesture of appreciation for their efforts.

The rankings should be the primary determinant of the decision on the selection of the Scholars. On completion of the full set of interviews by each panel, it may be helpful to the members of the group to review and compare their views. While this may lead to a reconsideration of the rankings, there should not be pressure to arrive at a consensus on all candidates. Some additional observations on the candidates may be made and recorded by the member of staff present, at the direction of the chair, at this time.

The same assessment grid is used at all stages of the competition. Given the noticeable differences in rankings given to many candidates by the members of the File Review Committee at the Semi-Final stage and the lack of success at the Final stage of some very highly-rated candidates, it will be advisable for the Foundation to look again at the grid. It may well be the case that the problem does not rest with the grid, per se, but rather with the way it is applied.

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

While Foundation management and staff members have internalized the methods of translating criteria and sub-criteria into practice, this is not necessarily the case for external reviewers and interviewers. It may be helpful for the Foundation to be more specific in some areas, or to provide more comprehensive guidelines to outside assessors. It will also be advisable for more time to be given to an orientation to the Interviewers, with time for questions and answers. This will be entirely feasible, if the proceedings begin by 5 PM on the Friday evening of a weekend.

In order to complete the package of proposals for adjustment to the selection process for the Scholarship Programme, as discussed above, **it is recommended** that the Foundation plan an extended selection process at the final stage, beginning early on Friday evening, and concluding on Sunday afternoon. This would provide the enabling environment in which all the other recommendations might be implemented effectively. It would also allow for the possibility of allowing for a modest increase in the number of candidates to be interviewed.

2.6 Reporting by Scholars, and Progress in their Doctoral Programmes

In the agreement between Scholars and the Foundation, it is stipulated that all Scholars are required to submit both a semi-annual and annual report, in which they are expected to discuss all relevant aspects of their research, as well as advising the Foundation of their interactions with their assigned Mentors. They are also asked to comment on their activities with regard to academic and non-academic presentations and publications, and to provide an overview of exchanges they have had with others, and various forms of public engagement in which they may have been involved. The reports are reviewed at the Foundation by the Programme Officer for Scholarships, and a response is sent in all cases. On occasion, a particular Scholar may be asked to provide additional information. The Programme Officer may request a copy of a conference presentation, a newspaper article, or a report, for posting on the internal web-site. Sometimes, the Scholar may be advised to make a greater effort to establish or maintain contact with her or his Mentor.

Some Scholars have indicated that the requirement to provide the reports creates some anxiety in that they perceive the norm to be of a Scholar heavily engaged in external activities, and wonder if they can meet this presumed standard. Others indicate that they find the reporting a helpful way of keeping track of what they have managed to do in the preceding six or twelve month period.

A letter sent by the President to Scholars following the first Trudeau Policy Conference helped to reassure Scholars that it is their studies which come first. However, it may be advisable for the Foundation to provide more complete guidelines, both on reporting and on its expectations of Scholars concerning public engagement. Alternatively, the Foundation might send out an annual letter to all Scholars, or separately to each cohort of Scholars, following review of the annual reports, with advice of this kind.

For all Scholars, except those in their first year of studies, the Foundation contacts academic supervisors, requesting a report on progress. For the 2003 cohort of Scholars, the first reports of this kind were received this year. In all case, satisfactory progress was reported. In one case, it was felt to be necessary for the President to contact the supervisor for clarification. The

response to the enquiry was satisfactory, and any concerns the Foundation might have had were dealt with fully.

3. THE TRUDEAU FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMME

3.1 Introduction

As noted above, it is for its Scholarship Programme for which the Foundation has become best known in its short period of operations. Among university administrators and many senior academics, however, the Fellowship Prize has achieved a high level of prestige. Winning Trudeau Fellowship Prizes is viewed as a priority for the three universities included in the Review, as well as for those departments and schools in the relevant disciplines which are aware of the Fellowship Programme. As noted earlier in the report, the Foundation and its programmes are not yet fully integrated into the culture of the Canadian academic world. At the same time, in the major universities and within the Canadian academic community at large, it is difficult for the Foundation to achieve full recognition for the importance of its awards, since it must compete for attention with other programmes, such as the Canada Research Chairs Programme, the Molson Prize, the Killam Prize, and the SSHRC Gold Medal.

One of the justifications for investing public money in the Foundation was the recognition for the under-funding of research in the social sciences and humanities. It must be borne in mind that at major universities funding for research in medicine, the natural sciences and applied sciences, exceeds by an astonishing margin funding for other fields. Trudeau Fellowships, important in their own right, may not be very visible within the overall picture of university research. Further, because most Trudeau Fellows are already holding positions of distinction in their universities, by contrast with Trudeau Scholars, it is not always the case that they will be identified, primarily, as Trudeau Fellows.

Programme Management and Administration

As is the case with the Scholars programme, there was a danger of this aspect of the Foundation's work being overlooked in the Review. Everything is working so well that Programme administration becomes almost invisible. It is not necessary to repeat the earlier comments on programme administration. The Fellows (and the Mentors) interviewed for the Review were entirely positive about their relations with the Foundation. There were no criticisms of any aspect of programme administration or of communications to and from the Foundation, and many compliments. The Fellows felt fully at ease in their dealings with the Foundation and its staff.

3.2. The Nominators and the Nominees

A majority of Fellows are academics, nominated by their universities. The list of **nominators** for Fellows and Mentors in 2005 includes University Presidents as well as an additional 107 names from various sectors. Of these, 45 (42 per cent) are related to academia. The others include leading figures from the voluntary sector (20 per cent), the private sector (15 per cent), the public sector and government (8 per cent), media (5 per cent), and "individuals", 10 per

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

cent. Of the 107, 76 per cent are male and 31 per cent female. In terms of language, 79 per cent are identified as English-Speakers, 20 per cent as French-Speakers, and 8 per cent as bilingual.

For 2005, there were 62 nominees for Trudeau Fellowship Prizes, including 20 nominations from shortlists of previous years. In 2004, 111 nominations were received and in 2003, 122 nominations. The number of nominees is not large, but the ratio of nominees to available awards is higher than for Scholars. According to the university representatives consulted in the Review, it is usual for major awards for senior academics to attract only a small number of nominees. At the Université de Montréal, the guidance sent out by the Vice-President for Research is that the nominees should be “chairable”, i.e. strong candidates for, or incumbents of, Canada Research Chairs, or an equivalent. Unlike the situation with the Scholars, where each year there is a new cohort of doctoral students from whom to select, the pool of potential nominees for the Fellowship is smaller and relatively constant in composition, and this may account for the reduced numbers of nominees for the third year of the competition.

Profile of 2005 Fellowship Nominations

By gender

Women	17	27%
Men	45	73%
	<hr/>	
	62	

By territory

Ontario	22	35%
Quebec	18	29%
Maritimes and Nfld.	7	11%
Prairies	6	10%
British Columbia	5	8%
International (*1)	4	6%
	<hr/>	
	62	

For the 2005 competition, there were eight nominations for those outside the universities. All of these candidates were writers or artists. Of the 62 candidates, only 17, or 27.4 per cent, were women. Twenty-two of the university candidates were from Ontario and 18 from Quebec (35.5 and 29 per cent, respectively). Seven candidates were from the Maritimes and Newfoundland, five from BC, six from the Prairies, and four were international (one each from the universities of Chicago, Michigan and Oxford and one writer from Tokyo). Among universities, seven candidates were based at the University of Toronto, six at the University of Montreal, four at Waterloo, and three each at Simon Fraser and Queens.

In terms of the academic disciplines and professional fields of the 2005 candidates, the representation was as follows:

- Writers and Artists 9;
- Political Science, including International Relations 6;
- Philosophy 6;
- Public Policy 6;

- Law 5;
- Literature 5;
- Sociology 2;
- Economics 3;
- Management and Industrial Relations 3;
- Environment and Architecture 3;
- Education 2;
- History and Art History 4;
- Anthropology 2.
- Music, Psychology, Canadian Studies, Communications, Legal Practice, and Technology, 1 each.

3.3 The Selection Process at the Universities

At the **Université de Montréal**, which has been successful thus far in nominating three of those selected as Trudeau Fellows, the process of identification and selection of candidates is organized by the Vice-President of Research and his office. Once the letter from the Foundation requesting nominations is received, the VP contacts relevant Deans to inform them of the process for nomination and advise them of deadlines. Proposals for candidates are forwarded by the Deans, while the VP himself may also put forward additional candidates. The VP himself selects some 5-8 names for further consideration with the other VPs and the President. Normally, files for 3-4 nominees are then forwarded to the Foundation.

At the Université de Montréal the requirement for confidentiality of the nomination process is disregarded. The University is aware of the requirement, but views it as untenable. Candidates are asked to prepare their own files in support of the nomination. There is considerable pressure on the Deans and the VP Research from potential candidates, and there have been bad feelings when some prominent individuals have not been selected as nominees by the university. Although the Foundation is not at fault, this may damage its image among faculty members at the university.

In the case of the **University of Toronto**, it is the Office of Research, under the direction of the VP Research, which works closely with the Deans, Principals and Chairs, to identify candidates and prepare nominations. The Office performs a quality control function and ensures that deadlines are met. This year (2005), the university received only three nominations, and submitted all three to the Foundation.²⁸ In the previous year, only one nomination was received, with two in the first year. These figures are not regarded as surprising, and are comparable to those for other major competitions in the social sciences and humanities. The University respects the principle of confidentiality, but recognizes that it is not always easy to enforce. Departments must ensure that they have the most up-to-date CV and publications from the nominee. This may result in the candidate inadvertently discovering what is afoot.

At the **University of Waterloo**, the process of selecting nominees for the Fellowship Programme is managed by an Associate Provost. Once the information on the competition has

²⁸ There were other nominations for candidates from the University of Toronto, but it appears that these were put forward by individual nominators, and were not formal nominees of the University.

been distributed, the responsible official consults with the Dean of Graduate Studies and the key academic Deans from relevant subject areas. The Deans, in turn, consult with the chairs. The VP Research also participates in the process. The process is similar to that employed by the university in selection of nominees for the Royal Society of Canada. The university respects the confidentiality requirement, but both the President and the Associate Provost view it as a barrier to preparing effective nomination files, and would prefer an open process.

The Foundation is to be congratulated on the quality of those it has selected to hold Trudeau Fellowships. It may be noted that, by comparison with their peers, they are, on the whole, more engaged with public issues, more concerned to communicate with broader publics, and tend to have a more inter-disciplinary bent to their research. Yet, the selection process at the universities seems to fit into normal patterns. Partly as a result, on first inspection, it appears that the candidates for the Fellowship, while distinguished, may appear to be a less distinctive group than are the Scholars.

As with the Scholarship programme, much depends on the extent to which individual departments and schools take the initiative in putting forward names of potential nominees. The requirement for confidentiality may serve to limit discussion about the Fellowship Prize Programme among members of faculty. Along with the tendency of the universities to wish to accommodate the nomination process within “normal” patterns, it may also encourage a rather conservative approach to consideration of possible candidates. Most candidates, and most of those selected, are rather predictable, and, with one or two notable exceptions, not so very different from those whose names are put forward in nomination for other major awards. This may or may not be viewed as an issue, but, in the opinion of the Reviewer, is a cause for some concern.

There is a trade-off here between the need for the Foundation, on the one hand, to encourage the universities to build the Fellowship award nomination process into its annual cycle, and, on the other, to build recognition that the Trudeau Fellowship is intended to be rather different from other major prizes and awards. It may take some time for the Foundation to be able to build a broad appreciation of the distinctive character of its awards, and, thereby, to be in a better position to address issues of this kind.

Given the Foundation’s strong and understandable commitment to a confidential process, the scope for action is limited to maintaining dialogue with the universities on encouraging a more adventurous approach to the nomination of candidates. Along with this would go a concerted effort to reach the broader academic community, to build a more accurate picture of the Fellowship Programme and to provide information on the rather varied profiles of those who might qualify as strong candidates for the award.

3.4 Selection at the Foundation: Selecting the Semi-Finalists

As with the Scholars, once the competition has closed, and files have been examined for completeness, the first step in selection is carried out internally by management staff. An assessment grid is employed, with candidates ranked from “High” to “Low” on four dimensions:

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

Category 1: *Creative thinking to highest international standards of the given discipline;*

Category 2: *Outstanding ability to communicate the results of research to other researchers and scholars and the general public;*

Category 3: *Potential commitment to work with Foundation Scholars and Mentors*

Category 4: *Interest in one or more themes of the Foundation*

Three members of the Foundation management team are involved in the selection process: the President, the Director of Programmes, and the Administrator of the Public Interaction Programme, who is also the officer responsible for the Fellowships and Mentors Programmes. In making their assessment of candidates, they work independently. Having assessed each candidate on the grid, the two members of the team other than the President then assign each candidate to Tier 1 (the highest), Tier 2, 3 or 4. The President makes his own assessment on the same basis. The team then meets to discuss the rankings and to agree on the placement of candidates. Those selected as the top candidates are then assigned places in the pool of Semi-Finalists. These files are then forwarded to the File Review Committee for their consideration. In 2005, 21 files were sent to the committee, and in 2004, 25.

It was determined at an early stage in 2005, that eight of the candidates were more appropriately viewed as nominees for Mentorships, rather than Fellowships. A decision was then made to remove these files and add them to the list of candidates for the next Mentors competition. It is apparent that the practice of sending out one nomination letter for both Fellows and Mentors may contribute to some confusion, and **it is recommended** that separate letters be sent out in the future – or separate attachments to one letter - with the differences between the two competitions spelled out even more starkly than before.

It is understood that the Foundation has struggled to resolve the difficulty of ensuring that the universities give attention to both competitions, without confusing the two, and while avoiding confusion through multiple mailings. The principal source of the problem would appear to lie in the lack of care taken by a number of universities in reviewing carefully the information included in the letters sent by the foundation.

3.5 The File Review Committee: Selecting the Finalists

The five members of the File Review Committee are all distinguished academics, or individuals respected for their knowledge of the arts and creative fields, and who have participated in selection processes for major competitions in these fields. As the President of the Foundation has explained, the rule of thumb adopted in selecting members of the Committee is that they should themselves be of the calibre to be considered as Fellows. Since the procedure adopted is for all reviewers to assess all files, the Foundation had made a special effort to identify outstanding reviewers who are poly-disciplinary. However, further steps have been necessary to allow for inclusion in the final pool of candidates from the arts and creative fields. At least two of the five reviewers each year have been women.

It is recognized that, while the Foundation can select a panel capable of assessing typical candidates from those fields in the humanities and social sciences most readily linked to the Foundation's four themes, it cannot hope to deal in the same way with candidates drawn from the "creative" fields. The Foundation has not encouraged applications from a range of fields in the arts and applied arts. Rather, it has decided in a particular year to include candidates from one creative field. Hence, in 2004, a decision was made to focus on writers. Several were included in the pool, and two members selected to serve on the panel had specific expertise in the area of contemporary literature. As had been agreed in advance, one Fellowship slot was set aside for the chosen candidate from this sub-field.

It has proved difficult to follow such a procedure each year. One candidate from a different creative field was nominated in a different year. The panel lacked the necessary expertise in the field, and did not investigate the materials provided in any depth. Doubts were raised at the ANRC, and further investigations resulted in a realization that the candidate was not at as high a level as had been thought. The Committee then determined to substitute one of the alternate candidates in its final list of nominees.

The File Review Committee is given one month to review the 20-25 files of the Semi-Finalists. The members also receive the same statement of selection criteria employed during the earlier, internal review process and an assessment grid. The Foundation also provides some additional notes to assist the Committee in applying the criteria. The concern for confidentiality of the process at the nomination stage also applies during selection. In order to avoid any possibility of lobbying on behalf of candidates, Committee members are asked not to disclose to others the role that they are playing on behalf of the Foundation.

In a brief discussion of "creative thinking", the note from the President suggests that the term "creativity" is to be applied flexibly, and asks the reviewers "to be open to the diversity of creativity." On "outstanding ability to communicate", the note indicates that the reviewers are "invited to assess the potential of the candidate to contribute actively and effectively to intellectual and policy communities and to contribute to public dialogue." As the note goes on to explain, "The central idea is that Trudeau Fellows should be creative and influential leaders in their chosen fields, and should want to relate their work to the work of others so as to promote greater shared knowledge and more informed public discourse."

The clarification of the Category 3 criterion is important, given the hope of the Foundation that the Fellows will not only take on the role of "its intellectual leaders", but that they will provide direct inspiration to its Scholars. As the note suggests, the criterion "reflects the desire to build a Trudeau Foundation network...it asks you to assess the likelihood of active engagement of a Fellow with an exciting cohort of young doctoral students and with creative policy professionals (Mentors)".

The five members review the files, and are asked to be prepared to meet at the Foundation for a day in March. The Executive Director of Programmes and the Programme Officer responsible for the Public Information Programme join the meeting, acting as resource persons, providing information as required. The President is also available in case his input may be required. The

Committee decides on a list of five nominees and two alternates to go to the ANRC for review, prior to submission of the final list to the full Board of Directors.

3.6 Fellows and their Progress

Since the Fellowship is non-taxable Prescribed Prize, there can be no formal contract between the Foundation and the Fellow, setting out requirements of the award. Hence, the Foundation does not request any formal reports of its Fellows on progress with their research or other matters. Fellows are requested to post publications and working papers on the internal web-site and to inform the Foundation of items concerning their activities which may be used on the public web-site, but there is no requirement that they do either.

3.7 Issues Concerning the Fellowship Programme

As with the Scholarship Programme, one matter of concern is the small number of nominees. Related to this is the issue of confidentiality at the nomination stage. The Foundation's position on this is both firm and understandable. Yet, it should be noted that it is not one which finds broad support at university level, where it is argued that opening the process will allow for the preparation of more representative and comprehensive nomination proposal packages, and of ensuring what may be viewed as a more rigorous approach. The Reviewer raised this issue with the Foundation, and was reminded that it took the McArthur Foundation at least ten years to gain recognition for the credibility of its Fellowship Programme, which was, in many ways, the inspiration and model for the Trudeau Fellowship Prize. It too has a confidentiality requirement. It is suggested that, over time, as the cachet of the Fellowship Prize is established, the negative view of the confidentiality requirement will evaporate.

While it is not suggested here that there is any urgency to making a change in this regard, it will be worthwhile for the Foundation to give careful consideration to weighing up the costs and benefits of the confidentiality provision and re-assess its position. In reflecting further on the implications of the current provision, it is worth devoting some attention to the selection criteria applied in the selection of Fellows. The Category 3 criterion, and, to a degree, Category 2, are subjective, requiring others to make a judgment on the predisposition of a candidate to follow certain actions and her or his willingness to act in a particular fashion. This is awkward for a reviewer to assess, or for a referee to comment on, without the opportunity to learn directly of the views and commitments of the candidate. Given the special role expected of Fellows in the Foundation, the requirement for confidentiality would seem to go against the need for adequate knowledge of the candidate in some areas of importance.

Changing the process would require asking universities to establish an internal selection process, in order to avoid charges of favouritism. Given the apparently ad hoc nature of procedures in the case of certain institutions, this might be no bad thing. Of course, there would be negative aspects to an open process, as can be seen from experience at those universities which have chosen to overlook the requirement for confidentiality, where there have been bad feelings on the part of those who felt overlooked by the university as it decided on its nominees. On the other hand, there might well be additional benefits in the possibility of

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

attracting larger numbers of candidates at the university level, including some with less “mainstream” credentials.

It is recommended that the Foundation hold discussions with the universities (at the VP and Dean’s level, and not merely through consulting University Presidents) on the confidentiality provision, in considering whether a change might be considered, and in assessing the consequences of making adjustments to the process.

It is understood that the Foundation feels a strong commitment to the virtues of maintaining the confidentiality requirement. If it chooses to hold the line on this matter, in the view of the Reviewer, there are some further steps to be taken in improving the selection process which may assist, over time, in building the credibility of the competition.

As matters stand, the burden of work in preparing nomination files rests with the Foundation itself, which must follow up on the initial letters of nomination by soliciting letters of reference, collecting appropriate examples of the candidates’ written work, exemplifying or summarizing their research work, as well as “op-ed” pieces and press reports on presentations to public audiences, along with other materials exemplifying a commitment to public engagement. Foundation staff members also prepare a summary of the credentials of each candidate.

If the Foundation does not open up the process, it must consider even greater investment in the file preparation process, to ensure that there is sufficient range and depth in the material presented to enable the File Review Committee to make a careful, comparative assessment of the merits of the candidates across all criteria. Some thought might also be given to the adequacy of current arrangements for letters of reference/testimonials.

It is recommended that the Foundation make a thorough assessment of the nomination and file preparation process, with a view to considering how best to improve the quality, detail and relevance of the supporting materials for the nomination of Fellowship candidates. This recommendation, like those which follow, should not be seen as a criticism of the adequacy of present arrangements, but rather as the outcome of this first opportunity to step back from current practice and consider how best to strengthen the process, based on experience to date. It is recognized that, if this recommendation is followed, there will be implications in terms of increased investment of staff time to make the improvements possible. The issue of management and human resources is taken up towards the end of the report.

A second issue concerns the List of Nominators and the nomination process. Under the present arrangements, academic candidates considered by the universities as potential nominees must go through an internal selection process, while others may be proposed by one individual, who might or might not be an academic, acting alone. **It is recommended** strongly that the Foundation give further thought to ways of strengthening and professionalizing the Fellowship nomination process. **It is recommended** further that the Foundation take the immediate step of requiring that, in proposing a candidate, each nominator secure the support of a seconder, drawn from the list of nominators.

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

If there is a desire by the Board and management to include candidates from “the creative fields” whether inside or outside universities, **it is recommended** that a separate group of nominators be established, and that there should be a requirement for nominations to be supported by a second member from within the group. A sub-committee of the File Review Committee of a further five members with the necessary expertise would then review any nominations submitted, and be asked to arrive at the recommendation of one or two names to be included among the final pool. At least one of those participating in the sub-committee would then join the membership of the File Review Committee as an advisor for the one day discussion leading to the final list of nominations to the ANRC.

In adding candidates from the “creative fields”, the Foundation has not yet succeeded in demonstrating how such candidates, when selected as Fellows, can contribute to its overall work. Further, such candidates may not readily meet the established selection criteria, or fit with the four themes. The objective of moving beyond the university world is a worthy and important one. However, it is suggested strongly that the Foundation spend additional time in thinking through how best to broaden its discipline base before it finds new ways to add Fellows who, while they may be outstanding at what they do, confuse the effort to implement the mission, as defined. The Foundation cannot be, nor should it seek to be, all things to all people.²⁹

Given the importance of the recommendations of the File Review Committee, **it is recommended** strongly that the Foundation institutionalize the practice it has followed in providing for a face-to-face deliberation meeting for the Committee (as in 2005), rather than a conference call. There may well be value in considering adding a sixth member to add to the range of experience and fields of expertise represented.

Through the Executive Director of Programmes and the Programme Officer for PIP, the Foundation has been careful to monitor the decisions of the File Review Committee to ensure that the members are giving due attention to the different criteria for selection. It is hoped that the Foundation continues this practice, with a particular concern to make sure that well-qualified but more unusual candidates are given fair treatment and consideration. Further, it has already become clear that some Fellows are more interested and willing than others to participate in Foundation activities, and to engage with Scholars. It will be as well for the Foundation to ensure that the balance of the criteria is about right, and to reconsider guidelines to reviewers to ensure that criteria of unique concern to the Foundation are given the importance they deserve.

It is also recommended that, in preparing its annual letter from the President to universities, inviting nominations, the Foundation give greater emphasis to encouraging the proposing of at least some candidates who have achieved some distinction, but who are at an earlier stage in

²⁹ In the course of the Review, some thought has been given to concrete steps which might be taken in responding to the difficulty of accommodating adequately those from “creative fields”. One possibility would be to weaken the precision of the Mission Statement by adding a phrase in paragraph one to refer to “other contributions to public life”. However, without modifying the four themes, this will not be helpful. Further, if the Programme is to achieve the desired impact of making a difference in the promotion of public dialogue, it needs as much specificity and focus as possible. This is an awkward area for the Foundation.

their careers. It may be the case that, for the most part, candidates of this type are not even being considered, in that they may not fit with the image associated with the Fellowship Programme in the minds of university administrators and those senior academics whose views may be canvassed.

In concluding this section of the Report, one further issue will be raised. As will be discussed in more detail below, attention has been given in the Review to whether the Fellows are “giving intellectual leadership to the Foundation.” There is no doubt that several Fellows have been active in a variety of ways in Foundation affairs, and, as the President reports, no Fellow has ever turned down a request for help or input. Yet, if one poses the question: “*Have they been central in setting the intellectual agenda for the Foundation?*” it is not so easy to give a simple affirmative answer. Perhaps the Reviewer is raising unrealistic expectations in this regard. The question will be considered in more depth in 5.3, below.

4. THE MENTORSHIP PROGRAMME

4.1 Introduction

It is acknowledged by all that the Mentor Programme is both the most innovative of the Foundation’s programmes, and the one where it has experienced the greatest difficulty in establishing the desirable pattern. The key problem has been in translating the Mentor concept into practice, and in working out the ideal role, or roles, which Mentors may play in supporting Scholars and in helping to link the Foundation more closely to the world of public policy and current issues. A number of steps have been taken by the Foundation to strengthen the effectiveness of the Programme, and the discussion continues on further innovations and adjustments.

4.2 Nominating and Selecting the Mentors

As discussed earlier, the list of Nominators is the same for both Fellows and Mentors. The increased number of Nominators, along with the broadening of the range of professional and occupational fields of those included for 2005, should prove helpful over time. It should serve to increase the opportunities for the Foundation to find the right mix of Mentors to complement the interests and areas of focus of the Scholars. For 2005, 74 nominations were received. As in the case of the Fellows, a nomination is often supported by only a 1-2 page letter. It is for the Foundation to prepare the dossier for the candidate, which should have sufficient depth and breadth to allow for comparison of candidates and consideration of their relative merits, in view of the selection criteria.

It might be noted that for 2005, at the request of the Board, Directors were approached actively by Foundation management to become engaged in the nomination of candidates. Apparently, this resulted in an increase of the number of Board-initiated nominations, and some of these were among those selected as Mentors. It is recognized that the members of the Board have a wealth of relevant experience and contacts, and that they represent an excellent source of ideas of potential candidates. Consideration might also be given to asking Members of the Foundation to propose nominees.

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

In their letters proposing the candidate, the nominators are asked to refer to three areas of special interest to the Foundation:

- i. The intellectual and practical gifts of the nominee, with an emphasis on “outstanding creativity in policy analysis and implementation”;
- ii. The ability of the nominee “to engage in lively exchange with other Mentors, Fellows and students”; and,
- iii. A commitment to work directly with Trudeau Scholars on issues related to one of the Foundation’s four themes.

In the guidelines, accompanying the letter to nominators sent by the President of the Foundation on August 1, 2005, it was noted that, in seeking out Mentors “demonstrating outstanding creativity in policy analysis and implementation”, the term “policy analysis” may be given a very broad interpretation. It is suggested that the term be taken to refer to “anyone who has shown a strong interest in the public good, and who has tried to factor these questions into his or her work.” The note goes on to advise that “Mentors may be drawn from government, business, the voluntary sector, the professions, or the arts community.”

A sense of how the Foundation envisages the calibre of the ideal Mentor is provided later in the guidelines to nominators: “nominators are most helpful when they understand that people can be intellectually outstanding and exceptionally creative at any age, and when they appreciate the fine distinction between the very good and the exceptional.”

As with the process associated with the nomination of Fellows, Nominators are asked to keep their proposals of candidates confidential. Further, they are asked specifically not to contact the nominee concerning the nomination.

The assessment grid for Mentors assigns weights in accordance with the relative importance of the three categories (the three areas of interest listed above) and allocates a number of points to each. “Outstanding creativity” is assigned 40 points; “commitment to work with the Foundation Scholars”, a further 40; and, “strong ability to engage with other policy professionals, researchers and Scholars”, 20 points - making for a total of 100.

Using the grid, the Foundation management team follows the same procedure as employed for Fellows. However, for Mentors, internal selection is used to bring the numbers down to around 16 Semi-Finalists. A limiting factor which must be borne in mind by selectors is that the Mentors are to be matched to the interests of the Scholars. After the first round of Mentorships and a thorough policy review at the Board level, a number of changes were made in the Programme. Mentors are appointed for Scholars only in their second year, when most will be in the second year of doctoral studies. Each Mentor is assigned to work with one or two Scholars at a time and each Scholar will receive Mentoring support for eighteen months. This allows for a longer period of partnership between Scholars and Mentors, focusing on the period of a Scholar’s doctoral work when the outside assistance may be most appreciated, and where the pressures of the doctoral cycle may be less immediate.

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

Because of the particularities of the Mentor Programme, it is less helpful than in the case of the other two awards programmes to examine data on the candidates. Further, some of the candidates are better-known for earlier roles played than for their current positions. This makes classification difficult and only serves to reinforce the point that the candidates have made it as individuals with very solid personal achievements first, and as representatives of particular professional fields and areas of expertise, second. Nevertheless, it may be of interest to note that, taking together the 32 semi-finalists for 2004 and 2005, the largest number come from a professional grouping including senior public servants, domestic and international, with those from NGOs, and Government-supported NGOs and those from a third loose grouping of those engaged in journalism and media management, close behind.

4.3 Selecting the Mentors Part Two: The Role of the File Review Committee

The files for the Semi-Finalists are sent to the five members of a File Review Committee (FRC) for assessment. According to the Foundation manual, up to 25 files may be sent to the Committee. However, the practice has been to send 16 to 18 files. The Committee is given two weeks to review the files; members then meet by conference call to arrive at a decision on a list of around nine proposed Mentors and two alternates. Normally, the alternates are viewed as particularly versatile, with experience and interests of relevance to several Trudeau scholars. The selection of alternates is important, because it may not prove possible to match one or more of the eight on the primary list with the Scholars.

The composition of the panel calls for considerable thought on the part of the Foundation. One of the difficulties to be faced in selection is that, by contrast with the academic excellence required in a Trudeau Fellow, there are no accepted standards for excellence in qualifying as a Mentor. The criteria seem both realistic and relevant, and yet still call for a great deal of what amounts to subjective judgment on the part of reviewers. The Foundation has responded to the difficulties of finding the right panel by attempting to balance individuals who themselves would be strong candidates as Mentors with others chosen primarily for their own experience in mentoring. One interesting change for 2005 was to include as one of the five a Scholar.

Profile of the File Review Committees for Mentors

	2004		2005		2006	
Gender						
- Male	2	40%	2	40%	3	60%
- Female	3	60%	3	60%	2	40%
	<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>	
	5	100%	5	100%	5	100%
Language						
- English	4	80%	3	60%	4	80%
- French	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%
- Bilingual	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
	<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>	
	5	100%	5	100%	5	100%
Geography						
- Ontario	3	60%	2	40%	3	60%

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

- Québec		0%	2	40%		0%
- British Columbia	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%
- Alberta	1	20%		0%		0%
- Saskatchewan		0%		0%		0%
- New Brunswick		0%		0%		0%
- Newfoundland		0%		0%	1	20%
- Nova Scotia		0%		0%		0%
- MB		0%		0%		0%
- Yukon		0%		0%		0%
	<hr/>				<hr/>	
	5	100%	5	100%	5	100%

Sector

- University		0%	2	40%	1	20%
- Voluntary Sector		0%		0%	1	20%
- Private Sector	5	100%	2	40%	1	20%
- The Professions		0%		0%		0%
- Public Sector		0%	1	20%	2	40%
- Media		0%		0%		0%
- Government		0%		0%		0%
	<hr/>				<hr/>	
	5	100%	5	100%	5	100%

As noted above in the discussion of Fellows, and even more so in this case, the selection criteria require a judgment to be made of the candidates in areas where objective measures are elusive. As the Foundation has recognized, there is a tension between, on the one hand, the issue of whether the candidate will carry prestige, potentially enhancing the image of the organization as one associated with excellence and elite circles, and, on the other, the qualities the individual may bring to mentoring. As anyone familiar with teaching and supervision in the universities, or with coaching and training of managers and professionals – or athletes, for that matter - will know, those who are at the top of their field are not necessarily the best at sharing their knowledge with others, or in knowing how to help bring out the potential of students or younger colleagues. The best players are not necessarily the best coaches.

Further, it is not easy to assess in advance how adaptable a potential Mentor might be in responding to the varying needs of usually much-younger Scholars for coaching, advice, door-opening, and other forms of support. In at least a few cases, Mentors appear to have offered types of support which do not match well the needs and priorities of the Scholars, and have felt rebuffed when the Scholars have not responded positively to the help proffered.

It is more straightforward to assess candidates on the basis of their overall achievements and public profile. It appears to be the case that, in working collectively, the reviewers have tended to be somewhat conservative in their decisions, and, in most cases, have selected those who are among the most prominent leaders in their various fields. Despite this general tendency in the approach to selection by the panellists, not all Mentors are so predictable in terms of their backgrounds and profiles, and some of the most effective current Mentoring relationships feature these less typical individuals.

There remains some awkwardness concerning the views of the Foundation and its Board on what a Mentor should be and what are the most important qualities a Mentor, or Mentors as a group, are expected to bring to the programme and to the Foundation. This has been recognized and was discussed at the April 2005 Meeting of the Board, which considered a “White Paper”, prepared by the President, entitled “Refining the Mentorship Programme.” The present ambiguity results in a lack of clarity in many aspects of the Programme. Foundation management is well-aware of many of the issues here discussed and has introduced a number of adjustments to the Programme which should bring about improvements.

4.4 The Mentoring Process

The general role of Fellows, Mentors and Scholars, in the Foundation and in its activities will be considered in the next chapter on the Public Interaction Programme. For Mentors, unlike Fellows, the prescribed role is one in which the Mentor is expected to interact and provide support to one or two assigned Scholars, while also adding a link for both these Scholars and the Foundation as a whole to the world of public policy and of engagement with public issues. The Mentor-Scholar role forms the core of the Mentor Programme. Accordingly, it will be assessed in this section of the Report.

At the outset, it must be stated that in embarking on the Mentorship Programme, the Foundation appreciated that it would be travelling on poorly-charted waters. It was recognized that the Programme was experimental and understood that it would be reshaped over time, as the Foundation had the opportunity to learn from experience. As noted above, a number of changes to the structure of the Programme and to selection have been made. As a result, according to both Mentors and Scholars, the Programme is working better now than previously. However, it must be stated that the findings of the Review suggest that there remain many issues yet to be addressed. Given the innovative character of the Programme, that such issues persist is not surprising, and should be best understood as symptoms of a stage in an evolving process.

In the revised version of the Foundation’s Strategic Plan, four potential roles of a Mentor are discussed (stated with minor adjustments):

- i. Mentors can introduce Scholars to other useful contacts;
- ii. Mentors can assist Scholars to adapt the presentation of their research findings for non-academic audiences;
- iii. Mentors may assist Scholars to place their work in a broader context, more closely related to public policy decisions;
- iv. Mentors can act as a more experienced friend and sounding board, offering encouragement to the Scholars in their work.

In summary, a Mentor is a resource person, and an advisor who may “open up real professional paths”. It is “the practical aspect and professional experience” which serves to separate the Mentor from the Scholar’s familiar university context.

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

While several of the most prominent among the Mentors have worked very hard to make the Mentor/Scholar relationship work, others have shown less initiative and interest in reaching out to Scholars. Certainly, for the relationship to work requires an effort on both sides. Where things do not work out, it is not the responsibility of the Mentor alone. However, it is for the Mentor to make a considerable effort to facilitate the establishment of a working relationship. Some Mentors are more at ease with this expectation than others. The possible conservative bias in the selection process, discussed above, may have been one factor among others in limiting the effectiveness of the Scholar/Mentor relationship. .

The Administrator of the Public Interaction Programme has conducted short surveys of Mentors and Scholars in September 2004 and May 2005, seeking comments on the experience of the Mentoring relationship. The greater level of satisfaction with the Programme indicated in responses to the latter survey would suggest that a number of changes introduced for the 2005 programme have made a difference. These have included giving more detailed attention to potential matches in the selection of Mentors, and the involvement of a Scholar as an invited member of the review panel, as well as additional useful guidelines for nominators.

The assignment of a programme officer to work directly with Mentors (and with Fellows) has been viewed very positively. Mentors appreciate having someone accessible to whom they can relate on any issues of concern. Several Mentors have also received strong support from the Foundation in their efforts to organize special events, bringing together one, two or more Mentors with groups of Scholars. Whatever may be said about the Mentorship Programme, there can be no criticism of any lack of effort on the part of the Foundation in seeking to strengthen its effectiveness.

There are both logistical and relational dimensions to the problems encountered by the Foundation in making the Programme work to the satisfaction of those involved and others concerned with its place in the Foundation's overall set of activities. First, the fact that Mentors and the Scholars assigned to them are often located in different parts of the country, or in different countries, and that Scholars may be engaged in travel for field research and other purposes, is seen to be a barrier to effective interaction. Given the heavy professional and other commitments of many Mentors, finding a time to meet seems to be problematic in many cases. Yet, it should be noted, some Scholar-Mentorship relationships appear to be working quite well, despite the factor of distance. Examples of such cases include one where the Scholar is based at a university in the UK, while the Mentor is in Canada. For some Scholars the issue of distance and availability may constitute a reason to do very little to make the relationship work, where it is seen as of little real value to them.

The second dimension of the Mentoring process is that of the form of the relationship which may be forged between Scholar and Mentor. Without intending to be facetious or to diminish the importance of the Programme, it might be noted that, as with a computer dating network, there is a relatively high risk of the relationship not proving to be effective or satisfactory to the two parties, for sociological and psychological, as well as professional reasons. Leaving aside the computer dating metaphor, what is necessary is for the parties to be able to establish a connection between them founded on a shared understanding of what the relationship is for, and of how it fits into the lives of each of them.

A reflection on the circumstances of three or four apparently effective Mentor-Scholar relationships suggests that the form of connection, and the intensity and regularity of contact, may vary considerably from case to case. This, in turn, would seem to reinforce the importance, noted above, of a willingness to adapt on the part of both Scholar and Mentor. Scholars, as well as Mentors, must contribute to exploring the territory where the two partners may find common ground.

In a few cases, the Mentoring relationship has brought together genuinely kindred spirits and complementary personalities, resulting in a warm, collaborative and empathetic relationship among friends, valued by both parties to the Mentorship. In other cases, the relationship may be more formal and emotionally more distant, yet still effective because of a shared commitment, interest and enthusiasm regarding the importance of certain issues, and perhaps a similar ethical commitment to addressing them.

Perhaps the matter of shared enthusiasm and commitment is of some importance. It certainly seems to be important, in contributing to her or his ability to build a partnership with the Mentor, for the Scholar to be given an opening to understand the professional commitments of the Mentor, and to see where the personal drive comes from. In some sense at least, an effective mentor is likely to be a role-model. Given this context, it should not be assumed that, because of the Mentor's impressive resume, she or he is offering the Scholar sufficient insight into what it is that makes the Mentor a significant player in the world of policy and public affairs. To bridge this gap requires a commitment on the part of the Mentor to the Scholar, as well as the opportunity for the two to get to know one another.

Having touched on some of the factors contributing to successful mentoring partnerships, it is necessary to move on to consider some additional barriers which preclude success in all cases. In considering what follows, it must be borne in mind that virtually all Scholars have such positive feelings towards the Foundation and its staff that it is difficult for them to raise any criticisms of any aspect of their programme. They feel that they are treated with such kindness, consideration and respect, and given so much, that even the most outspoken would have difficulties in raising serious questions about any aspect of the Foundation's work. Issues concerning the Mentorship programme would appear to be subject to this kind of self-censorship.

First, it must be said that a number of Scholars are not comfortable with the idea of having a Mentor assigned to them, without their having any say in the matter. Such feelings are not strongly held by many, but do influence the degree of enthusiasm some bring to the mentoring relationship. Several Scholars feel that, while the Mentoring process is an interesting part of the overall Scholarship experience, in the end it is adding little value. Others are extremely positive, both about the concept and their own experience. Some of the 2004 Scholars, who have yet to begin engagement in a mentoring relationship, are looking forward with some excitement to working with Mentors, viewing it as something of real importance added to their Scholarship Programme.

It is certainly the case that there were a lot of frustrations in the first year of the Programme, and that many lessons have been learned from that experience. The Programme has been adjusted in response, and it may well be that there will be fewer problems as the Programme matures. However, Scholars, although alike in certain ways, are not a uniform group. Some seem more readily disposed than others to enter into the mentoring relationship with the spirit and attitude required to make it effective. Others begin with a sceptical attitude to the value of the whole enterprise, and appear to feel less need for a structured mentoring relationship.

In summary, it might be said that the Mentorship Programme is still being shaped, and that its evolution would appear to be incomplete. As the Foundation is well aware, there remain issues on both the “supply” (Mentor) side, and on the “demand” side (Scholars). The Mentors are a special group of high-profile Canadians. It must be a matter of some concern to the Foundation that a number of those who are currently Mentors feel underutilized, and that the Foundation has not found an effective way to draw on what they have to offer. Most are not only willing, but keen, to do more. The Foundation is making a considerable effort to recognize and respond to such aspirations.

One feature of the programme, introduced for the current year by the Foundation in building on the experience of the first year, is the request that goes to each Mentor, asking that they sign a letter of agreement, which sets out the kind of role the awardee will play. The letter is quite comprehensive and provides valuable guidance to the new Mentor on how she or he may be most helpful in the role, while also offering assistance in shaping expectations of how the Scholar/Mentor relationship may work. There is also an appendix entitled: “Ways to Connect”, which includes concrete examples of different types of Mentor/Scholar activity. This has also been made available to Scholars.³⁰ Initiatives of this kind should help in strengthening the potential for effectiveness of the mentoring relationship.

As both the interviews conducted for the Review and the surveys conducted by the Foundation of Mentors and Scholars reveal there is a strong desire on the part of both groups for more opportunities to meet together in a large gathering at workshop, or better a retreat. This is in tune with the original vision of the “Trudeau Community”, which is proving much harder to realize in practice than had been anticipated. It may be that the most effective way for members of the two groups to work together will be in such settings, rather than on a one-on-one basis.³¹

The Reviewer is fully supportive of the concept of mentoring as a component of the Programme. It is only on the basis of putting the concept into practice, as the Foundation has done, that the nature of the challenges to be faced in making an initiative of this kind work have become apparent. The current Programme is built on what might now be seen as a very risky wager: that a series of effective mentoring relationships, designed on paper, can be brokered by the Foundation and made to be effective. Both Mentors and Scholars have complex professional and personal lives, with time pressures originating from both. It will not always be easy to nurture and build an ongoing relationship in this context. The front-end costs in terms

³⁰ An extract from the letter, along with the appendix, is included in the “White Paper” of April 2005.

³¹ As the President notes in his afore-mentioned White Paper, there has been a substantial increase in the past year in the number of activities bringing Scholars and Mentors together in group settings.

of the effort required to increase substantially the probability of success for each mentoring relationship may be greater than the Foundation will be willing to bear.

Mentors may be able to make a more constructive contribution through collective activities. The Ottawa Mentor-Scholar meeting represented a tentative beginning in this regard. The effort to build a workshop around the common interests of a group of Scholars and the Department of Health, as it develops a new long-term strategy, offers another example of ways in which Mentors can take the initiative in generating a special opportunity for Scholars to engage with the policy process, where they have something particular to offer. Encouraging such initiatives will also serve to bring the Mentors into the heart of the Public Interaction Programme as facilitators and experts, with something to contribute which allows them to live up to their mandate to link the Foundation and its activities more directly to the world of policy and public affairs.

The Foundation is to be commended for its efforts in introducing the Mentor Programme and in devoting considerable energy to developing new initiatives which aim to enhance the Programme's effectiveness and enhance its value. It is hoped that the Mentors themselves will be afforded the opportunity, as a group, to take a role in the shaping of the future of the Programme.

Reporting

Mentors do not report to the Foundation on their activities.

Recommendations

In the short term, **it is recommended** that the Foundation continue with efforts to strengthen the existing Programme. It is hoped that consideration will be given to encouraging the nominators and reviewers associated with the Mentorship Programme to give more careful attention to the more difficult issues of willingness, ability and availability, on the part of candidates to engage with Scholars. This may also require a rewriting of the letter of nomination, and rethinking the criteria and the guidelines for reviewers. It is suggested that, in the future, some of the most successful Mentors, on completion of their term, be asked to serve as reviewers, and others added to the nominators list.

The practice of involving a Scholar in the selection process is to be commended and should continue. It has also been a positive move on the part of the Foundation to appoint a chair of the Committee. Thought should be given to enlarging the File Review Committee and, possibly, to bringing the group together for a face-to-face meeting in line with the established practice for the Fellowship Prize competition.

Towards the close of their first year, or at the most appropriate time for the Foundation in its planning, Scholars should be asked if they wish to participate in the Mentorship Programme. Before this, **it is recommended** that there be an opportunity for the first-year Scholars to meet with "veterans" to discuss (among other things) how the Mentorship will enhance the quality of their experience with the Foundation, with the Scholar who sits on the FRC chairing the

meeting (informally). It is hoped that all Scholars would wish to take part in the mentoring process, but, if a Scholar wishes to decline, the decision should be accepted.

It is recommended further that the Foundation consider an informal consultation with Scholars on an annual basis to discuss with them, on an individual basis, what they hope to gain from a Mentorship relationship and to provide the opportunity for a frank exchange of views. Their views would then be taken in to account in Scholar-Mentor assignments. It is possible that the Reviewer is overstating the issues, but in view of the difficulties Scholars may experience (for the best of reasons, as discussed above) in making their views fully known to the Foundation, consideration might be given to having an independent adviser undertake the consultation.

It is also recommended that The Foundation allocate a modest budget to the Programme to permit the holding of a one-day meeting of all Mentors with Foundation staff as soon as possible following their appointment. Ideally, the existing Mentors would join the meeting for a second day. During the second day, plans might be made for an initial Mentor-Scholar meeting to be held later in the year, with a small group to do be selected to do further work in developing a draft plan for the meeting. The group might continue to play a role in initiating other activities and/or consulting others in developing a plan for such events.

The Reviewer has complete confidence in the management and staff of the Foundation as they continue to strengthen the Programme on the basis of learning from experience and listening with care to participants, both Scholars and Mentors, as well as other interested observers, Board members and Members of the Foundation included.

At the same time, it is not too early to begin considering the options for a remodelled programme and perhaps moving away from such reliance on the one-on-one model. Several of the current Mentors, including those reappointed, would be keen to work with the Foundation on proposals for new approaches. **It is recommended** that for 2006-7 (there is no immediate urgency for this initiative), the Foundation consider forming a small Working Group to assist the President to consider the current situation, assess the value of the current Programme on the basis of its effectiveness in contributing to the Foundation's mission, and advise the Foundation on options and possibilities for the future.

It will be important to adopt a broad perspective in looking at options, and, with this in mind, it is suggested that the group might also include other individuals drawn from the Trudeau Community who would have an active interest in thinking through alternative directions for the future. Depending on the way the Group process unfolds, as with the review of the "Humanities Issue", discussed above, the Foundation may wish to consider hiring a consultant to work with the group, assist it to move its agenda forward and to prepare the report (or assist in its preparation) on the basis of the Group's deliberations.

One possibility which might be examined at some point is a "mixed" model, where different individuals may be selected to make different kinds of contribution to bridging the gap between research and policy and practice, viewed broadly, for the Foundation, and for Scholars in particular. Some might be selected as "conventional" Mentors, while others might be viewed as

a resource to all Scholars and the Foundation as a whole, with a third group contributing through one or two quite intensive activities organized to open up new possibilities and ideas for Scholars. For example, one or two individuals might be asked to work with the Foundation in organizing intensive workshops in which Scholars can learn how to cooperate most effectively with radio and television programme makers, or film-and video-makers, in bringing their ideas to a broader audience. This would require them to develop some understanding of programme and script development and the constraints under which ideas are translated into programming or film/video. There could also be sessions on how to work with media as “experts” for news and public affairs programming.

For the present, **it is recommended** that in the guidelines for both nomination and selection, priority be assigned to the candidate’s ability to be an effective Mentor, drawing on the Letter to Mentors and the appendix to the Letter in making more concrete the kind of approaches taken by effective Mentors. This should assist the FRC in its deliberations. Further, the Foundation might take a close look at the way in which nominee files are prepared to give more attention to emphasizing the aptitude of the candidate as a potential Mentor. In the opinion of the Reviewer, more attention might also be given to a realistic appraisal of the time commitment (both “face time” and communication at a distance) required on the part of both Mentors and Scholars to build and maintain an effective Mentorship, and in advising both nominators, and, later, those selected, of what may be required of them.

5. THE PUBLIC INTERACTION PROGRAMME

5.1 Introduction

The Public Interaction Programme (PIP) provides the programmatic framework within which the Foundation seeks to realize two aspects of its mandate and vision. The first of these is the goal of facilitating public dialogue on major social and policy issues. The second dimension concerns the ongoing effort to organize a series of events and to put in place linking mechanisms through which Trudeau Foundation awardees can come together in larger and smaller groups to interact and exchange ideas over matters of mutual concern. A particular concern here is to ensure that the Scholars have the opportunity to work with and learn from the Fellows and Mentors.

In this chapter of the review, an effort will be made to reflect on what has taken place in the various activities and events which have been organized and to consider what has been accomplished. In addition, it is in this chapter that attention will focus on the early progress made by the Foundation in building “a Trudeau Community”, envisaged as a network of thinkers and practitioners, engaged in exploring and throwing new light on ideas and issues. The question to be asked here is whether the programmes of the Foundation add up to more than a sum of the parts. In this respect, consideration will also be given to the respective roles of Fellows, Scholars and Mentors in the PIP and in the life of the Foundation.

As a beginning, it will be worthwhile to consider how the Foundation itself sees the PIP and how the Programme is seen to contribute to achieving the Foundation’s overall objectives. The following short extract is taken from the draft text for the Foundation’s new brochure. It

describes (particularly in the reference to the “six major events”) the shape of PIP as it will be by 2006, rather than as it has been during the period of the Review:

Public Interaction Programme (PIP)

The importance of engaging a broader public in a fruitful dialogue

This fourth programme brings together all Trudeau award winners – Fellows, Scholars and Mentors – to generate informed and lively debates on major issues of public policy affecting Canadians and global society. The Foundation is building its own community of creative and critical thinkers while providing ways for them and the wider public to work together to generate and communicate ideas that matter.

PIP comes to life through **six major annual events** – the Trudeau Conference, the Trudeau Lecture, the Trudeau Fellows meeting, the Trudeau Scholar-Mentor meeting, the Trudeau Scholars Workshop, and the Trudeau Summer Institute. In addition, members of the Trudeau Community are encouraged to organize events linked to one or several of the Foundation themes with a view to generating a richer public debate on important societal issues.

But that is not enough. The Foundation must create opportunities for engagement with a broader public. This in turn leads to a better informed citizenry, new ideas, and heightened opportunities for democratic participation.

With the exception of the Trudeau Conference in November 2004, the Mentor-Scholar Meeting in May 2005, the Scholars Workshop and meeting of new Scholars in May 2005, other major events described above exist only on paper, but they will be introduced during 2006 and will become annual events. In other words, it is early in the day to make a thorough assessment of the Programme. Even so, a great deal has been done in a short time, and, as will be seen in the next section of the chapter, taken together, the list of activities completed, along with those scheduled for the coming months, is quite extensive. Time and space will not permit a detailed assessment of each activity. Instead, more detailed attention will be given to the Trudeau Conference, with other events referred to only to illustrate issues discussed.

The Programme was established by a Board decision in April 2004 to provide structure and an organizational base for the internal and external networking and interaction that was so much a part of the founding vision for the Foundation. It was originally known as Academic Interchange and Public Engagement (AIPE). The members of the management team, encouraged by a number of Directors with a keen interest in this aspect of the Foundation’s mission, worked for some months to elaborate a conceptual map of how the Programme might function. Over the past eighteen months, both the range and intensity of activities has increased.

Much has been accomplished. The fact that this Programme is still in evolution should not be surprising, given that it is only in 2005 and 2006 that the Foundation begins to have the number

of participants among the awardees at the core of “the Trudeau Community” to constitute what might be regarded as a critical mass. As of the summer of 2005, there are 14 Fellows, 8 Mentors and 5 former Mentors, and 40 Scholars, along with 6 full-time staff members, as well as the Directors and the Members of the Foundation.

As to engaging with those external to the Foundation’s immediate Community, this requires visibility for the Foundation and a general understanding of its purposes. After three years of operation, the Foundation is still building a base of public awareness concerning its place in the public realm.

One factor seen as critical to the future of the Community is a continuing ability to engage the interest and participation of “alumni”, or former awardees. With the exception of a small number of Mentors, the Foundation has yet “to graduate” the first cohorts of its awardees. This will be both a challenge and a promise of greater potential for the future of the network, and of the Community which may be nurtured and established through that network.

5.2 The Range of Activities of PIP

As noted in an internal strategy document for the Programme, entitled PIP Programme: Goals and Perspectives, prepared by the responsible Programme Officer, the list of types of activity is a long one. Some of these are aimed principally at internal audiences, and some at a broader public. Of those aimed at awardees, some are intended to involve all, while others are intended for smaller groups. The list, with comments, is as follows:

A) One-Two Day Events

- i. *The Trudeau Conference*. The Conference is held annually, with the aim to link Trudeau “awardees” and other members of the “Trudeau Community” with an invited list of others from various circles (government, the private sector, think-tanks, the voluntary sector, the arts, academia, writers and the mass media), who are brought together around a common set of concerns relating to public policy, decision-making and relevant social issues. The initial conference, a relatively elaborate affair, was held at a hotel in Montreal in October 2004 on the theme “Ideas Move”. A second, more modest, conference, co-sponsored with the Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP), will be held in an academic setting in Toronto in November 2005.
- ii. *The Trudeau Lecture*, featuring a leading international or national figure, will be held twice yearly.
- iii. *National Meetings*, to be held twice yearly. To date, these meetings, involving Scholars, Fellows and Mentors, have been rather brief in duration. The first was held in Vancouver in October 2003, very early in the life of the Foundation, and involved Fellows and Scholars. A second such event was a one-day meeting of some Fellows, involved in preparing background papers for the Trudeau Conference, along with most Scholars, as a preparatory step for the November Conference. A third meeting, involving all three groups of awardees is scheduled for October 2005.

- iv. *Regional Meetings, Roundtables and Workshops.* A significant number of events that would appear to fall into this category have been held, or are planned. They include:
- A seminar/meeting in November 2004 for a group of interested Scholars with Charles Taylor (organized by a Toronto-based Scholar);
 - A full-day seminar on Legal pluralism and Migration in November 2004 at the Foundation convened and led by Trudeau Fellow Rod MacDonald, involving ten participants from inside and outside the Trudeau Community, and featuring a bilingual discussion of issues.
 - A Round-Table on Sustainable Cities at the Foundation in Montreal in January 2005, with presentations by two former Trudeau Mentors, Michael Harcourt and Elizabeth Dowdeswell, a number of Scholars, and others invited by the Foundation, including senior policy-makers;
 - A lunch meeting of Scholars interested in Aboriginal issues, held at the Foundation in February 2005;
 - A one-day symposium of Religion, Law and Society, held at the Université de Montréal in March 2005, organized by Trudeau Fellow, Daniel Weinstock and his Research Centre in cooperation with the Foundation, and involving one other Fellow and a Scholar among the presenters;
 - A half-day Workshop in May 2005 in Ottawa, organized with the Foundation by four Mentors, based in Ottawa, and a fifth, based at a research centre elsewhere in Southern Ontario, and involving participation of a large number of Scholars. The Workshop involved presentations by the Mentors on key issues relating to policy in their respective fields, and a discussion period. The Scholars also had a one-hour session with the Clerk to the Privy Council, a member of the Board of Directors of the Foundation;
 - A Roundtable on Nuclear Waste Management, held in Toronto in September 2005, in cooperation with the Sierra Club of Canada, of which the Director is also a Mentor. Several Scholars with research interests closely related to the topic took part in the event;
 - A Mentors Lunch to be held in the Fall of 2005;
 - A one-day Roundtable on Health, held in Ottawa in October, 2005, organized by the Deputy Minister of Health, a Trudeau Mentor, and policy staff at the Department. The roundtable involved eight Scholars and one Fellow whose research focuses on health-related issues, and links to the Department's preparation of a long-term health strategy;

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

- v. *Scholars Conferences*, focussing on work in progress. The first of these was held in Ottawa in May on the day following the workshop with Mentors (see above). A second, two-day event is planned for Toronto in November 2005, prior to the second Trudeau Conference.

B. *Events of Three Days Duration or Longer*

- i. *Summer Institute*. Intended to last one week, the first such Institute will be held at Acadia University in June 2006. It is planned to involve Scholars, Fellows and Mentors. This event is likely to be of particular importance as a step in the direction of strengthening the sense of community and common experience among Scholars, and in enabling them to learn directly about the ideas and research work of the Fellows. It will also be the first occasion where the three groups of awardees will work together on a broad basis.
- ii. *Retreats*. The first such event, lasting 2-3 days, took place in June 2005, with a focus on welcoming new Scholars.
- iii. *Intensive French Language Courses*. The first of these, a three-day course, was organized at the initiative of a bilingual Scholar, and was held for six of his English-Speaking peers in Quebec City in April 2005. There was a very positive response from participants, and a further course, of one week's duration, is planned for the summer of 2006.
- iv. *Collaborative Events*. A number of activities of this kind have taken place, or are planned. They include:
 - An academic conference held at Merton College, Oxford, in April 2005, co-sponsored with the 21st Century Trust. The conference, entitled, "Politics and Ethnicity: Communities, the State and Managing Changing Relations", featured presentations by four Trudeau Fellows. A number of Scholars were among the participants;
 - A Conference on Global Citizenship, held in Vancouver in early September, 2005. The conference was co-organized by the Foundation, the Liu Institute for Global Studies at UBC and the Walter and Duncan Gordon Foundation. It involved a number of Trudeau Fellows and Scholars;
 - A "National Dialogue on engaging Young Canadians", to take place in Ottawa in November 2005, and organized by the Canadian Policy Research Network, CPRN (a think-tank). The Director of CPRN, also a Mentor has arranged for a number of Scholars with related interests, to participate.

The PIP document is quite comprehensive in its coverage. It goes on to list a number of networking tools, or mechanisms, through which the Foundation can strengthen internal and external links. These include:

- Building the “virtual community”, through establishing a dynamic private web-site and facilitating active engagement through it among members of the community. It must be noted that there have been long delays in establishing the web-site, and it has yet to fulfil expectations. The Foundation has recently hired a part-time communications officer to take charge of the virtual community, and more can be expected in this area in the next year. As discussed below, a partnership with the Centre for International Governance (CIGI) and its IGLOO web-portal is another relevant initiative.
- Publishing the Trudeau Foundation Newsletter (TFN). This is to be published three times yearly, and distributed electronically to a long list of all of those who have participated in Foundation events or interacted with it in one way or another. Two issues of the newsletter have been published, in May and September 2005.
- Publications;

5.3 Assessing What Has Been Accomplished to Date

The Trudeau Conference: Origins, Conceptualization, Objectives and Planning³²

As noted above, the first “Pierre Elliott Trudeau Public Policy Conference” was held in Montreal, at the Delta Centre-Ville Hotel, from October 14-16, 2004. The idea of a “Trudeau Conference” is included in the funding agreement between the Foundation and the Government of Canada. The reference to the Conference indicates that the event is to be held annually, and that it is to be in some way accessible to the Canadian public. Hence, an agreement was arrived at for this first Conference to be recorded by CPAC for eventual airing.

The Conference was intended as a vehicle enabling the Foundation to connect with a broader audience and to promote a dialogue, as envisaged in the organization’s Mission Statement: *The Pierre Elliott Trudeau Foundation seeks to promote outstanding research and creative work in the social sciences and humanities, and to foster a fruitful dialogue between the humanities and social sciences, and policymakers in government, business, the voluntary sector, the professions and the arts community.*

The Conference, then, would be concerned with bringing to bear the insights of research and creative work in the social sciences and humanities on issues of public concern, and to do so in a context encouraging discussion and a shared reflection among those from the world of ideas and those engaged in policy and practice. The effort to translate the idea into a concept which

³² The following sources were used in preparing this section of the Review. In the course of his interviews, the Reviewer asked all those who had attended the Conference for their thoughts on what had taken place. In addition, he held a two-hour debriefing session with the President and the Executive Director of Programmes at the Foundation, going through a structured list of issue topics on the Conference, its preparation and its outcome. Other staff members contributed to this deliberation at those points where their own inputs were most relevant. In addition, the Reviewer had access to a file of responses from participants, solicited by the Foundation, as well as a Public Relations Report, prepared by the Foundation’s communications consultants. Finally, the Reviewer was asked by the Foundation to attend the Conference himself, and his own experience is added to the mix.

could form the basis for organization of a particular event began with a meeting and subsequent exchanges of ideas, involving the President of the Foundation and the first four Fellows, appointed in 2003.

There was an effort to review and focus on some very broad issues underlying an array of current concerns facing Canada and the world. Two major themes emerged: first, the preoccupation with security and the concern with strengthening barriers against possible security threats; and, second, globalization and the transfer and exchange of knowledge and ideas. Successive working drafts of a preliminary outline were produced, and the notion of networks and networking began to emerge, along with recognition of the way in which security barriers might impact on knowledge networks and the free flow of ideas, as well as the free movement of those who generate or espouse them.

A working title for the Conference took shape as “Sharing Knowledge across Cultural Boundaries and Security Barriers”, and a concept paper and general work plan for the conference was produced and circulated. While the focus of the event remained the same, the working title was replaced by a snappier label: “Ideas Move.” A set of four discussion papers was produced by Fellows and other leading academics and thinkers.

In that this was the first Trudeau Conference, it carried with it multiple objectives. According to Foundation management, there were four principal preoccupations guiding its planning:

- i. The first objective reflected a desire of the Board of Directors that the Conference be organized in recognition of the fact that it offered an appropriate opportunity for a “re-launch” of the Foundation to a public audience, nor that it was fully established, with all programmes in operation.
- ii. There was a desire to showcase the qualities and dynamism of the young Trudeau Scholars.
- iii. The Conference was also viewed as a vehicle for reaching out to the humanities and the world of the creative arts.
- iv. Finally, there was a concern to model an event that was very different from “business as usual”, or what might have been predicted. There was the hope that the event might prove to be memorable for those who participated.

It was important to the Foundation that the event be held in Montreal. It represented an opportunity to demonstrate to sceptics and the uninitiated that the Foundation was non-partisan and open to a range of political perspectives. Two ex-Tory Premiers, both Directors of the Foundation, were present. A former Québec Premier, Pierre Marc Johnson, acted as a moderator at two sessions. A major Francophone artist, Robert Lalonde, the actor and novelist, was featured in a special session.

Organizing the Conference was a major undertaking for the Foundation, with its small staff. The Board and the President both saw the event as especially important in building the Foundation and its reputation. Consequently, it received a great deal of attention, and a much larger budget (\$200,000) than was likely to be made available for conferences in subsequent years. Both a conference planner and an activity organizer were hired, with the latter working

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

on the fine details of the activities and their sequencing, and on ensuring that all angles were covered.

It was decided that there should be a considerable investment in communications and “visuals.” A conference web-site was established. Great care was given to preparation of backdrops, signage and rolling visual screen displays for the conference hall. The Foundation’s communications consultants, Scott Thornley, worked on the “branding” of the event. Two videos were commissioned for showing during the conference, to highlight its themes and provoke the imagination of participants.

The most critical concern was “to make sure that the right people got there”. Great care was taken to developing the list of participants (“We really targeted people”) and then following up on mailed invitations, individually in many cases, to confirm attendance at the event. Similarly, considerable time was devoted to thinking through who should be the featured speakers or presenters.

The Conference Programme and Activities

The conference was organized in building blocks around a few key individuals, and with a deliberate effort to vary forms of engagement with the audience. It opened at 5.30 P.M. on a Thursday evening. Following short speeches of welcome from Roy Heenan, Chair of the Board of Directors, and Justin Trudeau, a Member of the Foundation, proceedings began with “a Moderated Conversation” between Boaventura de Sousa Santos of the World Social Forum, and Janice Stein, a Trudeau Fellow, with journalist Ann Medina in the chair. There followed a reception and well-catered dinner, where participants sat at tables with those from the same small groups which were to be the means for discussion on the afternoon of Day 2.

The second day opened with a plenary session, picking up on key themes raised in the “Moderated Conversation” of the previous evening, as well as in the discussion papers, which had been distributed to participants in advance. This was followed by the first of two commissioned video presentations, both on the topic of “Knowledge Networks”. In the later part of the morning, and for much of the afternoon, participants met in pre-arranged small groups to consider case-studies of various networks, and to try to draw from the discussion some general issues to bring to a plenary discussion later. Scholars were assigned to act as rapporteurs for the sessions, and to take on a role of responsibility for moving matters forward.

The afternoon had begun with a short reflection (very well-received) by Robert Lalonde on “Crossing Cultural Boundaries.” Following the continuation of the small group sessions, the conference participants reassembled in plenary session. The Scholars who had been given the role of rapporteurs provided summary presentations to the larger assembly on the small group discussions, and then the floor was opened to a general discussion. There then followed the second video presentation, and, in a separate room, equipped for the occasion with a low stage, a dance performance on “Security Barriers” by the Roger Sinha Dance Company. This completed the formal sessions for Friday.

Saturday began with a reading from his novel, “A Family Matter”, by Trudeau Fellow, Rohinton Mistry, followed by an interview-discussion with Mr. Mistry conducted by Ken Wiwa, a writer and commentator and Trudeau Mentor. The “normal” business of the day then began, with a session in which representatives selected by the Scholars made presentations on future initiatives proposed by their peers. The Scholars had worked late the previous evening with Trudeau Fellow, Daniel Weinstock to focus their thinking and organize their wide-ranging ideas around these proposals. There then followed a discussion in response to the initiatives proposed.

The substantive work of the Conference then concluded with reflections from two Trudeau Scholars, James Tully, a political philosopher from the University of Victoria, and Danielle Juteau, a sociologist from the University of Montreal. The Conference was brought to a close at around 12.30 P.M. with short presentations by Stephen Toope, the Foundation’s President, and Board Member, Alexandre Trudeau, expressing thanks to the participants and giving an indication of further steps, beyond the Conference.

Assessing the Conference

The Conference may be assessed by weighing up what was accomplished against the four objectives, noted above. More generally, its value for the Foundation will be considered with reference to that part of the Mission Statement, quoted above, concerning “*the establishment of a fruitful dialogue between the humanities and social sciences and policy-makers in government, business, the voluntary sector, the professions and the arts community*”.

i) *Re-launching the Foundation*: Within intellectual circles, the conference made a modest splash. It also attracted relatively good media coverage.³³ Three stories on the Conference appeared in the Montreal Gazette, and, particularly important to the Foundation, given concerns about its image with the Francophone community, was the two-page piece in *Le Devoir*, reprinting Robert Lalonde’s presentation. The image of the Conference was professional, even a little “glitzy”. Despite the generally good coverage, the Conference was not viewed as “a news event”. It was not planned with news coverage in mind, and its schedule was set with no thought for media deadlines. This is not necessarily a criticism, but if there was a desire to enhance the Foundation’s public image, some opportunities to do so were missed.

The effort put into enhancing the visual aspect of the Conference seems to have produced the desired effect that this was to be seen as a special occasion. The variety of formats for presentations, and the linking in a general way of all elements to a set of core themes, gave an impression of movement.

In the most general way, the Conference presented the Foundation as it wished to be seen, as professional, dynamic and interested in the big questions. The central role given to Scholars also demonstrated the Foundation’s investment in the making of a future generation of public intellectuals. The success in attracting a varied audience of thinkers and decision-makers from a

³³ A complete summary of media coverage is available in the *Public Relations Report* prepared for the foundation by Environics Communications.

variety of backgrounds was an accomplishment in itself. For the most part, even those who were critical of some aspects of the Conference found it to be an event to remember.

ii) *Showcasing the Scholars*: At a general level, the foundation achieved its objective. The Scholars felt empowered by the responsibility given to them. All participants in the Conference came away with a strong, positive impression of the capabilities of the young people who carry the label of Trudeau Scholar so proudly.

At another level, there were some difficulties. The Scholars enjoyed the overall experience, but the objective to place the Scholars at the centre of things was not sufficiently well integrated with the overall flow of the development of ideas. There was perhaps a lack of clarity in the role assigned to the Scholars. In addition, partly as a result of the special attention they were accorded at the Conference, they appear to have become quite passionate in their sense of ownership of both the Conference and the Foundation's future. They then seemed to have turned their attention to matters beyond the ambit of the themes and issues discussed. Consequently, there was an apparent lack of fit of the Scholars' work on new initiatives, the structure of the Conference, and the expectation of the larger group of participants that the presentations of the Scholars on the final morning would build more directly on the small group discussions of the previous day.

Though the depth of concern felt on this matter should not be exaggerated, many of the Scholars felt let down to some degree by the Foundation, in that they had worked hard on proposals which were then dismissed as irrelevant. In turn, many of the participants other than the Scholars felt that their own inputs to the small group discussions had been ignored. If the idea of the Conference was to bring the various pieces together, the set of difficulties associated with the contribution of the Scholars was one of the factors impeding coherence in this respect.

It was a positive initiative to give the Scholars a special role. In retrospect, they needed more support and guidance in bringing it off. As a group, they have a lot to offer. As one individual who worked with them quite closely commented, in retrospect, "it was not the best use of their talents". It is quite clear to this Reviewer, as it is to others who have had the good fortune to meet them, that they are an extraordinary and gifted group. It is easy to forget that they are still young and lacking in broad experience. Their skills and enthusiasm must be channelled effectively. At the risk of sounding patronizing, it must be said that, although in time they will outpace us all, for now, in the world of ideas, they are still at an apprentice stage.

iii) *Reaching Out to the Humanities and the Work of Creative Artists*: In terms of this objective, the Conference was a critical triumph. The Foundation's four themes make it a challenge to find a way to embrace the humanities and creative arts in their own right. At the Conference, it was the interventions by an actor, a novelist and a dance company, that were most appreciated by participants. Beyond this, along with the videos, these interventions gave the Conference a kind of life and vitality, and even a sensual quality, which polite debates and discussions could not. All that can be said here is that it worked, and that it did so in quite unexpected ways.

iv) *Presenting a Different Kind of Event*: as has been discussed above, the Foundation succeeded here beyond all expectations.

The Conference as “Fruitful Dialogue”

Looking at the Conference as an embodiment of what the Mission Statement commits the Foundation to strive for obliges us to enter more difficult territory. In considering this question, it must be born in mind that we have already considered four objectives, and that the Foundation has come out of assessment against those objectives rather well. In expecting more, one may be asking too much. The more objectives that are piled onto an event, or any activity or set of activities, the less successful it is likely to be.

There were good discussions at the Conference, particularly in the small groups, which virtually all who commented on the Conference spoke of in the most positive way. The initial “Moderated Conversation”, which was, effectively, the major debate of the Conference was felt by the Foundation, and by most participants, to be an energizing beginning, or a “high-octane exchange of ideas”, as one Scholar put it. It did what it was intended to do. One comment made on this and other sessions by several of those interviewed, was that proceedings seemed “too scripted.” Debates and discussions were polite and rather reserved. This is not bad in itself, but there was a lack of sustained engagement, and, in part, this was a result of the overall framework and the need to address other objectives.

The closing dialogues on the final day were disappointingly discursive in tone, and obscure in content. As several participants commented, including some of those involved directly in the Conference, there was a lack of closure, of bringing matters together: “it left us hanging.” This was seen as a lesson to be learned for the future, rather than as a failure of organization and preparation.

It will be a matter of concern to the Foundation that a good number of non-academics attending, as well as some academics, found the proceedings to be “too ethereal, too abstract.” One individual very close to the Foundation, and well-known as a strong, practical thinker, found the whole affair to lack in connections to the world of real people. Comments of this kind were also made by three or four from the higher levels of the policy world in interviews with the Reviewer, as well as some from the voluntary sector. As one of these respondents observed, there was a need for some practical issues to dig into.

The Conference was described as “a Public Policy Conference”. Yet, except in the opening debate and the small group sessions, the connections to public policy were not as direct as they might have been. Yet, at the same time, it clearly met or exceeded the expectations of most participants. There was much discussion of networks and ideas, but the term “Public Policy Conference” seems to have been to some degree, at least, a misnomer. To members of the group of public policy practitioners, which represents an important set of stakeholders for the Foundation, the discussions seemed to be a conversation among academic insiders: ironic in view of the topics, but also revealing in posing a challenge to the Foundation in its future networking efforts.

On balance, comments about the Conference were positive, many very much so. The Conference is generally viewed as representing a very solid beginning to the Foundation’s efforts to reach a broader public. The fact that most participants found it to be memorable, and

think back to it as a special occasion, indicates that it succeeded in meeting its immediate objectives. What is apparent, to the Reviewer, as to the Foundation, is that this was “a one-off”. It did not set a pattern to be followed for the future. Insofar as there were dimensions of the Conference which were less successful than others, this should hardly be viewed as surprising in view of the ambitious nature of the undertaking. There will be opportunities in future conferences to address a number of the issues raised.

The ability to bring off an event of the magnitude of the Conference is a tribute to the Foundation and its staff. It represented an enormous effort on their part. What they accomplished was extraordinary. It is the task of a Review like this to raise bigger questions. The limitations suggested above should not be viewed in criticism of inadequacies, but rather as a basis for lessons to be learned for the future.³⁴

Other Activities under the Public Interaction Programme

At the time the Reviewer first became acquainted with the Foundation, the Public Interaction Programme, or Academic Interchange and Public Engagement, was simply an idea. At the time of writing, as is apparent from the listing above of the various kinds of activities undertaken through the Programme, it has developed rapidly. Today, there is a rich array of activities supported by the Foundation, and new forms of activity are evolving. There are many issues to be considered in how to strengthen the Trudeau Community, and how the Foundation may most effectively support and facilitate public dialogue. These issues are very much in play and receiving active attention at the Foundation.

As will be discussed in the following section of the chapter, some big questions remain to be answered. This is in no way a criticism of a young organization that continues to ask itself “what else should we do?” and “how can we do better in working towards our objectives?” The rapid development of the PIP is to the great credit of all concerned. It is providing valuable opportunities for Scholars in particular, but also for other awardees, for learning and interaction that go beyond the basics of each of the three awards programmes. Much remains to be done, but the Foundation has come a long way in a short time.

The work of the Foundation is labour-intensive and requires constant communication with others by its management and staff. The Board has chosen, understandably, to be cautious in its investment in building up the administration of the Foundation. Consequently, an under-estimation of the workload involved in developing the Foundation’s internal website and electronic newsletter has made it difficult for the Foundation to enhance its capacity for communication. Now that a Communications Officer has been hired, it is understood that the development of these two initiatives will move forward. Also of interest is the recently announced partnership between the Foundation and The Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI) associated with the University of Waterloo, for the use of the IGLOO community portal. If the facility lives up to its promise, this will enable members of the Trudeau Community to “disseminate research and ideas to a broad audience of experts and

³⁴ A point which might be noted for future reference is that the Foundation’s ability to exert quality control over major events will vary to the extent that it is sharing with other organizations responsibility for organizing such activities.

leaders; access a comprehensive library of high quality media, academic and policy resources; (and) become members of a network of pre-eminent international governance organizations” (quoted passage from the IGLOO brochure)

5.4 Towards a “Trudeau Community”

One of the great hopes of the Foundation is that it will succeed in forging a Trudeau Community. A beginning has been made in this direction, but, as yet, none of the three categories of awardees have truly found their place within the Foundation outside their own programme track. It is implicit in the first paragraph of the Foundation’s mission statement, as well as in any consideration of how the Foundation may contribute most effectively to the public good, that each of the three Programmes, while important in its own right, will contribute to enhancing the overall “footprint” of the Foundation in the public and academic life of Canada. It must be said that, as yet, the whole is not greater than the sum of the parts. At the same time, it has been noted that a major effort is underway to transform this state of affairs.

It is unreasonable to expect success in all strategic areas of the programme in a period of only three years. At the same time, looking forward, it will be important for the Foundation to take action to make adjustments, not only to programme structures, but also in setting expectations with both nominators and awardees, in order to assure that the Foundation moves in the appropriate direction. For the Foundation to achieve certain of the Medium-term and Longer-term Results set out in the Evaluation Framework, and discussed in the next chapter, it will be essential for more progress to be made in bringing the three programmes into closer alignment. As a means of exploring this matter in more depth, it will be helpful to look briefly at the situation of each of the three groups of awardees in turn.

The Fellows and their Place in the Foundation

In many documents associated with the Foundation, Fellows are described as its “intellectual leaders”. At the same time, the fact that the Fellowship is, for the purposes of the Income Tax Act, a prize, means that the Foundation cannot require anything of the awardees. This sets the Fellows apart from either Scholars or Mentors, and the Foundation has been extremely careful in limiting its requests for assistance to Fellows.

Individual Fellows have offered support to the Foundation in a number of ways. They were centrally involved in developing the concept for the Trudeau Conference; they prepared background papers for it, and three of them were involved as presenters in the Conference proper. Another Fellow worked with the Scholars at the Conference, helping them to prepare for the session at which they presented their ideas on future initiatives. Fellows have also assisted in the organization of smaller activities, and have been among the featured speakers at conferences co-organized by the Foundation. A number of them have also been of direct assistance to individual Scholars. The President also seeks and receives advice on specific issues from a long list of fellows. Yet, despite this commendable level of activity, as a group, they are not at the centre of things in the life of the Foundation in the sense that they are setting its intellectual agenda.

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

Mainly because of legal/financial concerns related to the Prize, the Foundation is generally reluctant to ask the Fellows to take on a more central intellectual role. Yet, if it is to build "a fruitful dialogue" with the world of policy and public affairs, who else is to take the lead except the Fellows? Mentors can do much more in building linkages, but it is the Fellows who represent the developed intellectual capital of the Foundation. All of the three Fellows interviewed for the Review felt a strong sense of obligation to the Foundation. As one of them explained, regardless of the form of the agreement with the Foundation, there is a strong felt sense of moral or normative obligation. All three would be willing, and eager, to do far more than they have been asked to do.

Under present circumstances, much of the burden of intellectual leadership for the Foundation is carried by the President. To date, he has managed the task with considerable acumen, but the arrangement does not provide a sound or sustainable basis for future development. The Fellows and others must play a stronger role in this respect.

It is recommended that the Foundation reflect carefully on its approach to Fellows, and to what they may contribute to the intellectual life of the Foundation. Consideration might be given to making adjustments to the selection criteria, to pay more attention in selection to the probable willingness of a candidate to play the role of intellectual leader and guide in the work of the Foundation. If a potential Fellow is driven by a personal research agenda that excludes the possibility of participating actively in Foundation activities and playing a part in developing its intellectual agenda, as well as in working with Scholars, perhaps such a candidate should be excluded from consideration. The extent of what is to be expected of any one Fellow should not be exaggerated. However, judging from the information gathered for the Review, Fellows would welcome an enhanced role and greater engagement in helping the Foundation to realize its ambitions.

Fellows themselves note that there has been no opportunity for them to meet as a group, and **the Reviewer recommends** to the Foundation that to provide for such an opportunity once or twice each year would be a healthy next step in providing a forum where the Fellows themselves may be able to consider ways to take on a more pro-active role in working with the Foundation in setting the intellectual agenda.

The Reviewer has been advised that it is the intent of the Foundation to build the Summer Institute for 2006 around presentations by, and discussions with, the Fellows on their research and professional commitments. This will be another important step in strengthening the bonds among the sub-groups within the Trudeau Community.

As a contribution to obtaining valuable feedback on the Fellowship Programme and on the role of fellows in the Foundation, **it is recommended** that formal Exit Interviews be introduced for all Fellows completing their tenure as awardees. A common approach and interview check-list of topics should be used, preferably with interviews conducted by experienced external consultants as interviewers. Ideally, the external consultants would prepare a summary report for the Foundation on the findings of the set of interviews conducted each year. As noted below, the Exit Interviews would also be helpful for evaluation purposes in providing more

detailed information on both the contribution of the Foundation to enhancing the work of the Fellows, and the contribution the Fellows have made to the Foundation.³⁵

The Role of Scholars in the Foundation

The selection process for Scholars gives a good deal of attention to matters beyond academic excellence. It is clear to Scholars, as well as to universities, that the Trudeau Scholarship is more than a simple funding programme. Yet there remains an ambiguity between the recognition by the Foundation of the priority to be given to completing doctoral studies, on the one hand, and the expectation that Scholars will become engaged in a variety of activities, on the other.

³⁵ It is proposed that “*Exit Interviews*” with Fellows be conducted, wherever possible, within three months of the conclusion of the period of the Fellowship award. The interviews should be relatively informal, taking the form of a conversation, guided by a check-list of topics (to be agreed with the Foundation) to be covered by the interviewer. The topics covered would include a wide-ranging discussion of the research undertaken, and the public activities in which the Fellow engaged, during her/his tenure of the award. There would also be discussion of the role of inter-disciplinary approaches in the research and the links to public policy, as well as forms of collaboration and exchange with other awardees. It would also be useful for the interviewer to ask about the names of research and public policy collaborators with whom the Fellow has worked during her/his tenure.

In addition, the interviewer would ask the Fellow to reflect on the role she/he has been able to play in the life of the Foundation and relations with other Fellows, Scholars and Mentors, and on the value to her or him of such interaction. In summing up, the Fellow would be asked about the difference the award has made to her/his ability to pursue his/her research or creative agenda and to publish, as well as in bringing the results of the work to a broader audience, and in participating in public discussion and debate.

It should also be possible to address “process issues” relating to the programme, offering the Foundation some feedback on its operations, and its communications with awardees. The interviewer would cue the Fellow on particular issues and concerns, but, in the event of a non-response, would not probe further. The approach should be to emphasize that the interview is intended as a wide-ranging conversation to enable the Foundation to learn as much as possible about the value of its programmes, while also ensuring that it has a good understanding of the work of the Fellow and its policy implications. Reviewing the transcripts would also be a valuable source of information for the Foundation as it makes further efforts to strengthen the Fellowship programme and considers ways to enhance the contributions of fellows to the vitalization of the Trudeau Community.

From an evaluation perspective, the benefit of such an approach is that it will allow the Fellows to “tell their own stories”, rather than respond to a structured questionnaire. It will provide important information for evaluation purposes, but in a non-evaluative, non-intrusive context. This approach, particularly for Fellows, who have an entirely non-contractual relationship with the Foundation, will be preferable to conducting interviews specifically for evaluation purposes, where issues of sensitivity to respecting the independence of the Fellow might arise.

The concept of the Exit Interview, the format to be adopted in the interviews, and the issue of who is to do the interviewing (i.e. Foundation staff, interviewers hired directly by the Foundation, or members of the team engaged in the Preliminary Evaluation, but playing a different role, in this case) will be discussed with the Foundation at an early stage. Given the fact that such interviews (“intensive, semi-structured elite interviews” in social science terminology) would, in the experience of the writer of this document, require at least 60-90 minutes to complete, it seems unrealistic that Foundation staff would be able to find the time to conduct them. In any case, as suggested above, it would probably be more sensible for there to be some distance between the Foundation and the interviewing team. For consistency, it will be advisable for the same team of experienced interviewers to be involved throughout, and for a set of interviews to be undertaken in the same period each year.

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

The principal concern of universities, academic departments and supervisors, is that doctoral students will complete their work within the expected time. With the first year of studies devoted to completing any course requirements and comprehensive examinations, as well as preparing a research proposal, the second, or second and third, year for field research and/or textual studies, and the last year to writing up the dissertation, there is steady pressure throughout for the Scholar, like her or his peers, to continue to make progress at the expected rate.

The emphasis at the university will be to keep the Scholar moving steadily along a relatively narrow track. For the Foundation, the emphasis must be to encourage her or him to get out of the track, for at least part of the time. As one Fellow noted after the Trudeau Conference, many of the Scholars were experiencing difficulty in getting out of their academic silos to grapple with bigger issues. She noted that “the Foundation must push them out”.

Although both types of commitment (to completing the doctorate and to the Foundation’s broadening activities) will be of enormous value to the Scholar in the future, the benefits are different in kind. It must be recognized that there is at the very least a creative tension between the two. Some manage this tension better than others. For the Foundation, there are a number of questions to be addressed:

- Are the selection processes giving enough weight to selecting those who can manage both types of commitment?
- Are the guidelines to Scholars sufficiently clear on the Foundation’s expectations of its Scholars?
- Is the Foundation giving enough thought “to where the Scholars are coming from” in developing plans for new activities?
- How do the needs of individual Scholars for support in broadening their views of the world, and their capacity to engage with it, vary, and how can the Foundation best respond to these needs?

This is a new experience for everyone concerned, and it is not a criticism of the Foundation to suggest that the Scholars may need more support on these matters than they have received. The Scholars appear to be a most capable and resourceful group of individuals. Sometimes these small gaps in their ability to manage everything are not immediately apparent.

Even after the sending out of a letter by the President to all Scholars, following the Trudeau Conference, emphasizing that priority should be given to academic work, doubts and uncertainties remain among some very self-confident young people. For some Scholars, there seems to be no difficulty. They are used to “balancing” in their lives, and appear to welcome every new opportunity to engage with other Scholars, or with those outside the Foundation. Others experience a real tension. Although to selection panels and interviewers, commonalities may be more evident than differences among those who become Scholars, as the Foundation has learned, its Scholars make up a diverse group with contrasting circumstances of life and a variety of approaches to “public engagement”.³⁶

³⁶ As with other competitions, as sophisticated young people, applicants for the Trudeau Scholarship awards learn to package and present themselves to meet the anticipated priorities of selectors and interviewers. This might

In interviews with the Reviewer, most Scholars indicated that they very much appreciated being part of a community of Scholars, and looked for every chance they had to meet with their peers. This is especially important for Scholars from smaller universities, or those more distant geographically from other Scholars. There is a strong interest among many Scholars in building closer bonds of community.

There were also a number of comments from Scholars about the difficulty of “finding a common language”. This was not a reference to the issue of bilingualism, but to the barriers among different forms of academic discourse. Some Scholars, across a range of disciplines, work within frameworks heavily influenced by deep theoretical perspectives. This makes it difficult for others, coming from less theoretically-based fields, to penetrate or appreciate their work - or, more importantly, its relevance and importance. One role that the Foundation (and Mentors) may play is to assist all Scholars with improving their abilities to communicate with non-specialist audiences. One or two Mentors are already doing this on a one-on-one basis.

Many have commented on the fact that a majority of the Scholars have the profile of “activists”. As one Scholar commented to the Reviewer, in reflecting proudly on her peers, “There is a strong sense of social activism among many of the Scholars. They are so engaged with their world, so involved, widely read, engaged in every topic, so vital and alive”. This commonality of engagement with the real world does serve to bring many of the Scholars together. But some also feel on the outside. Two or three of the Scholars interviewed indicated that they felt there was a certain political correctness about the Scholars’ discussions (particularly at the Conference), and that certain views were more acceptable than others. Others noted that Scholars whose work is more reflective in approach experience difficulty in engaging in broad discussions with others.

The Scholars are the heart of the Community, and their role, their experience and ability to both contribute and learn, should be a principal driving force for PIP. Now that there are more than 40 Scholars, issues of this kind become more urgent. To ensure that all feel included, it will be important to ensure that there are a variety of topics and themes which form the focus for Foundation events. More thought might also be given to different modes of participation, and it is understood that the foundation is already attending to this matter.

There is an apparent hunger for more opportunities for active engagement by the Scholars with ideas and issues in settings where they can work together in small groups and with others. The introduction of summer institutes and retreats represents a welcome step in this direction. The discussion above of the problems of dealing with boundaries of language, academic vocabulary and theoretical perspectives, and varying forms of commitment, suggests the felt need on the part of the Scholars for more attention to be given by the Foundation to the building of common experience, to make available opportunities for shared exposure to the best minds and most interesting practitioners and creators the Foundation can find, and shared discussion of big issues. All of this is in line with a founding vision of the Foundation which foresaw the creation

sometimes lead to an under-estimation of diversity in outlook, interests and professional and personal needs, among the Scholars.

of a special community of engagement. Plans for the inaugural Summer Institute in 2006 suggest that it will represent a significant contribution in responding to some of these concerns.

At the same time, such efforts go against the grain of the more narrow academic commitment each Scholar must live with and live up to. There will be a need for regular reflection at the Foundation on how the process is working in achieving the right balance for a group of Scholars with varied needs and interests. It will also be advisable for the Foundation to facilitate discussions, both formal and more casual, with small groups and individual Scholars, as well as Fellows, Mentors and “friends of the Foundation”, on these matters. This is a major task. It requires the support of a small working group, reference group, or “standing advisory committee”, of those who are already part of the Trudeau Community, including Members of the Foundation or Directors, should they have the time and the interest required for them to participate. Members of the group would have a strong interest in the process, and would be willing to devote the necessary time to making it work, without creating an extra management burden for staff. Soon, it will be possible to involve graduating Scholars or former Fellows in the group. Over time, the group might also work with Foundation management in convening meetings of Scholar alumni, to seek their input and advice.

It is recommended that the Foundation give consideration to forming a small advisory group, with a continuing role to provide advice from time to time, or respond to concerns raised by the President or the Board relating to the Scholarship programme, with particular reference to “the scholarship experience” and balancing the desire for broadening intellectual horizons with the concern that Scholars complete their academic programmes as expected. The group might also have a role in offering advice on how to move forward the agenda on building the Trudeau Community. With this in mind, the Foundation would do well to give the group a broader advisory mandate regarding the PIP as a whole. **It is, therefore, further recommended** that the Group be given a broader mandate and be named the *PIP Advisory Committee*.

Mentors in the Foundation

There is less to be said on this topic, since the issue has been discussed from one angle in the preceding chapter on the Mentorship Programme, and since the Foundation is actively engaged in enhancing the role Mentors play. Perhaps the most relevant starting point is the observation that, although they all have busy lives, many Mentors feel underutilized. Mentors can play a much stronger role than at present in supporting the Foundation in achieving its public dialogue goals. Mentors, by definition, have a strong commitment to improving the policy process and supporting the development of better policies and improved practice in various fields. They are also people who know how to get things done. The Foundation can ask for their support in thinking through and planning its agenda of public engagement work, as well as for their direct involvement in making things happen.

The Foundation is rapidly approaching a time when the demands on management and staff time exceed what can be supported. The expectations of the Foundation on the part of its stakeholders are also growing. It must make more effective use of other groups in the “Trudeau Community” to carry the workload, while recognizing that certain matters must be left to

management and staff. Mentors can do a great deal in both thinking and doing, and many of them appear perfectly willing to take on a much enhanced role.

The full potential of Mentors as contributors to the Foundation is yet to be realized. The Mentors themselves know it, are not comfortable with the knowledge, and would like to be part of the solution to the problem. The Foundation has been working hard to strengthen the quality of engagement with Scholars and the life of the organization. With a gradual reshaping of the model for Mentorship, considerable improvements may be expected. It will be necessary for the Foundation to invest more time in bringing Mentors together for some full-day sessions, to get to know one another and then to begin taking on a bigger role. After this, the process can become largely self-managing.

As with Fellows, there would be value in introducing an **Exit interview** for Mentors. **It is recommended** that, shortly after completion of their term as Mentors (with the first interviews to be conducted after the members of the first group serving on an 18-month basis complete their term), all holders of the award be asked to take part in an Exit interview. The interview would be structured in a similar way to that envisaged for Fellows (see Footnote 35).

The Trudeau Community and Public Engagement

The PIP is a programme driven by two underlying objectives. The first is the need to support the coming together of awardees and other members of the Community. The second is to reach out to a broader public. It is suggested here that the first order of business is to build and strengthen the community. Accordingly, in planning activities and events, this objective would be the driving force for the agenda. Where it is possible to do more, or where special opportunities arise, they may be pursued, but not at the cost of the first objective.

Over time, as the Community expands to accommodate relatively large numbers of different categories of alumni, as in the case with voluntary or professional organizations, the members of the Community will be in a position to take on enhanced responsibility for forming the agenda and implementing it. With an enlarged community and a large resource base of extraordinary, multi-talented people to draw on, the Foundation will be in a stronger position to reach out, and to promote dialogue. It will be necessary to set aside some modest funds to support new, path-breaking initiatives. It may also be possible for the enlarged community to succeed in raising the necessary funds to facilitate the process.

It is recognized that it will take some years for the Foundation to build up the public profile it requires to enable it gain recognition for its accomplishments and the qualities of those supported by it. Even when consideration is limited to an elite audience of those concerned with ideas and engaged with public issues, there remains a problem of how to reach the desired audience.

A number of those interviewed for the Review suggested that there was a need for the Foundation to produce some form of serious publication as a contribution to establishing its footprint. One well-informed observer, in a conversation with the Reviewer, put it like this: “without a dedicated communications vehicle, you will not reach your audience.”

There would appear to be a real need for a substantial publication which would provide a showcase for the work of the Foundation, with a combination of articles and discussion forums, featuring awardees, along with some personal interest stories and photo sets on their work and activities, including major events. Such a publication would require a professional editor and a designer. Given the cost and amount of work involved, production on an annual basis would seem to be realistic. Such a publication would be an ideal “calling card” for the Foundation, as well as a means of making the research work of Fellows and Scholars, and the reflections of Mentors, available to a broader audience.

There are several people associated with the Foundation, from the worlds of universities and foundations, as well as business and publishing, who have experience with the production and/or commissioning of well-produced publications of professional quality, some focussing on research and public engagement activities. Funds permitting, **it is recommended** that the Foundation give consideration to the idea of producing a high-quality, annual publication, consulting with those who will be in a position to expose it to a stiff reality test.

6. SUMMING UP INTERIM ACHIEVEMENTS AND RESULTS

In this chapter, the Programme Logic, or Results Chart, is used as a framework for consideration of what has been accomplished to date.³⁷ The description of *Activities* and *Outputs* follows closely on the details provided in the Institutional profile of the Foundation. The three levels or results, or *Impacts*, move from an initial assessment (Short-Term Impact) of whether the programmes and individual awardees within them are meeting their immediate objectives, and on to a consideration of the broader impact of the programmes in the light of the Foundation’s stated goals.³⁸

INPUTS

- Annual Endowment Fund Income: approximately \$6 million/year, estimated over the 5 year evaluation period;
- Private Endowment Income, approximately \$10,000/year;
- 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

³⁷ The Programme Logic Model, or Chart, provides an overview of the sequence of steps, linking the resources applied to the Foundation’s programme to the programme 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 programmes and the difference they have made in the research and policy worlds, and in wider society. The Programme Logic, developed in close consultation with staff, seeks to summarize what the Foundation does and what it expects to accomplish. It serves as the basis for the whole evaluation process, including this Preliminary Review. A full discussion of the Programme Logic will be found in the Framework for the Programme Evaluation of the Trudeau Foundation, November 2004, with Revisions March 2005.

³⁸ It should be noted that the Programme Logic was developed through a detailed consultation process with the management and staff of the Foundation, with the Evaluation Steering Committee and the Board of Directors.

by the Board of directors, Members, and numerous “friends” of the Foundation;

- The contributions of Fellows, Scholars and Mentors to meeting the intellectual and administrative needs of the Foundation.

Commentary

For the most part, the inputs have all been provided, as planned, with the exception of private endowment income. A strategy for private fund-raising has been prepared and a campaign is now at the planning stage. There remain some issues concerning the intellectual and administrative contributions of Fellows and Mentors, as discussed above, but, certainly, the spirit of the agreement has been observed in full measure.

ACTIVITIES

- Application (Scholars Programme only), nomination, review and selection processes for Scholars, Fellows and Mentors;
- Management and delivery of four programmes: Scholarships; Fellowship Prizes; Mentorships; and the Public Interaction Programme (PIP);
- 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.

Commentary

For the most part, as discussed in earlier chapters, the activities have been planned and delivered as expected. Greater success has been achieved than might have been expected, so early in the life of the Foundation, in leveraging the support of other institutions, through co-sponsorship of events. So far, the foundation has been able to devote little attention to “communicating the results of award-holders’ research work” to the public policy community, or a larger audience, except through making available selected publications on its web-site. New partnerships are under consideration which may result in further developments in this area.

OUTPUTS

- Fellowship Prizes, Scholarships and Mentorships are awarded annually;
- Continuation of existing Fellowships for 3 years;
- Continuation of existing Scholarship awards for up to 4 years;
- The Trudeau Conference and other events are held;
- The Foundation facilitates a range of opportunities for its award-holders to engage effectively in public dialogue;

- The Foundation's internal web-site actively engages all categories of award-holder in ongoing exchange and discussion.

Commentary

Most outputs have been achieved, as expected. The three award programmes are operating effectively, as discussed above. Much remains to be done in the public dialogue arena, but, as discussed in the previous chapter, the Foundation will need time to develop an effective strategy in this field. The development of the Foundation's "virtual community" is still at an early stage.

SHORT-TERM IMPACTS

FELLOWSHIPS:

- Fellows demonstrate continuing research and creative excellence, along with the capabilities to actively and effectively engage in public dialogue;
- Fellows participate actively in inter-disciplinary networks; such activities are integral to implementing their research³⁹ plans.

SCHOLARSHIPS:

- Scholars demonstrate the ability to produce research and creative work of outstanding quality;
- Scholars 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);
- Scholars participate actively in inter-disciplinary networks; such activities are integral to implementing their research plans.

MENTORSHIPS

- 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;
- Mentors enhance the attentiveness of other award-holders, particularly Scholars, and of the Foundation in general, to broader public dialogue, challenging awardees and the institution to integrate public preoccupations into their/its ongoing work;

PUBLIC INTERACTION PROGRAMME

- Through the thoroughness and appropriateness of its application, nomination and selection processes, as well as ongoing facilitation efforts, the Foundation demonstrates

³⁹ The term "research", as used here, and throughout the Programme Logic Chart, is to be understood in a broad sense, and is intended to include creative work undertaken by award-holders from outside the social sciences and humanities.

its ability to strengthen inter-disciplinary 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.

Commentary

On the basis of the evidence collected by the review, it may be said that the Foundation would appear to be on track in its efforts to accomplish the specified results. However, after such a short period of operations, it is early to make conclusive judgments on any of the specific results. All second-year Scholars have received satisfactory reports on their academic work, and many have been active in various forms of engagement. By some time in 2006, most of the first cohort should have completed their studies, and, at that point, drawing on their reports to the Foundation, as well as other information, it will be possible to draw some firm conclusions on the performance of the Scholars against the objectives set.

For Fellows, the data is harder to come by. It is recommended strongly that the Foundation devise a mechanism for independent “exit interviews” with Fellows as a basis for discussing with them the overall experience and the details of their research and other activities.

The development of the Mentor Programme has proved more difficult, as all acknowledge. The Programme has undergone a number of changes in the past year. It will be realistic to make a preliminary assessment of short-term results next year.

It is early days for PIP, but impressive strides have been made, and further new initiatives are planned for the coming year. The general assessment of the Programme by the Review is a positive one. Achieving the short-term results prescribed will be difficult, but, although some adjustments may be required, the Foundation appears to be moving along the right track.

MEDIUM-TERM IMPACTS

- **MI:** Outstanding research and creative work is produced, is made available to the wider community, and receives both peer and public recognition, for both its quality and its connection to important societal issues;
- **M2:** 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 societal relevance of work in these fields;
- **M3:** The Foundation is valued 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 societal significance, in Canada, and/or internationally.

- **M4:** The Foundation is 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.

Commentary

It is far too early to expect to see much evidence of these results. In general, it might be noted that it is the impression of the Review that it may take several more years (perhaps seven to ten years), for the Foundation to gain the types of recognition summarized under Medium-Term Impact.

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.

Commentary

Given sufficient time for their realization (perhaps 12 years), the first two impact goals appear valid and entirely achievable. As to the third, it will be harder to achieve and assess. However, through its efforts to foster trans-disciplinary consideration of major public issues, while also fostering a variety of forms of dialogue and public engagement, there is certainly the possibility that the Foundation may be seen to be making a contribution of this kind.⁴⁰ However, given the limited opportunities at present for concerted public dialogue in Canada, whether over primarily domestic or global issues, if the Foundation is to make a difference in this sphere, it will need to take on a more pro-active and visible role than it is able to at present in making connections, in promoting debate, and in working with others to provide a forum for such debate.

As discussed above, although the Foundation is making a start in these areas, it will be essential for it to give priority in the short term, at least, to building up the "Trudeau Community" and strengthening the bonds which hold it together. In the longer term, a strong and integrated network with a shared purpose will provide a firm foundation for reaching out to other organizations and a broader public.

⁴⁰ On this topic, see Stephen Toope, "Democracy, Debate and higher Education", to be published in Times Higher Education Supplement.

7. STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT ISSUES

The Review has noted the impressive performance of the Foundation in designing, putting into operation and institutionalizing its three awards programme, and in the rapid progress that has been made in building the PIP. Management has been treated in this report primarily as a dimension of the review of programmes, rather than as a topic in its own right. At this point, on concluding the detailed consideration of each programme, as well as the “roadmap” towards the achievement of results, it may be helpful to give consideration to a small number of emergent management and strategic issues.

Strategic Considerations

In their early years, many organizations concerned with delivery of services of various kinds find themselves under pressure to put their programmes into operation as quickly as possible. As a result, the organization shapes itself around completion of key tasks, with quality control concerns focusing on activities, as well as on programme credibility with stakeholders. Particularly if staff members are stretched to accomplish the core programme tasks, there may be little opportunity to consider the bigger picture. While the Foundation and the Board of Directors have been concerned, necessarily, with programmes and operations, it is to the credit of all concerned that bigger issues have not been forgotten.

What is also apparent is that the Foundation may well face difficulties in taking on additional tasks which must be undertaken to allow it to take further steps in adjusting its programmes, along the lines discussed above, as a means to greater effectiveness in achieving its objectives. What will be particularly important will be to bear in mind the relationship of each programme to the larger whole in considering and introducing the changes required in each one.

One of the earliest steps taken by the Foundation’s President and Board was the preparation of a **Strategic Plan**. This document has served the organization well in setting priorities and providing guidance on the work undertaken. What may be necessary now will be to reassess and adjust strategy to take into account the findings and recommendations of the Review, as well as other issues of concern, but with particular attention to consideration of *how* and *when* new tasks will be undertaken, as well as to the identification of the resources required to enable the Foundation to take them on.

The work of the Foundation is heavily labour-intensive, and each of its individual awards requires a considerable level of effort to provide the required support, particularly at “the front end”. Staffing levels may not be fully consistent with what is required, and it is hoped that management and the Board will give careful thought providing some relief in this regard. Nevertheless, for budgetary reasons, it may not be realistic at this stage to contemplate adding to staff numbers beyond the adjustments already under way. What will be necessary will be for the Foundation to consider different ways of working in order that new tasks may be taken on without adding significantly to staff work load.

In the preceding discussions, suggestions have been made for the formation of working groups. It has also been noted that there is an apparent willingness, and even eagerness, among

members of the Foundation and awardees (including soon-to-be *alumni* of various categories) to carry more of the load. It is apparent to the Reviewer that, within realistic limits, the initiative to form such groupings might prove of considerable value to the Foundation as it takes on additional tasks. In addition, adopting such an approach might well introduce positive changes in the overall organizational philosophy and culture of the Foundation, while also reinforcing the bond between it and its immediate stakeholders.

The establishment of committees and working groups by an organization often increases the burden on management. Yet, in the case of the Foundation, many of those who might contribute to building such groups and taking on the associated tasks have strong management and operational skills. The recommendations made above on the establishment of occasional working groups with a mandate to take on the work required should be seen not merely as a response to a specific concern but as a means to a sharing of the thinking and planning work of the Foundation.

Internal Working Arrangements

The Foundation has a small staff, and yet, even within such a small group of employees, working habits are established rapidly. Without wishing to suggest any particular problems, **it is recommended** that it may be timely for the Foundation to give some low-key attention to working relationships between the “front” and “back offices”. The purpose of a reflection on the adequacy or appropriateness of current arrangements will be to ensure that programme and administrative work is well-integrated, and that arrangements for mutual support enhance the overall quality of work and positive relations among staff. Following a consultative approach, some adjustments to job descriptions may also be advisable to take into account the most effective division of labour among staff.

8. A SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Scholarship Programme

1. It is recommended that the Foundation approach the Canadian Association for Graduate Studies (CAGS) with a view to requesting the opportunity to make a presentation on the Scholarship Programme and issues relating to the candidate pool.

2. It will be worthwhile for the Foundation to conduct some further investigations of barriers to participation of candidates from Humanities (possibly for the Fellowship, as well as the Scholarship, Programme). Accordingly, **It is recommended** that a small Reference, or Working, Group, with an advisory function, be established. The Group might be chaired by a member of the Foundation, or a Director. Those invited to participate might include some who have served as file reviewers or interviewers, and others recommended by University Presidents, Principals or Rectors, or Deans of Graduate Studies. The Foundation would be well-advised to allow the Group at least 12 months to consider the issue and to reflect on the information and opinions gathered, prior to the preparation of its report and conclusions.

3. On the apparent shortage of Francophone candidates is concerned, as in the case of the Humanities, **it is recommended** that the Foundation contemplate undertaking a further assessment of the issue with the support of a small Working Group, composed on similar lines, and drawn from relevant stakeholders. In the “Francophone case”, it will be helpful if the Group first consider whether there really is a “problem”, or whether, in fact, the numbers are more-or-less as they should be. This will be important for the Foundation, as a first step, before it considers investing further resources in systematic efforts to facilitate enhanced participation.

4. **It is recommended** that the Foundation give consideration to increasing the maximum number of candidates from six to eight for a few, larger institutions, bearing in mind the graduate enrolment in all relevant disciplines. Without wishing to disadvantage smaller institutions, taking into account the apparent concentration of talent at a small number of institutions, and given the objective to include the most outstanding applicants in the pool, some adjustment here would seem warranted.

5. One of the findings of the Review is that there is a need for more detailed guidelines on how universities should undertake internal selection. A particular concern is the ad hoc nature of arrangements employed by certain universities. **It is recommended** that the Foundation indicate a requirement that a formal Selection Committee be set up at each participating university. Beyond this, guidelines would be couched as recommendations, rather than as mandatory. Despite this, every effort should be made to encourage their adoption.

6. In order to provide complete assurance to all concerned of fairness in **internal selection procedures** at the Foundation, it will be advisable for the Foundation to maintain a more complete record of its procedures. Accordingly, **it is recommended that** the Foundation adopt the procedure of preparing and maintaining on file an appropriately detailed summary record (within the constraints of any legal advice provided) of what transpires at *each stage* in the selection process where candidate names are removed **for all award competitions**. This includes the distinct stages in internal selection, where decisions are made by Foundation staff: the component of the process where the foundation may be judged to be most vulnerable to external questioning of its procedures. A rationale should be provided for the inclusion of each candidate whose name is carried forward to the next stage.

7. **It is further recommended** that, on an annual basis, the President present a complete report on the selection process and results to the Board (possibly following prior consideration at the ANRC), and that this report be reviewed and then attached to the minutes for future reference.

8. **It is recommended** that the Foundation review the guidelines on ranking procedures to be followed by the File review Committee (FRC) with a view to ensuring a straightforward way of assigning a ranking to each candidate. Further, **it is recommended** that the Foundation adopt detailed guidelines on its own internal decision-making as it prepares the list of finalists on the basis of the work of the FRC, and that these guidelines be recorded in the Programme Manual.

9. **It is recommended** that the Foundation increase the size of the FRC to six, and that steps are considered to increase the diversity of the background of its membership.

10. The Foundation has exercised some discretion in determining the composition of the Finalist pool to make sure that certain groups are adequately represented. This issue is best addressed at the level of the composition of the overall pool of candidates, and working to increase participation of under-represented groups. The Review notes that, by and large, this is the approach which the Foundation has adopted. It is encouraged to ensure that this continues to be the case, and **it is recommended** that it include guidelines on such procedures in its Programme Manual

11. It is recommended that the size of each of the two interview panels for the Scholarship award finalists be increased from three to five, with one of the members designated as a chair. This will also provide the opportunity to broaden the base of experience of the panels.

12. It is strongly recommended that, with the support of panel chairs, the Foundation emphasize in its guidance to panellists that the preferred approach to the interview is conversational.

13. It is recommended that the Foundation adopt a 40-minute to one-hour interview as the norm, following a consistent format. With the process facilitated by a chair, this will permit each candidate to provide an explanation of her or his research and its relationship to larger issues, while also giving the panel the opportunity to get to know all of the candidates. To ensure fairness, each interview would follow approximately the same procedure and sequence

14. It is also recommended that there be a Trudeau Fellow, or former Fellow, among the interviewers in each panel, as has often been the case in practice to date. The Fellows should be selected from those who have been most active in Foundation activities, since they will have greater experience with the various qualities of successful Scholars.

15. It is recommended that the Foundation request individual members of the panels to rank each candidate and to record the assigned rating, using an agreed numeric ranking system. Each interviewee would be ranked separately by each member of the interviewing panel. A member of staff should be present to assist the chair and to keep a general record of proceedings, enabling that individual to act as a resource person and a “prompt” to the chair in the final discussions to decide on the fate of marginal candidates.

16. Instead of maintaining the current group process of assessing candidate rankings within each panel, **it is recommended** that at the close of interviews, in collaboration with the panel chairs, the Foundation staff members who have assisted the two chairs calculate the average rankings for each candidate, and determine an order of merit based on these figures. A meeting would then be held involving the two chairs and the Foundation team, led by the Executive Programme Director, along with the two Fellows who have served as panel members, to make decisions among marginal candidates.

17. In order to make for shared information on all candidates and a fairer process of assessment at this last stage, **it is recommended** that the two chairs and the two Fellows be asked to review all files, including those assigned to the panel in which they will not participate, in advance. To

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

make this request more reasonable, it may be that the staff will have additional work to do in preparing more detailed summaries of the file for each candidate.

18. To complete the package of proposals for adjustment to the selection process for the Scholarship Programme, as discussed above, **it is recommended** that the Foundation plan an extended selection process at the final stage, beginning early on Friday evening, and concluding on Sunday afternoon. This would provide the enabling environment in which all the other recommendations might be implemented effectively. If required, it would also allow for the possibility of allowing for a modest increase in the number of candidates to be interviewed.

The Fellowship Programme

1. It is apparent that the practice of sending out one nomination letter for both Fellows and Mentors may contribute to some confusion, and **it is recommended** that separate letters be sent out in the future – or separate attachments to one letter - with the differences between the two competitions spelled out even more starkly than before.

2. It is recommended that the Foundation hold discussions with the universities (at the VP and Dean’s level, and not merely through consulting University Presidents) on the confidentiality provision in the nomination process, in considering whether a change might be considered, and in assessing the consequences of making adjustments to the process.

3. It is recommended that the Foundation make a thorough assessment of the nomination and file preparation process, with a view to considering how best to improve the quality, detail and relevance of the supporting materials for the nomination of Fellowship candidates. This recommendation, like those which follow, should not be seen as a criticism of the adequacy of present arrangements, but rather as the outcome of this first opportunity to step back from current practice and consider how best to strengthen the process, based on experience to date. It is recognized that, if this recommendation is followed, there will be implications in terms of increased investment of staff time to make the improvements possible.

4. A related issue concerns the List of Nominators and the nomination process. Under the present arrangements, academic candidates considered by the universities as potential nominees must go through an internal selection process, while others may be proposed by one individual, who might or might not be an academic, acting alone. **It is recommended** strongly that the Foundation give further thought to ways of strengthening and professionalizing the Fellowship nomination process.

5. It is recommended further that the Foundation take the immediate step of requiring that, in proposing a candidate, each nominator secure the support of a seconder, drawn from the list of nominators.

6. If there is a desire by the Board and management to include candidates from “the creative fields” whether inside or outside universities, **it is recommended** that a separate group of nominators be established, and that there should be a requirement for nominations to be supported by a second member from within the group. A sub-committee of the File Review

TF Preliminary Review 29 10 2005 PMR

Committee of a further five members with the necessary expertise would then review any nominations submitted, and be asked to arrive at the recommendation of one or two names to be included among the final pool. At least one of those participating in the sub-committee would then join the membership of the File Review Committee as an advisor for the one day discussion leading to the final list of nominations to the ANRC.

7. Given the importance of the recommendations of the File Review Committee, **it is recommended** strongly that the Foundation institutionalize the practice it has followed in providing for a face-to-face deliberation meeting for the Committee (as in 2005), rather than a conference call. There may well be value in considering adding a sixth member to add to the range of experience and fields of expertise represented.

The Mentorship Programme

1. In the short term, **it is recommended** that the Foundation continue with efforts to strengthen the existing Programme. It is hoped that consideration will be given to encouraging the nominators and reviewers associated with the Mentorship Programme to give more careful attention to the more difficult issues of willingness, ability and availability, on the part of candidates to engage with Scholars. This may also require a rewriting of the letter of nomination, and rethinking the criteria and the guidelines for reviewers. It is suggested that, in the future, some of the most successful Mentors, on completion of their term, be asked to serve as reviewers, and others added to the nominators list.

2. Towards the close of their first year, or at the most appropriate time for the Foundation in its planning, Scholars should be asked if they wish to participate in the Mentorship Programme. Before this, **it is recommended** that there be an opportunity for the first-year Scholars to meet with “veterans” to discuss (among other things) how the Mentorship will enhance the quality of their experience with the Foundation.

3. **It is recommended further** that the Foundation consider an informal consultation with Scholars on an annual basis to discuss with them, on an individual basis, what they hope to gain from a Mentorship relationship and to provide the opportunity for a frank exchange of views. Their views would then be taken in to account in Scholar-Mentor assignments.

4. **It is also recommended** that The Foundation allocate a modest budget to the Programme to permit the holding of a one-day meeting of all Mentors with Foundation staff as soon as possible following their appointment. Ideally, the existing Mentors would join the meeting for a second day. During the second day, plans might be made for an initial Mentor-Scholar meeting to be held later in the year, with a small group to do be selected to do further work in developing a draft plan for the meeting. The group might continue to play a role in initiating other activities and/or consulting others in developing a plan for such events.

5. **It is recommended** that for 2006-7 (there is no immediate urgency for this initiative), the Foundation form a small Working Group to assist the President in considering the options for a remodelled Mentorship Programme and advise the Foundation on options and possibilities for the future. It will be important for the Group to adopt a broad perspective in looking at options,

and, with this in mind, it is suggested that it might also include among its members, as well as former Mentors, other individuals drawn from the Trudeau Community who would have an active interest in thinking through alternative directions for the future.

6. One possibility which might be examined at some point is a “mixed” model, where different individuals may be selected to make different kinds of contribution to bridging the gap between research and policy and practice, viewed broadly, for the Foundation, and for Scholars in particular. Some might be selected as “conventional” Mentors, while others might be viewed as a resource to all Scholars and the Foundation as a whole, with a third group contributing through one or two quite intensive activities organized to open up new possibilities and ideas for Scholars. **It is recommended** that consideration of options along these lines be included in the working group’s terms of reference.

7. For the present, **it is recommended** that in the guidelines for both nomination and selection, priority be assigned to the candidate’s ability to be an effective Mentor, drawing on the Letter to Mentors and the appendix to the Letter in making more concrete the kind of approaches taken by effective Mentors. This should assist the FRC in its deliberations. Further, the Foundation might take a close look at the way in which nominee files are prepared to give more attention to emphasizing the aptitude of the candidate as a potential Mentor. In the opinion of the Reviewer, more attention might also be given to a realistic appraisal of the time commitment (both “face time” and communication at a distance) required on the part of both Mentors and Scholars to build and maintain an effective Mentorship, and in advising both nominators, and, later, those selected, of what may be required of them.

The Public Interaction Programme and the Role of Fellows, Scholars and Mentors in the Life of the Trudeau Community

1. It is suggested that, while Fellows have been active in the life of the Foundation, it will be necessary for them to play a stronger role in setting the intellectual agenda for the Foundation to achieve its goals. Accordingly, **it is recommended** that the Foundation reflect carefully on its approach to Fellows, and on what they may be expected to contribute as intellectual leaders and guides to the work of the Foundation. Consideration might be given to making adjustments to the selection criteria, to paying more attention in selection to the probable willingness of a candidate to play the role of intellectual leader and guide in the work of the Foundation. Judging from the information gathered for the Review, Fellows would welcome an enhanced role and greater engagement in helping the Foundation to realize its ambitions.

2. Fellows themselves note that there has been no opportunity for them to meet as a group, and **the Reviewer recommends** to the Foundation that to provide for such an opportunity once or twice each year would be a healthy next step in providing a forum where the Fellows themselves may be able to consider ways to take on a more pro-active role in working with the Foundation in setting the intellectual agenda.

3. As a contribution to obtaining valuable feedback on the Fellowship Programme and on the role of fellows in the Foundation, **it is recommended** that formal Exit Interviews be introduced for all Fellows completing their tenure as awardees.

4. It is recommended that the Foundation give consideration to forming a small advisory group, with a continuing role to provide advice from time to time, or respond to concerns raised by the President or the Board relating to the Scholarship programme, with particular reference to “the scholarship experience” and balancing the desire for broadening intellectual horizons with the concern that Scholars complete their academic programmes as expected. While ensuring that the topic of Scholar engagement was central to the group’s concerns, with future needs in mind, the Foundation might prefer to give the group a broader advisory mandate regarding the PIP as a whole. On this basis, **it is recommended that** the group be designated *the PIP Advisory Committee*, with a broader role in offering advice on how to move forward the agenda on building the Trudeau Community.

5. As with Fellows, there would be value in introducing an **Exit interview** for Mentors **It is recommended** that, shortly after completion of their term as Mentors (with the first interviews to be conducted after the members of the first group serving on an 18-month basis complete their term), all holders of the award be asked to take part in an Exit interview. The interview would be structured in a similar way to that envisaged for Fellows.

6. Funds permitting, **it is recommended** that the Foundation give consideration to the idea of producing an annual high-quality publication to enhance its visibility and influence.