

# Summative Evaluation of the Aboriginal Friendship Centres Program

---

Final Report

Evaluation Services  
Corporate Review Branch

---

May 18, 2005

## Table of Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....  | <b>I</b>  |
| <b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....   | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 BACKGROUND.....   | 1         |
| 1.1.1 <i>Development of the Friendship Centres movement</i> .....           | 1         |
| 1.1.2 <i>Governance Structure and Activities</i> .....                      | 2         |
| 1.1.2.1 Department of Canadian Heritage.....                                | 2         |
| 1.1.2.2 The National Association of Friendship Centres.....                 | 3         |
| 1.1.2.3 Provincial/Territorial Associations.....                            | 4         |
| 1.1.2.4 Aboriginal Friendship Centres.....                                  | 4         |
| 1.1.3 <i>Resources</i> .....  | 6         |
| 1.1.4 <i>Expected outcomes</i> .....  | 7         |
| 1.2 EVALUATION.....   | 7         |
| 1.2.1 <i>Methodology</i> .....  | 8         |
| 1.2.2 <i>Scope and Limitations</i> .....                                    | 9         |
| <b>EVALUATION FINDINGS</b> .....  | <b>10</b> |
| 1.3 RELEVANCE.....  | 10        |
| 1.3.1 <i>Demographic trends</i> .....                                       | 10        |
| 1.3.2 <i>Evolving role of the AFCs</i> .....                                | 12        |
| 1.3.3 <i>Continuing need for core funding</i> .....                         | 12        |
| 1.4 ALIGNMENT WITH DEPARTMENTAL AND GOVERNMENT-WIDE PRIORITIES.....         | 13        |
| 1.4.1 <i>Departmental strategic outcomes</i> .....                          | 13        |
| 1.4.2 <i>Government-wide Priorities</i> .....                               | 14        |
| 1.5 SUCCESS.....  | 15        |
| 1.5.1 <i>Short-term outcomes</i> .....                                      | 15        |
| 1.5.2 <i>Final outcome</i> .....  | 18        |
| 1.6 COST-EFFECTIVENESS.....   | 20        |
| 1.6.1 <i>Cost per participant</i> .....                                     | 21        |
| 1.6.2 <i>Overlap and duplication</i> .....                                  | 21        |
| <b>CONCLUSIONS</b> .....  | <b>23</b> |
| 1.7 RELEVANCE.....  | 23        |
| 1.7.1 <i>A continuing need</i> .....  | 23        |
| 1.7.2 <i>Alignment with Department and government-wide priorities</i> ..... | 24        |
| 1.8 SUCCESS.....  | 24        |
| 1.8.1 <i>Immediate outcomes achievement</i> .....                           | 24        |
| 1.8.2 <i>Final outcome achievement</i> .....                                | 26        |
| 1.9 COST-EFFECTIVENESS.....   | 26        |
| <b>RECOMMENDATIONS, MANAGEMENT RESPONSE AND ACTION PLAN</b> .....           | <b>28</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX A: LIST OF INTERVIEWS</b>                                       |           |

## Executive Summary

This report presents the results of a summative evaluation of the Aboriginal Friendship Centres Program conducted by the Corporate Review Branch, Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH). Public opinion research for this evaluation was conducted by EKOS Research Associates Inc. Key informant interviews, the document review, and an analysis of administrative data were conducted by Beals, Lalonde & Associates.

### INTRODUCTION

The Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program (AFCP) supports activities that encourage equal access and participation in Canadian society of urban Aboriginal people while fostering and strengthening Aboriginal cultural distinctiveness. Created in 1972, the Program provides core funding to a network of 118 Aboriginal Friendship Centres across Canada and the National Association of Friendship Centres (NAFC) as well as its affiliated provincial and territorial associations. The Program enables the organizations to leverage additional funds to design and deliver culturally appropriate programming to Aboriginal Peoples residing in, or traveling through, urban communities. Friendship Centres constitute the largest off-reserve Aboriginal service infrastructure in Canada and provide a wide range of programs and services in housing, education, human resource development and employment, youth and family services, health, recreation and culture to off-reserve First Nations, Non-Status Indian, Métis and Inuit people.

The current annual funding provided to the NAFC remains at the mid-1990s level of \$14.6 million.

### Governance

Since 1996, funding to individual centres has been delivered by the National Association of Friendship Centres with the support of its Provincial/Territorial Associations (PTAs). Each AFC is run by a volunteer Board of Directors and sets its own goals and objectives based on the needs of the community in which it is located. The 1996 Transfer Agreement between PCH and the NAFC stipulates that AFCs are to ensure that centres are open to all Aboriginal people regardless of status, gender, sexual orientation, origin, religion, age, disability or marital status. Funding is provided to the NAFC by PCH through a contribution agreement administered by the Aboriginal Programs Directorate, within the Aboriginal Affairs Branch. The Transfer Agreement was first renewed in 2001 and the present agreement will expire on March 31, 2006.

### Program Objectives

The Transfer Agreement states that the objective of the Program is: “to improve the quality of life for Aboriginal Peoples in an urban environment by supporting self-determined activities which encourage equal access to, and participation in, Canadian society; and which respect and strengthen the increasing emphasis on Aboriginal cultural distinctiveness”. The evaluation approaches these

objectives by dividing them between short-term (supporting self-determined activities...) and long-term or final outcomes (improving quality of life).

### **Evaluation objective and methodology**

The objective of this evaluation is to provide evidence-based answers to the following evaluation questions:

- Does the AFCP continue to be consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities, and does it address an actual need? (relevance)
- Is the AFCP meeting its objectives, within budget and without unwanted outcomes? (success)
- Are the most appropriate and efficient means being used to achieve objectives, relative to alternative design and delivery approaches? (cost-effectiveness).

The evaluation relies on multiple lines of inquiry: the review and analysis of documents and administrative data, including the review of the Impact Assessment of the Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program, prepared by the New Economy Development Group Inc. in 2003-2004; open-ended key informant interviews (n= 23) performed to obtain data pertaining to the management of the Program, its impact and cost-effectiveness; and a public opinion survey (n = 606) of urban Aboriginals, to contribute to the assessment of its relevance and success/impact.

### **EVALUATION FINDINGS**

Findings from the lines of inquiry are presented according to the three evaluation issues of relevance, success and cost-effectiveness.

#### **Relevance**

The Aboriginal Friendship Centres (AFCs) are a direct result of the move of Aboriginal peoples from reserves to cities. Statistical data reviewed for this evaluation show that the trend towards the urbanization of the Aboriginal population is increasing. The 2001 Census shows that 1.3 million people in Canada report having some Aboriginal ancestry, representing 4.4% of the total population (3.8% in 1996). The 2001 Census shows that 71% of all Aboriginal people in Canada live off-reserve (51% live in urban areas — of which with 29% in census metropolitan areas (CMA) and 22% in urban non-CMA), and 20% live in rural non-reserve areas. Twenty-five percent of the Aboriginal population live in 10 of Canada's 27 census metropolitan areas. In 1991, the urban Aboriginal population was anticipated to grow by 43% in the next 25 years, from 320,000 to 457,000 in 2016. The Census figures also show that the Aboriginal population is young with a median age of 24.7 years, 13 years younger than the non-Aboriginal population.

This trend towards increasing urbanization seems to be reflected in the evolution of the services offered in the AFCs. The AFCs have become not only drop-in and referral centres but also direct providers of government services and programs. The review of administrative data shows that the AFCs were involved in the delivery of more than 900 programs to the urban Aboriginal population, for a total budget of \$64.5 million in 2003-2004. Findings from the public opinion survey show that AFCs continue to be perceived to be very relevant and useful institution for urban Aboriginal communities, and are perceived to play a crucial role in the life of the community. For instance, three-quarters of the respondents agreed that AFCs are a place for Aboriginal people to relate to their culture and feel connected to their community. Half of the respondents agreed that the AFC helps Aboriginal people in their community to feel connected to the non-Aboriginal community.

These results confirm that the Program contributes to PCH's strategic outcome "Canadians live in an inclusive society built on inter-cultural understanding and citizen participation". Although AFCs are not directly mentioned in recent Speeches from the Throne, it can be concluded that the Program is consistent with priorities of this government, specifically by responding to the needs of urban Aboriginal people, and contributing to building the infrastructure (including the "social economy") of Canadian cities. As one key informant put it: "Because of the percentage of western city populations that is Aboriginal, what happens to urban Aboriginal people will have a major impact on western cities."

## **Success**

### *Short-term outcomes:*

Evaluation findings clearly show that the Program is achieving its short-term outcomes. AFCP has contributed to the establishment of an infrastructure of Aboriginal Friendship Centres that is perceived by its users to be adequate, accessible and is reaching its targeted population. Although this evaluation did not proceed to a systematic review based on Centre visits and inspection, more than half of the survey respondents consider the AFC facilities and equipment to be good, while only one out of ten respondents consider them to be poor (two in ten said they are neither good nor poor and the rest gave no rating).

Overall, the urban Aboriginal population is well aware of the existence of centres. Quite a high proportion of respondents to the survey (67%) have been to a centre at some point in their life. This is more than double the incidence of respondents going to all other organizations providing services to urban Aboriginals combined. Use of AFCs is highest in small to moderate-sized communities, with between 5,000 and 20,000 people. Most people who use AFCs have gone there more than once. In fact, one in four use the centres regularly (once every two months or more frequently). The frequency of visits is even higher in small to moderate-sized communities of 5,000 to 20,000 people. Centre programs and services seem to be widely used. Only one in five AFC visitors do not use these programs. The most popular use remains the social drop-in aspect, as it is mentioned by 51% of the respondents. Other services are all used about half to two-thirds as much as the drop-in service. Virtually everyone who attends a program or uses a service is satisfied with it (at least four

in five are), with little difference in satisfaction levels among the different programs. About half of visitors obtain referrals to a program or service and satisfaction levels are equally high on this front.

The document review demonstrated that AFCs successfully access other sources of funding and enter into partnerships to offer their communities programs and services. The percentage of total budgets represented by AFCP funding over total non-program activities and total budgets vary greatly among regions and centres. For instance, data shows that AFCP funding accounts for 7% of the centres' total budgets in British Columbia, and 25% in Saskatchewan.

In general, AFCs appear to be well grounded to their communities' needs, considering the level of use and satisfaction with services found in the public opinion research. However, while all stakeholders reported that their targeted clientele was "all Aboriginal people" regardless of their origins, document and administrative data review reveal that some Aboriginal communities, namely the Métis and the Inuit, are under-represented on Centres' boards and among their clientele. A key stakeholder felt that the centres are not responsive to the needs of the Inuit population.

#### *Final outcome:*

Qualitative evidence suggests that as a result of its support to AFCs and their work, Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program has enabled many urban Aboriginal people to improve their quality of life. There have, however, been a number of challenges. These include an unequal distribution of services offered by the AFCs across Canada, differing capacity of centres across Canada, as well as accessibility and funding issues.

Overall, based on the ratings provided in the public opinion survey, the urban Aboriginal population in general perceives the impact of the AFCs on their quality of life to be moderate. Between 51 and 61% provided a positive rating regarding contribution of AFCs through their programs to the health of Aboriginal people in their community; preservation of Aboriginal languages and cultures; the level and quality of education of Aboriginal people; the level of social support Aboriginal people enjoy; the sense of personal well-being and the sense of community; more than 40% rated positively AFCs' impact with regard to how well connected Aboriginal people feel to the non-Aboriginal community, to level of employment, and to how well prepared are Aboriginal peoples to find work and be employed.

#### **Cost-effectiveness**

AFCP funding accounts for slightly more than one third of the non-program activities of the Centres, and approximately 13% of the total budget. AFCs in general are able to leverage the AFCP monies they receive in a very effective manner and are providing the AFCP with a very effective and efficient way of meeting the needs of urban Aboriginal peoples. Other funding sources include other federal departments, provincial and municipal governments. The amount of leverage is quite substantial. In 2002/03, AFCs multiplied each AFCP dollar by 8.91. However, the great level of variation among regions and individual Centres suggest that the funding provided by AFCP is having more impact in some Centres than in others.

A review of the documents provided no evidence that there was any overlap or duplication of work undertaken by other government departments. Interviews conducted for the impact assessment with stakeholders outside the Friendship Centres uncovered little evidence that the AFCs were duplicating the work of other organizations. Where possible duplication was identified, it tended to be in the larger cities' AFCs. Most interviewees saw the Centres as unique in delivering culturally appropriate programs and services that complement non-Aboriginal agencies' efforts to reach out to the urban Aboriginal population. The growth in demand for service from the Aboriginal population is leading to more specialized and numerous agencies – a trend which will likely accelerate in the future. This said, the AFCs remain unique in their role as a well-recognized and accepted urban Aboriginal institution.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS, MANAGEMENT RESPONSE AND ACTION PLAN**

Based on the evaluation findings and conclusions, it is recommended that:

- 1) The Program define expected outcomes related to core-funding provided to NAFC, PTAs and AFCs;

### **Management Response:**

#### **Recommendation accepted**

Expected outcomes related to core funding to NAFC, PTAs and AFCs, such as the *capacity* of friendship centre organizations to support the interest of urban Aboriginal communities, are included in the APP RMAF.

Timeline:

RMAF approved: September 05

- 2) The Program, with NAFC and PTAs, encourage AFCs to conduct formal community needs assessments to ensure the programs and services they deliver are responsive to communities' needs.

### **Management Response:**

#### **Recommendation accepted**

The Aboriginal Affairs Branch will work with NAFC and PTA to establish a process in which AFCs are encouraged to conduct formal community needs assessments.

Timeline:

Establish a process for AFCs needs assessments: Fall 05

- 3) The Program, with NAFC and PTAs, ensure there are no systemic barriers that prevent the full participation in and access to AFCs by all Aboriginal Peoples; and

**Management Response:**

**Recommendation accepted**

The Aboriginal Affairs Branch will work with NAFC and PTAs on AFCP policy related issues. This work will address systemic barriers that prevent the full participation in and access to AFCs by all Aboriginal Peoples.

Timeline:

Policy work completed: Fiscal year 06/07

- 4) The Program, with the NAFC and PTAs, explore how the differing circumstances of larger urban and smaller urban, rural or remote AFCs could be taken into consideration in order to maximize outcome achievement.

**Management Response:**

**Recommendation accepted**

The Aboriginal Affairs Branch will work with NAFC and PTAs on AFCP policy related issues. This work will address the differing circumstances of the various AFCs and make recommendations on how all friendship centre organizations can best maximize their outcome achievement and remain relevant in their communities.

Timeline:

Policy work completed: Fiscal year 06/07



## Introduction

This report presents the results of a summative evaluation of the Aboriginal Friendship Centres Program conducted by the Corporate Review Branch. Public Opinion Research for this evaluation was conducted for the Corporate Review Branch by EKOS Research Associates Inc. Interviews, document review and analysis of administrative data were performed by Beals, Lalonde & Associates.

### 1.1 Background

Until the mid-point of the twentieth century, most of Canada's Aboriginal people lived on reserves, in rural communities or in remote northern communities. Today, the majority of Aboriginal people live in cities. The 2001 Census reported that 71% of Aboriginal people live off-reserve. 51 per cent live in urban areas, and 25 per cent live in 10 major urban centres (see section 1.3.1).

#### 1.1.1 Development of the Friendship Centres movement

When the move to cities started, many Aboriginal people experienced social, cultural and economic upheaval related to their separation from their traditional economy and culture, and the contrast between their home community and the urban environment. In the 1950s, a number of Aboriginal Friendship Centres (AFCs) were established to help Aboriginal people cope with the transition. Established by Aboriginal people for Aboriginal people, the first AFCs were intended to serve as drop-in centres where Aboriginal people could socialize and maintain contacts, often in their own Aboriginal languages. The early AFCs initially relied on volunteers, fundraising events, private donations, grants from foundations, and project funding from provincial and federal governments. By 1968, there were 26 AFCs across Canada, whose role had expanded from a simple drop-in centre to also providing referral or direct access to a range of services.

The concept of Provincial/Territorial Associations (PTAs) of AFCs emerged in the late 1960s, reflecting the growth in the number of AFCs, expanding communications between them, and the recognition that they shared many common goals and problems that could be best addressed by working together.

By 1972 there were 43 AFCs across the country and the National Association of Friendship Centres (NAFC) was established. In the same year, the federal government formally recognized the viability of AFCs by implementing the Migrating Native Peoples Program (MNPP), within the Department of Secretary of State. The MNPP replaced the previous system of funding AFCs through federal-provincial agreements in favour of direct federal core funding to AFCs and to the NAFC. Funding under the MNPP was for a five-year period. Funding was renewed in 1978 and again in 1983, at which time the program was renamed the Native Friendship Centres Program. The program was significantly enriched at that time. The core funding level increased by 42% from

\$10.2 million in 1982/83 to \$14 million in 1983. A detailed set of Criteria and Guidelines to govern the program was also introduced in 1983.

In 1988, the program was again renamed, becoming the Aboriginal Friendship Centres Program (AFCP), and its status as a permanent program was secured. The early 1990s saw significant changes in the federal government that had a profound impact on the AFCP.

- The Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH) was created, through the merger of a number of other agencies and departments, including the Department of Secretary of State. The AFCP thus came to reside in PCH.
- The AFCP, like many other programs, experienced funding reductions. The funding level declined from \$19,660,000 in 1992/93 to \$ 13,902,000 in 1997/98.

Up until 1995, PCH (and before that, the Department of Secretary of State) had been responsible for the administration and delivery of the AFCP. A Memorandum of Understanding signed in 1995 established a framework for the negotiation of the transfer of those responsibilities from PCH to the NAFC. The MOU was consistent with and recognized Canada's commitment to building new relationships with Aboriginal peoples based on trust, mutual respect and participation in the decision-making process, and in providing the necessary tools required to become self-sustaining.

After a series of meetings between the NAFC and PCH, the Transfer Agreement (TA), which detailed the responsibilities of each party to the TA, was signed on March 29, 1996. The TA was renewed in 2001, following a two-phase evaluation study. The present agreement will expire on March 31, 2006. The current funding for the NAFC remains at the mid-1990s level of \$14.6 million.

### 1.1.2 Governance Structure and Activities

The Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program (AFCP) is funded by the Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH) and is delivered by the National Association of Friendship Centres (NAFC) with the support of its Provincial/Territorial Associations (PTAs). A network of 117 Aboriginal Friendship Centres (AFCs) across Canada deliver a variety of cultural and social programs to urban Aboriginal communities.

#### 1.1.2.1 Department of Canadian Heritage

Within the Department, the AFCP resides in the Aboriginal Programs Directorate (APD), which is part of the Aboriginal Affairs Branch, which in turn is part of the Citizenship and Heritage Sector – one of the five departmental sectors.

The APD is responsible for administering the TA with the NAFC. APD staff thus deal directly and primarily with the NAFC, to whom those funds are transferred. Communications are informal and on an as-needed basis, rather than through more formal regularly scheduled meetings.

Activities carried out by APD staff include, but may not be limited to:

- Reviewing the funding application submitted by the NAFC (Appendix A to the TA) yearly and inputting relevant data about Grants and Contributions
- Participating in the Branch Review Process, through which Appendix A is approved
- Preparing approval letters and ensuring that funds are transferred
- Monitoring financial and activity reports
- Participating in evaluations and audits
- Preparing briefing notes and other correspondence as required.

### 1.1.2.2 The National Association of Friendship Centres

The NAFC is a national Aboriginal organization representing the AFCs as well as providing support to seven Provincial/Territorial Associations (PTAs) across Canada. The NAFC is a non-profit organization managed by an Executive Director and governed by a voluntary Board of Directors. There is a five-member Executive Committee, comprised of the President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer and Youth Member.

Under the AFCP, the NAFC is responsible for two primary types of activities: Program Administration and Program Delivery.

These activities include, but may not be limited to:

- Table 1: Activities carried out by the NAFC

| Program Administration   | Program Delivery   |
|--|--|
| Maintaining national funding criteria  | Tasks associated with operating and maintaining an office  |
| Submitting Appendix A to the TA (which functions as a funding proposal) and prior to that, liaising as required with PTAs and AFCs to prepare Appendix A | Seeking additional funding from foundations and a range of other government agencies for AFC programs              |
| Liaising with PCH  | Outreach, advocacy, and lobbying to ensure that the voice of urban Aboriginal people is heard on a range of issues |
| Receiving transfer payments from PCH   | Policy development and research  |
| Distributing program administration funds to PTAs  | Coordination and networking with other Aboriginal groups, and with a range of service providers                    |
| Participating in dispute resolution process  | Raising public awareness about the issues and concerns of urban Aboriginal people                                  |
| Working with centers in difficulty   | Partnership development, with various municipal, provincial and federal organizations and Boards.                  |
| Liaising directly with AFCs in provinces/territories where there is no PTA   |  |
| Distributing program delivery funds to individual AFCs   |  |
| Managing and administering contribution agreements with all of the AFCs  |  |
| Collaborating in audit and evaluation processes  |  |

---

**Program Administration**

Monitoring and coordinating the receipt of audited financial statements and activity reports from PTAs and AFCs, and providing such reports to PCH  
 Consulting PCH Headquarters.

---

**Program Delivery**

Funding provided through the AFCP enables the NAFC to seek and obtain funding from other sources to conduct a wide range of other activities and projects.

### 1.1.2.3 Provincial/Territorial Associations

Provincial/Territorial Associations (PTAs) provide their constituents (member AFCs) with a range of services similar to the program delivery services the NAFC provides at a national level. Unlike the NAFC, which receives both program delivery and administration funds, however, PTAs receive only program administration funds under the AFCP. Each of the 7 funded PTAs receives \$70,000 for program administration, regardless of the number of AFCs it represents.

Program administration activities at this level revolve primarily around the business of obtaining, providing, monitoring and reporting on AFCP funding. These administrative activities include, but may not be limited to:

- Reviewing and recommending funding applications consistent with the national funding criteria
- Administering and recommending the core funding application process, and communicating recommendations to the NAFC for cheque distribution
- Participating in the dispute resolution process
- Collaborating in audit processes
- Meeting financial and activity reporting requirements of the NAFC
- Participating in the development of an accountability framework to assist the NFAC in the evaluation of the AFCP
- Providing administrative support to AFCs to ensure their participation in the evaluation process
- Liaising with member AFCs

### 1.1.2.4 Aboriginal Friendship Centres

An AFC is defined in the TA as a “community-based and directed Aboriginal institution serving the interests of urban Aboriginal people in the areas of social, cultural, economic and community development. An AFC is a primary information referral agency and recognized training institution.

It provides and promotes human resource development through a wide range of programs and services to a diverse and increasing urban Aboriginal community.”

Each AFC is run by a volunteer Board of Directors and sets its own goals and objectives based on the needs of the community in which it is located. The TA stipulates that AFCs are to ensure that the Centre is open to all Aboriginal people regardless of status, gender, sexual orientation, origin, religion, age, disability or marital status.

Program delivery activities include, but may not be limited to:

- Salaries and benefits
- Space and building costs: rent, taxes, mortgage payments
- Office costs (i.e., telephone, office supplies, etc.)
- Professional services
- Meetings
- Training
- Travel
- Furniture and equipment
- Promotion, publicity, newsletters
- Maintenance
- Insurance.

Funding provided through the AFCP enables individual AFCs to seek and obtain funding from other sources to conduct a wide range of other activities and projects. These activities can be grouped in three primary categories:

- 1) Providing Social Services: culturally sensitive programs and services related to Aboriginal health, youth, justice, education, sports and recreation, culture, employment, language, housing and economic development are delivered from AFCs. Examples of such programs include: Urban Multipurpose Aboriginal Youth Centres; Young Canada Works; suicide awareness; National Aboriginal Day; HIV/AIDS awareness; Aboriginal inmate outreach; child day care and summer camps.
- 2) Providing Referral Services: AFCs also provide referrals to a range of mainstream providers of health, education and social services. Staff at AFCs develop and maintain contacts with these service providers, and also provide recommendations on how to render culturally

appropriate services to Aboriginal clients. The following are examples of the types of organizations to whom AFCs are likely to refer clients: community colleges; health clinics; Aboriginal organizations and service providers; substance abuse treatment providers; employment agencies; and local offices of provincial social service agencies.

- 3) Community and Cultural Development: AFCs are more than service providers and referral agencies. They are places where urban Aboriginal people come to meet other Aboriginal people. AFCs facilitate this by providing a range of activities related to cultural, spiritual and personal development, family/group relations, and community well-being. Some of these programs include pow wows, festivals, sports activities, a wide range of activities for youth, workshops and various drop-in programs. Community development also includes a public education function. AFCs also provide a bridge between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities by acting as a resource and providing information to non-Aboriginal people. Many AFCs have speakers available who address schools and organizations about Aboriginal issues and culture.

### 1.1.3 Resources

After the TA took effect in 1996, the Aboriginal Programs Directorate retained 1.5 FTEs to manage the AFCP. These are not in the form of specific dedicated positions. Instead, a number of people have some involvement with the AFCP, including a Program Officer who is the primary departmental contact for the NAFC.

Through the AFCP, PCH provides \$14,632,048 on a yearly basis to the NAFC. Funding is provided for:

- Program administration, which includes costs incurred to administer the budget development, approval, receipt, and disbursement processes
- Program delivery, which includes costs incurred to operate the NAFC and individual AFCs.

The annual budget for these activities is allocated as follows:

• Table 2: NAFC annual budget

| Recipient | Administration | Program Delivery | Totals       |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|--------------|
| NAFC      | \$202,000      | \$516,079*       | \$718,079    |
| PTAs      | \$490,000**    |                  | \$490,000    |
| AFCs      |                | \$13,423,969     | \$13,423,969 |
| Totals    | \$692,000      | \$13,940,048     | \$14,632,048 |

\* Program delivery funds include \$76,096 to the NAFC for official languages, and \$249,583 to AFCs for Remoteness Allowance.

\*\*\$70,000 is allocated to each of the 7 PTAs.

The funding described above is provided by PCH to NAFC through two transfers each year. It covers 99 AFCs. From 2001-2002 to 2005-2006, the TA was amended to procure additional core

funding of \$849,048 for 2001-02 and \$1,541,146 for 17 new and developing, previously unfunded AFCs, and to equalize the level of funding received by other AFCs.

#### 1.1.4 Expected outcomes

In 2003-2004, in the absence of a Results-based Management and Accountability Framework (RMAF) and of a performance monitoring system, the Corporate Review Branch conducted an evaluation assessment of the AFCP. As a result, a chain of expected outcomes was defined, reflecting the implicit and explicit assumptions on which the program has operated over the years.

Outcomes are the combined results, effects, or impacts of a program's activities and outputs. For the AFCP, tiers of immediate, intermediate and ultimate outcomes should be anticipated.

- Short-term outcomes : As an immediate result of receiving core funding, funded organizations should be able to develop or maintain the infrastructure required to operate an AFC or office. This would include:
  - Obtaining or maintaining the physical space required to run an office or a Centre
  - Hiring and compensating the core staff required to run that office or Centre, to carry out the financial and administrative tasks required to continue to procure core funding, and to find ways to access additional funding
  - Providing appropriate governance, ensuring that Boards are representative of the client population, and that processes used to identify needs are democratic and inclusive.
- Intermediate Outcomes: Once the infrastructure described above is in place, the intermediate outcomes that can be expected are that:
  - AFCs, PTAs, and NAFC will successfully procure additional funding
  - They will use those funds to provide culturally appropriate programs and services that are responsive to the self-identified needs of the urban Aboriginal people in their own communities.
- Ultimate Outcomes: Over the long term, organizations that have succeeded in accessing other sources of funding in order to provide a range of programs and services responsive to the needs of their constituents within the resources available, should see an overall improvement in the quality of life of the urban Aboriginal people in their communities, as a result of the well-targeted and effective programs and services delivered by AFCs and their Associations.

#### 1.2 Evaluation

The objective of this evaluation is to provide evidence-based answers to the following evaluation questions:

- Does the AFCP continue to be consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities, and does it address an actual need? (relevance)
- Is the AFCP meeting its objectives, within budget and without unwanted outcomes? (success)
- Are the most appropriate and efficient means being used to achieve objectives, relative to alternative design and delivery approaches? (cost-effectiveness).

### 1.2.1 Methodology

The methodology included multiple lines of evidence:

**Review and Analysis of Document and Administrative Data:** A document review was conducted to inform the evaluation team about the background and evolution of the AFCP, to provide primary information from seminal documents, and to confirm information obtained from other sources. The documents reviewed included: official program documentation; the Transfer Agreement; a number of years of Appendix A to the TA; PCH, NAFC, PTA, and AFC financial records; NAFC activity reports; the NAFC database; Statistics Canada Census data on urban Aboriginal populations; previous evaluation and audit reports, including the compilation of administrative data provided by the NAFC and the review of the *Impact Assessment of the Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program*, prepared by the New Economy Development Group Inc. for the Corporate Review Branch in 2003-2004.

**Key informant interviews:** Key informant interviews (N= 23) were performed to obtain data pertaining to the management of the Program, its impact and cost-effectiveness. The list of key informants was provided by Program officials and included representative from: the National Association of Friendship Centres; the Provincial and Territorial Associations; Aboriginal Friendship Centres; the Department of Canadian Heritage Aboriginal Programs Directorate. It was decided that the type of data to be obtained through interviews would be best obtained through in-depth interviews with open-ended questions (as opposed to the closed questions featured on surveys or very structured interviews). The interviews were conducted following an interview guide developed with the approval of the APD and Corporate Review Branch. Aggregated results of the interviews were presented to the Project Authority, ensuring confidentiality.

**Survey of the urban Aboriginal population:** A public opinion research survey (N=606) was conducted with the targeted population of the AFCP to contribute to the assessment of its relevance and success/impact. The survey included 606 completed interviews with Aboriginal Peoples (16 years of age or older) living in urban communities where AFCs are located. This yields a level of precision of +/-4.0 per cent for the sample overall and +/-7 to +/-12 per cent for most sub-groups isolated in the analysis. A questionnaire was first developed by officials of the Program and Corporate Review Branch, with the collaboration of a specialized consultant firm. Prior to the conduct of the survey, the survey instrument was tested with a minimum of 20 cases, in iterations, with changes made after the first five interviews and then again after ten. The survey took place over roughly two weeks, between October 27 and November 19, 2004. The average length of the



interview was 12 minutes. Taking into consideration the incidence of eligibility in the sample, the overall response rate for the survey was 42 per cent.

### 1.2.2 Scope and Limitations

From the beginning of the evaluation project, there was a widely shared perception among internal and external stakeholders that the Program has been evaluated and examined too many times (the impact assessment having just been completed) with little results. Among the concerns of the Program officials was the fact that most of the evaluation information collected on this Program relied solely on qualitative data. This prompted the decision to focus the evaluation on the urban Aboriginal community at large, using public opinion research, instead of focussing on the Centres' users through more qualitative and in-depth lines of enquiry.

However, this approach is not without limitations:

- The targeted population is very difficult to reach through public opinion research. Only one previous research project had been completed with this population before. Although the sampling plan that was developed is very solid, generalizing results of the survey to whole populations might be misleading. In addition, the budget for this part of the research was relatively small, considering what is usually the case in this field of research. Therefore, the length of the interviews and the depth of the analysis of the results were somehow limited
- The nature of some of the variables reported limits the scope and validity of this report. The final objective of the Program is to improve the quality of life of urban Aboriginals. Such an objective is very broad and hard to define on an objective and quantifiable basis. In these circumstances, it seemed reasonable to assess the impact of the program using two lines of evidence: the results of the qualitative impact assessment, and the perceptions of the respondents to the survey regarding the impact of the Centres on a variety of issues affecting their quality of life. However precise this last measurement can be, the fact remains that it is based on a subjective assessment.

## Evaluation findings

Evaluation findings are presented in relation with the three main evaluation issues: relevance, success and cost-effectiveness.

### 1.3 Relevance

Relevance of the AFCP is assessed by considering the continuing existence of the need that gave rise to the Program, as well as including the need to provide operational funding to AFCs and the alignment of the Program with departmental/government objectives and priorities.

#### 1.3.1 Demographic trends

The AFCs are a direct result of the move of Aboriginal peoples from reserves to cities. The first mandate of AFCs was directly related to the needs of Aboriginals settling in a new urban environment. For example, the role of AFCs as drop-in places for the urban Aboriginal population to socialize was prominent in these circumstances. However, evaluation information suggests that the nature of the need that the Centres are addressing is evolving.

The 2001 Census shows that 1.3 million people in Canada report having some Aboriginal ancestry, representing 4.4% of the total population. This compares to 3.8% in 1996, demonstrating that the Aboriginal share of the total population in Canada is growing. The Métis population exhibited the largest growth rate, with its population increasing by 43% over the five-year period. The 2001 Census figures also show that the Aboriginal population is a young population with a median age of 24.7 years, 13 years younger than the non-Aboriginal population.

The 2001 Census shows that 71% of all Aboriginal people in Canada live off-reserve (51% live in urban areas with 29% in census metropolitan areas (CMA) and 22% in urban non-CMA), and 20% live in rural non-reserve areas. Twenty-five percent of the Aboriginal population live in 10 of Canada's 27 census metropolitan areas.

• Table 3: Aboriginal Population in ten Census Metropolitan Areas

| City            | Aboriginal Population | Total Population | % of total |
|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------|
| Winnipeg        | 55,755                | 661,730          | 8.4        |
| Edmonton        | 40,930                | 927,020          | 4.4        |
| Vancouver       | 36,860                | 1,067,475        | 1.9        |
| Calgary         | 21,915                | 943,310          | 2.3        |
| Toronto         | 20,300                | 4,647,960        | 0.4        |
| Saskatoon       | 20,275                | 222,635          | 9.1        |
| Regina          | 15,685                | 190,015          | 8.3        |
| Ottawa-Gatineau | 13,485                | 1,050,755        | 1.3        |
| Prince Albert   | 11,640                | 39,890           | 29.2       |
| Montreal        | 11,085                | 3,380,640        | 0.3        |

Canada's Aboriginal population is becoming increasingly urbanized. The urban Aboriginal population experienced rapid growth between 1981 and 1991, increasing by 55% (compared to an 11% increase in urban non-Aboriginal residents). Although its future rate of growth is expected to be slower, the urban Aboriginal population is still anticipated to grow by 43% in the next 25 years, from 320,000 in 1991 to 457,000 in 2016.<sup>1</sup> Also, it would seem that this increase in the proportion of Aboriginals living in urban centres is not only related to migration but also to natural growth within urban centres. Indeed, the 2001 census reports a net gain of almost 3,100 Aboriginal people to the reserves, with 10,285 moving on to reserves and 7,175 leaving.

As reported by Statistics Canada, that population is young (15-24 represented 18% of the off-reserve Aboriginal population, compared with 13% in the general population; children under 15 years of age are the most numerous segment of the off-reserve Aboriginal population; the urban Aboriginal youth population is growing at a rate faster than any other demographic group in the country and will continue, over the next several decades at least, to make up 50% or more of the total Aboriginal population)<sup>2</sup>.

The 2001 Census shows Aboriginal people being more mobile than other Canadians. Statistics Canada's analysis suggests that this high level of mobility creates challenges for planning and implementing programs in education, social services, housing, and health care, especially in urban areas. Moreover, the urban Aboriginal population is not a homogeneous group. Individuals from every Aboriginal group move into cities, bringing their own cultural, historical and linguistic needs and aspirations. While no definitive statistics have been collected on how long Aboriginal people remain in the city, there are indications of a wide variety of residency patterns. According to a committee report to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal peoples, "*Some Aboriginal urban residents are transient, moving back and forth between the city and their home communities. Many others stay permanently in urban areas or are second- or third-generation urban dwellers.*"<sup>3</sup> David Newhouse, from Trent University, has done similar research. His findings show that urban Aboriginal community consists of both a set of long-time residents in the cities — two or three generations — and a set of newcomers, recent arrivals and visitors to the city. Indian and Northern Affairs describes a "churn effect" — highly mobile population to/from and within urban areas<sup>4</sup>.

The 2000-01 Canadian Community Health Survey found that off-reserve Aboriginal peoples are generally in poorer health than the non-Aboriginal population. The study also confirmed that "in 2000-01, the off-reserve Aboriginal population...had lower levels of education attainment and household income and was less likely to have worked the entire year than the non-Aboriginal population."<sup>5</sup> The poor socio-economic circumstances of Aboriginal peoples means that a

<sup>1</sup> The Statistics Canada, 2001 Census, analysis series — Aboriginal peoples of Canada: A demographic profile, January 2002

<sup>2</sup> Vivian O'Donnell and Heather Tait, *Well-Being of the non-reserve Aboriginal Population*, Canadian Social Trends, Spring 2004, pp 19-23.

<sup>3</sup> "Aboriginal Peoples in Urban Centres: Report of the National Round table on Aboriginal Urban Issues, for Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, pg. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Implications of First Nations Demography Workshop — Recent Migration Patterns, Mary Jane Norris, Indian and Northern Affairs. Presentation at the Aboriginal Policy Research Conference, Ottawa, November, 2002

<sup>5</sup> Canadian Community Health Survey, 2000-01

significant portion of urban Aboriginal youth are more at risk of growing up in a low-income family than their non-Aboriginal peers.

### 1.3.2 Evolving role of the AFCs

Evidence from the document review and interviews with stakeholders suggests that the role of the AFCs, while continuing to be necessary, is evolving. Initially, the AFCs played a pivotal role as facilitators of the transition from rural, remote and reserve life to an urban environment, enabling Aboriginal people to relate to new circumstances. More recently, AFCs have evolved into direct service providers and advocates for an increasingly permanent urban Aboriginal population. While in many larger communities they are no longer the only organization under Aboriginal control, they were usually the first. AFCs have been responsible for creating and spinning off other Aboriginal service organizations. In Toronto, for instance, there are 30 Aboriginal specific organizations, many of which originated from the AFC, such as Wigwamen Native Housing, Anishnawbe Health Toronto and Aboriginal Legal Services. AFCs maintain a central facilitating and catalytic role which enables Aboriginal peoples in the urban areas to have a gathering place within an Aboriginal “user-friendly environment,” one which is culturally appropriate and welcoming. Few if any non-Aboriginal service delivery organizations, however well-intentioned, are able to create and maintain such a unique environment.

Those findings are supported by the results of the public opinion survey conducted for this evaluation, where a majority of respondents agree with a series of general statements regarding the role played by the AFC in their community. Such statements include the following:

- Friendship Centres are a place for Aboriginal people to participate in activities in their language and relate to their culture (76% agree)
- Friendship Centres help Aboriginal people to feel connected to their community (74% agree)
- Friendship Centres provide a safe haven for urban Aboriginal people (66% agree)
- Friendship Centres help Aboriginal people in their community to feel connected to the non-Aboriginal community (52% agree)

A majority of respondents also positively rated the relevance and usefulness of AFCs’ programs and service to their community (71%), to the youth (67%) and to themselves (53%). Only a small proportion of respondents (below 10%) found the relevance and usefulness of those programs and services to be poor. Also, only a minority of respondents (31% vs. 45%) believe that AFCs are not as important as they used to be because of the presence of other Aboriginal organizations.

### 1.3.3 Continuing need for core funding

Table 4 uses data extracted from the NAFC database. Data for 2000/01 to 2002/03 were not provided in the same detail as for 2003/04, nor with the same assumptions.

• Table 4: AFCP funding as part of AFCs' total budget

|                          | 2000/01       | 2001/02       | 2002/03       | 2003/04*     |
|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| AFCP funding             | \$13,913,969  | \$14,513,297  | \$15,027,020  | \$11,568,412 |
| Total budget             | \$136,985,957 | \$159,981,069 | \$133,929,300 | \$96,420,380 |
| AFCP as % of budget      | 10.16%        | 9.07%         | 11.22%        | 12%          |
| Non-program budget       |               |               |               | 32,551,353** |
| AFCP as % of non-program |               |               |               | 39%          |

\* Figures for 2003-04 do not include numbers for Alberta. Also does not include \$490,000 AFCP funding for PTAs, nor the funds generated by PTAs.

\*\* Includes administrative fees related to funded programs, AFCP funds, and funds raised from other sources.

In 2003/2004, AFCP funding represented, 12% of all AFC overall budgets funding, 39% of the operating costs (including administrative fees related to funded program activities), and 44% of operating costs excluding administrative fees. Relative importance of AFCP funding for operational activities, ranged from 20% for AFCs in B.C., to 70% for those in the Atlantic Provinces, as shown in table 5.

• Table 5: AFCP funding as part of programs and non-program budget by region

|              | AFCP funding | Operations | Specific Programs | Total (ops + programs) | AFCP % of operations | AFCP as % of total budget |
|--------------|--------------|------------|-------------------|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| B.C.         | 2,559,017    | 13,031,499 | 22,996,874        | 36,028,373             | 20%                  | 7%                        |
| Manitoba     | 1,057,537    | 1,695,398  | 7,050,817         | 8,746,215              | 62%                  | 12%                       |
| Atlantic     | 534,156      | 758,629    | 3,693,445         | 4,452,075              | 70%                  | 12%                       |
| Territories  | 1,033,877    | 2,152,035  | 3,878,213         | 6,030,248              | 48%                  | 17%                       |
| Ontario      | 4,005,737    | 7,420,750  | 20,433,334        | 27,854,084             | 54%                  | 14%                       |
| Quebec       | 609,714      | 1,457,379  | 4,720,563         | 6,177,942              | 42%                  | 10%                       |
| Saskatchewan | 1,768,374    | 3,367,193  | 3,764,250         | 7,131,443              | 53%                  | 25%                       |
| Total        | 11,568,412   | 29,882,883 | 66,537,496        | 96,420,380             | 39%                  | 12%                       |

This funding, as a whole, accounts roughly for a third of AFCs operational costs.

Stakeholders were asked if there was a continuing need for operational funding. As expected, all of interviewees responded in the affirmative, emphasizing core operational funding as the foundation that allows fund-raising to take place. Core funding was also perceived to be vital by interviewees from the PTAs.

#### 1.4 Alignment with Departmental and Government-Wide Priorities

This section examines the extent to which the Program is aligned with the pursuit of the Department's strategic outcomes and the government-wide priorities.

##### 1.4.1 Departmental strategic outcomes

Section 3 of the Transfer Agreement states that the objective of the Program is: "to improve the quality of life for Aboriginal Peoples in an urban environment by supporting self-determined

activities which encourage equal access to, and participation in, Canadian society; and which respect and strengthen the increasing emphasis on Aboriginal cultural distinctiveness”. Therefore, the primary objective of the program is actually to support self-determined activities that encourage equal access to and participation in Canadian society in a culturally sensitive fashion. The AFCP provides funding to enable the parties to the program to pursue the ultimate desired impact of the Program: an improved quality of life for urban Aboriginal peoples.

Furthermore, the work of Aboriginal Friendship Centres promotes the participation of Aboriginal Peoples in contributing to community by ensuring that Friendship Centre members are involved in identifying local needs, establishing priorities, and developing implementation plans and that Friendship Centre staff liaise with other local service providers to ensure that they understand how their services might need to be adapted to be culturally appropriate for urban Aboriginal peoples.

When the objectives and the operating principles of the Program are thus delineated, it becomes evident that the objectives and associated outcomes of the AFC Program were, and continue to be, in line with PCH strategic objective that Canadians live in an inclusive society built on inter-cultural understanding and citizen participation. While this strategic objective is broad and encompass many aspects of Canadian life, it does identify fostering participation in Canada’s civic and cultural life, understanding of diverse cultures, and the understanding of the rights and responsibilities of shared citizenship, all of which fit with the objectives of the Program.

The Aboriginal Friendship Centres Program has been included in the Department’s Program Activity Architecture under the “Aboriginal Networks” sub-sub-activity. As such it is expected to contribute to activities that encourage equal access and participation in Canadian society while fostering and strengthening Aboriginal cultural distinctiveness.

#### 1.4.2 Government-wide Priorities

In the February and October 2004 *Speeches from the Throne*, the government committed to increasing opportunities and sharing Canada’s prosperity with Aboriginal Canadians. The Speeches also committed the government to addressing the “the challenges facing off-reserve Aboriginal Canadians” and to enabling vibrant and healthy communities. The off-reserve network of organizations supported under the APP can provide over thirty years of knowledge and experience towards the realization of these goals.

Although AFCs are not directly mentioned in the Speeches from the Throne, it can be concluded that the program is consistent with priorities clearly established for this government, specifically on responding to the needs of urban Aboriginal people, and on building the infrastructure (including the “social economy”) of Canadian cities. One key informant summarized the input received on this question by saying: “Because of the percentage of western city populations that is Aboriginal, what happens to urban Aboriginal people will have a major impact on western cities.”

## 1.5 Success

The assessment of the Program's successes and impact relies on evidence-based answers to the following evaluation questions:

- To what extent did PCH contribute to the establishment of an infrastructure that is community-based and positioned to seek out funding from other sources? (immediate and intermediate outcomes)
- To what extent has the AFCP contributed to improve the quality of life of urban Aboriginal people? (long-term outcomes)

These two questions represent a simplification of the logic model presented in section 1 that is deemed acceptable, considering the information that is available for this evaluation.

### 1.5.1 Short-term outcomes

To measure the achievement of the Program's short-term outcomes, this evaluation presents information regarding the extent to which an infrastructure of centres exists and is accessible; reaches and is being used by its target clientele; is responsive and representative of the communities it serves; and is positioned to access funding from other sources and offer programs.

**Accessibility:** There are currently 118 Friendship Centres, 99 of which receive core funding from 2001-2002 to 2005-2006. The TA was amended to procure additional core funding of \$849,048 and \$1,541,146 for 17 new and developing, previously unfunded AFCs. Overall, the physical facilities and equipment of these Centres are perceived to be adequate by a majority the targeted population (56%), although 10% consider them to be in a poor condition. Accessibility was measured by asking respondents to rate the location of their Centre in terms of "its neighbourhood and how to get there". Among respondents, 81% provide a positive rating ("good" or "very good"), while only 10% rated it negatively ("poor" or "very poor"). Residents of rural areas are more apt to say that the location is good compared with urban residents. The location of the Centre is rated the poorest by residents in the largest communities (with 100,000 residents or more).

**Reach:** To assess the extent to which the AFCP is effectively reaching the urban Aboriginal population, questions were included in the public opinion survey to measure awareness, as well as levels of knowledge and use of the Centres. Overall awareness (prompted and unprompted) of the Centres is reported to be fairly high (87%). Awareness of the Centres seems to be related to higher levels of education, living in urban areas and the number of years living in the same community. More than half (57%) of the respondents who are aware of the AFCs reported to have been to the Centre in their community within the past two years, while two-thirds (67%) indicated that they have visited an AFC at least once in their lifetime. Overall, one-third of Aboriginal residents living in the communities in the sample who are aware of AFCs have never been to a Centre (32%). Residents living in communities with between 5,000 and 20,000 people are more apt to say that they have visited the Centre in their community.

**Use:** AFCs are used for a variety of purposes by their target clientele, including social visits (51% of survey respondents who visited a Centre in the last 48 months), education programs and services (39%), cultural and language programs and services (36%), employment programs and services (34%), health program and services (28%), and child care, after school and summer camps programs and services (25%). Satisfaction levels are very high (between 81% and 86%) for these services. Of the respondents who have been to an AFC within the past two years, about half (51%) have been to their local Centre between one and five times during that period and about half (49%) more than 5 times. Urban residents collectively report a higher average number of visits than rural residents do, as is also the case with residents of mid-sized communities (of between 5,000 and 20,000 people), compared with smaller and larger communities. Among non-visitors, reasons for not visiting their community Aboriginal Friendship Centre include a lack of interest and time (30% for each). Lack of information about the location of the Centres and available services and activities were also cited by six and five percent of non-visitors, respectively. The reputation of the Centre in their community was not cited often as a reason not to visit their Centre. Métis and people with lower (self-rated) knowledge of the purpose and functions of the Aboriginal Friendship Centres are less interested in AFCs than others. Visits to other Aboriginal organizations in the community are not as common as they are to Aboriginal Friendship Centres. Half (51%) of those who said that they are aware of these other organizations have visited them in the past two years (compared with two-thirds of people who have visited an AFC). That is, 23% of all Aboriginal residents report having visited an Aboriginal organization other than an AFC, compared with 58% who have visited an AFC, or less than half of the incidence of visiting overall. Women, parents, and people who have visited an Aboriginal Friendship Centre are more inclined than others to also have visited other Aboriginal organizations in their community.

**Users' profile:** According to the survey results, there seems to be a fairly systematic pattern of who visits these Centres and who does not. AFC visitors have systematically higher levels of education and income. They are also more likely to be parents and under 55 years of age. Those with the least education and income, as well as older residents, those in poor health, or with disabilities, are less apt to use the Centres. Aboriginal Friendship Centres are also more popular in urban communities, both in terms of incidence and frequency of use. Residents in western Canada are not as positive about AFCs as people are elsewhere in Canada, particularly with respect to sense of community, level of support and level and quality of education. While the sense of connection to the Aboriginal community created by AFCs is reported to be good, the sense of connection to the non-Aboriginal community is not as good, particularly in larger communities and in the west. First Nations people are more frequent users of Centres than Métis, which may be a reflection of the programming offered, or perhaps of an overarching perception that Friendship Centres are geared to First Nations.

**Representativeness:** A review of administrative data provided by the NAFC for the year 2002-2003 shows that a full 87% of board members for AFCs are status Indians, 1% are non-status, 2% are Métis and another 10% are listed as "other"; 54% are female and 46% are male. All AFC and PTA interviewees stated that their target group was "all Aboriginal people" in the areas they serviced. However, programming does tend to mirror the demographics of that population. For example, in an area where most of the Aboriginal population is Cree, there are a number of Cree



language programs. Another AFC interviewee described arrangements made to satisfy the needs of a diverse membership, by having specific nights designated as either “West Coast Nights” or “Plains Nights”. The issue of programming appropriate to a diverse blend of Aboriginal cultures was cited as problematic by only one interviewee stating that AFCs are not responsive to the needs of Inuit people and do not offer programs or services appropriate to their culture or that meet their needs. When asked how AFCs were assessing the need within their communities, the majority of AFC and PTA interviewees said they conducted formal or informal needs assessments<sup>6</sup>. In some cases, the process described included: community consultations; questionnaires; environmental scans; gap analysis; surveys; and focus groups. The election of Directors (whose platforms represent their assessments of their communities’ needs) and the discussions conducted as part of AGMs were also reported as ways to be responsive to the needs of the community. It was also mentioned that Centres are most able to meet needs when those needs coincide with federal or provincial initiatives for which funds are available. Many interviewees praised how on-target many of these programs (which quite a few of them tagged as “Flavour of the Year”) are. However, some interviewees expressed frustration at their inability to meet needs for which there are no corresponding funding programs.

**Representation and advocacy:** Interviewees reported significant consultation with non-Aboriginal policy makers and service providers at all levels. A few examples include, federal government departments including PCH, Health Canada, and HRSDC on a range of programs like the Aboriginal Healing and Wellness Strategy, the federal homelessness initiative, a diabetes initiative, and the UMAC. They also reported collaborating with Provincial departments, councils and committees on a wide range of subjects, including health, economic development, and training, as well as youth justice. Boards of education and Neighbourhood Community Planning groups were cited, as well as hospitals, local food banks, Women’s shelters and community organizations like chambers of commerce and Kinsmen. In the North, AFCs have an integral role to play in the development of the Northern Strategy. AFCs are active participants in municipal planning, including participation in the *Supporting Community Partnership Initiative* and the *Urban Aboriginal Strategy*. A number of interviewees stressed their perception of the NAFC, PTAs, and Friendship Centres as service providers rather than representative agencies. They felt they were often being asked to act as representatives of urban Aboriginal people, rather than simply as advocates for Friendship Centres. Most of these added that they would not mind attending consultations and providing input appropriate to their service provider role, if they had sufficient resources allocated for this. But some said resource constraints, coupled with the service vs. representative dilemma, had led them to try to curtail their involvement in consultations. A number of interviewees also felt that their service vs. representative dilemma was exacerbated by an absence of representative agencies looking after the needs and the rights of urban Aboriginal people. The AFN interviewee noted that in recent years there has not been a direct focus on urban issues within his organization, but that these are now receiving more attention and the AFN will soon be introducing an Urban Secretariat.

---

<sup>6</sup> Based on information provided during the planning phase, it was expected that documentation would exist that will allow evaluators to assess the correspondence between stated communities needs and programming offered by the Centres. In the absence of such documentation, this part of the evaluation relies solely on information provided by stakeholders.

**Leverage ratios:** In 2002/03, AFCs (including Alberta and PTAs) multiplied each AFCP dollar by 8.91, and in the most recent reporting period, 2003/04, AFCs (excluding Alberta and PTAs) multiplied each AFCP dollar by 8.57. The analysis of Centre budget documents from the AFCs studied for the 2003 Impact Assessment revealed leverage ratios ranging from 3:1 to 25:1. These results can be considered clear evidence of the importance of the Centres’ interaction with other agencies and is indicative of the breadth of these arrangements. The Impact Assessment revealed that AFCs have been able to create an extensive network of community and government linkages that allow them to deliver programs that meet the needs of their communities. The case studies show that each AFC has its own list of partners and these differ according to the diverse needs of the Aboriginal people in each locality. If there is any commonality, it is in the sectors they represent, which typically include health, education, social services, recreation, justice and crisis intervention. Table 6, based on information provided by the NAFC, shows the number of participants by type of programming offered in all the AFCs. As it is certain that some individuals participated in more than one type of programming, the data does not allow to reconcile the figures to arrive at a single total for participants.

• Table 6: Participants in AFC Programs, (2003-2004)

| Type of programming       | # of programs | # of participants | Total funding   |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Health                    | 302           | 110,205           | \$ 23,629,087   |
| Justice                   | 78            | 29,526            | \$ 4,997,999    |
| Education                 | 62            | 8,147             | \$ 4,130,296    |
| Employment                | 75            | 32,721            | \$ 4,950,932    |
| Language                  | 8             | 1,435             | \$ 137,971      |
| Youth                     | 197           | 92,771            | \$ 15,029,617   |
| Sports (not recreational) | 12            | 10,647            | \$ 252,723      |
| Cultural                  | 55            | 98,258            | \$ 965,943      |
| Housing                   | 25            | 35,115            | \$ 6,012,379    |
| Economic Development      | 7             | 28,442            | \$ 640,121      |
| Other                     | 81            | 58,193            | \$ 3,770,633    |
| Total                     | 902           |                   | \$64,517,701.00 |

### 1.5.2 Final outcome

As mentioned in the methodology section, accurately measuring the contribution of the AFCP to the improvement of the quality of life of urban Aboriginals is a multi-faceted challenge. For this evaluation, it has been decided that the final outcome should be measured based on the perceptions and judgment of the targeted population. Although this assessment has obvious limitations (the principal being that, in the end, it remains subjective), it does allow for corroborating results of previous assessments regarding the impact of the AFCP.

In 1996, the Royal Commission on Aboriginal People (RCAP) reported that Friendship Centres have “produced a wide range of positive achievements for Aboriginal people, including increased

pride and self-esteem, and improved access to services, employment, training, housing and other benefits. Their activities have contributed to the development of stable and active urban Aboriginal communities, particularly their efforts to develop other Aboriginal agencies and organization, hundreds of which grew out of Friendship Centre activities. The Centres have created greater awareness of Aboriginal issues in urban communities, encouraged non-Aboriginal agencies to be more responsive to the needs of Aboriginal people, and created a positive image of Aboriginal people. They have also, by reflecting Aboriginal values in their structure and operations, provided a useful model for other community agencies<sup>7</sup>.”

The results from the Impact Assessment conducted in 2003-2004 remain consistent with the findings of the RCAP report. The extent to which the AFCP has successfully enabled the AFCs to achieve the desired impacts is well illustrated in the seven case studies, annexed to that assessment report. All lines of inquiry used to conduct the qualitative impact assessment – case studies, focus groups, interviews and document review – suggest that the AFCP has been a successful program in terms of its impact on the quality of life of urban Aboriginal people. They point to the initiatives which have improved and continue to improve Aboriginal people’s access to opportunities and services, as well as providing the linkages which connect Aboriginal people to the mainstream, while keeping them in touch with their own distinctive cultures.

The key stakeholders interviewed for the impact assessment identified the many and varied ways that the program has been able to address the broad objective of the program. There was unanimous agreement among the stakeholders that the AFCP has fulfilled, and is carrying out, a vital role in enabling Aboriginal people leaving their rural, remote and reserve communities to adapt and contribute to their new urban communities, while at the same time promoting and protecting the culture, traditions, and values of Aboriginal peoples. Individual Aboriginal persons, Friendship Centre Board members and staff at all the sites studied, as well as local urban service providers, Canadian Heritage and provincial government representatives, all generally agree that the Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program (AFCP) has enabled many urban Aboriginal people to improve their quality of life.

In meeting the AFCP’s access and participation goals, the Friendship Centres are a bridge for urban Aboriginal peoples, enabling them to derive strength from their peers as a means of relating to the rest of the urban population. They are a place where urban citizenship skills are acquired and leadership is nurtured. A number of prominent Aboriginal leaders with roots in the AFC experience illustrate this point. Virtually all the AFC sites studied demonstrated the role they play in connecting Aboriginal people to urban life, whether by referring clients to the appropriate local agencies, filling certain service gaps, or proactively expressing an Aboriginal opinion. Several respondents underlined the “brokering role” that the AFCs individually and collectively play in expressing, and at times representing, the views of urban Aboriginal peoples who are sometimes not well served by more rurally and reserve-focused Aboriginal political organizations. The encouragement to participate is a two-way street, as was noted by numerous interviewees. The role of many AFCs in promoting greater mutual understanding and awareness of Aboriginal requirements and traditions

---

<sup>7</sup> *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*, Volume 4, Perspectives and Realities, Chapter 7, p. 565

was often highlighted during the course of the study. Examples such as pow wows and other cultural events open to the public, awareness training for municipal service providers and judicial and police services were a few examples noted. The AFCs' reaching out to the broader community was seen to be an important means of establishing mutual respect and a better understanding of Aboriginal cultures and characteristics.

These perceptions seem to be shared, but only to a certain point, by the respondents to the public opinion survey conducted for this evaluation. Overall, based on the ratings provided, the impact of the Centres is perceived to be moderate. Six in ten respondents agree that the Centres have a positive impact on the sense of Aboriginal community that people feel (61%), and on the sense of personal well-being that Aboriginal people feel in their community (60%). Over half of residents asked agree that the Centres have a positive impact in the community on the level of social support Aboriginal people feel (57%), the level and quality of education of Aboriginal people (53%), the health of Aboriginal people, and preservation of Aboriginal languages and culture (51%). Less than half of those asked believe that the Centres have a positive impact on the level of employment of Aboriginal people (44%), or on how well connected Aboriginal people feel to the non-Aboriginal community.

On a number of issues, roughly two in ten residents who were asked (20 to 24%) believe that the Centres have had no impact in their community (on the level and quality of education, the preservation of Aboriginal languages and culture, employment among Aboriginal people, and how well connected Aboriginal people feel to the non-Aboriginal community). Furthermore, one in seven or more of the residents asked (14 to 19%) believe that the Centres have had a negative impact in a number of areas in their community (on the level of support Aboriginal people feel, the level and quality of education of Aboriginal people, the health of Aboriginal people, employment among Aboriginal people, and how well connected Aboriginal people feel to the non-Aboriginal community).

Variables associated with a more positive perception of the impact of the Centres include: being a regular user of a Centre; being under 35 year old; and being employed. Residents in the west (Alberta and B.C.) are less positive as others about the sense of community, level of social support, and level and quality of education in their community that could be attributed to the AFCP. On the other hand, residents in Manitoba are more positive than others across the country about the impact the AFC had on the level and quality of education of Aboriginal people in the community. Ontario residents are the most positive about the level of support, health of people and how well connected people feel to the non-Aboriginal community. Residents of rural communities, as well as those with 5,000 to 20,000 people are also more positive than others about the connection to non-Aboriginal people. Residents of the largest communities (with more than 100,000) are the least positive about this type of connection to the broader population.

## 1.6 Cost-effectiveness

In the technical sense, cost-effectiveness measures the cost associated with a given amount of the expected outcome. Considering that the measurement of the long-term outcomes of the Program is

based on subjective evaluations, such a measurement would not make much sense. To examine if the most appropriate and efficient means are being used to achieve program objectives, this evaluations reviews various qualitative and quantitative measures of efficiency (cost per participants to programs; leverage ratios). The issue of duplication and overlap with other programs is also addressed.

#### 1.6.1 Cost per participant

The review and analysis of administrative data revealed that the average AFCP cost per participant was 29 dollars. This was calculated assuming \$15 million in AFCP funding, and 505,460 participants. When the cost was calculated for the target population the cost per participant dropped to 26 dollars. This was also based on the identified \$15 million in AFCP funding but took into consideration a total of 567,000 Aboriginal individuals, and included both adults and children.

The leveraging of program funding or the diversity of funding sources can reflect the cost-effectiveness of a program in obtaining a given set of outcomes or results. As mentioned, in 2002/03, AFCs (including Alberta and PTAs) multiplied each AFCP dollar by 8.91, and in the most recent reporting period, 2003/04, AFCs (excluding Alberta and PTAs) multiplied each AFCP dollar by 8.57. Information reported from the Impact Assessment however reveals that those leverage ratios vary greatly between regions and individual Centres. The above findings suggest that while AFCP funding as a whole accounts for slightly more than one third of the non-program activities of the Centres, and approximately 13% of the total budget, AFCs are nevertheless able to leverage the monies they receive and are providing the AFCP with an effective and efficient way of meeting the objectives of the program.

The concept of being a victim of your own success arose when discussing this issue. A few interviewees said they feared that if they were ever more efficient, the end result would be the loss of their AFCP funding. They were adamant that no matter how effective they are, they must have the stability that only core funding can bring.

#### 1.6.2 Overlap and duplication

A review of the program documents provided no evidence that there was any overlap or duplication of work undertaken by other government departments.

Interviews conducted for the Impact Assessment with stakeholders outside the Friendship Centres uncovered little evidence that the AFCs were duplicating the work of other organizations. Where duplication was identified, it tended to be in the larger cities. Most interviewees saw the Centres as unique in delivering culturally appropriate programs and services that complement non-Aboriginal agencies' efforts to reach out to the urban Aboriginal population. In some instances, AFCs have created an outreach capacity to address the needs of a hard-to-serve group, or have called for attention to be paid to a new need expressed by Aboriginal people. Given that many AFCs have developed and then "spun-off" specialized agencies, especially in the larger urban communities where demand is greater than supply, there is of necessity some duplication and overlap between the AFCs and other agencies. It should be noted however, that this finding is true for both Aboriginal

and non-Aboriginal service providers in large urban communities and suggests that duplication is born of necessity. The growth in demand from the Aboriginal population is leading to more specialized and numerous agencies – a trend which will likely accelerate in the future. This said, the AFCs remain unique in their role as a well-recognized and accepted urban Aboriginal gathering place, one with an important cultural and catalytic role.

All informants interviewed for the current evaluation reported that they work very hard to build partnerships so as to avoid duplication, and that they were confident there was very little if any duplication. In the rare case where there was an apparent duplication or redundancy, it would be attributable to flawed liaison/communication with other service providers. This is not to say that services provided are not similar to those provided by other agencies. Many interviewees noted that there were many similarities. But they said that all Friendship Centre programs are delivered through the filter of Aboriginal culture, which makes them unique. For example, Alcoholics Anonymous, as delivered in the mainstream, has a significant faith-based component. This is also true of AA programs delivered at AFCs. But the “faith-base” in AFC programs is congruent with Canadian Aboriginal spirituality. The same can be said for the secondary school programs that are run out of many Friendship Centres – there is great similarity to regular high school curriculum, but in AFCs there is a filter of Aboriginal culture that overlays and underlies the program. In a similar vein, many (primarily treatment and/or cognitive-based) programs have life-skills components that include a focus on safety. One AFC interviewee explained that when her Centre covers this subject, the topics are tailored to Aboriginal people new to an urban environment, and thus include subjects like: How to be Safe in the City, and, What is Neighbourhood Watch. Another PTA/NAFC interviewee from Manitoba explained that her organization has signed a protocol with the Manitoba Métis Federation that designates AFCs as the primary service delivery agent for services for Aboriginal people in Manitoba, and that AFCs recognize the Manitoba Métis Federation as the representative voice. This protocol commits them to working together and ensures that programs are complementary, not duplicative.

## Conclusions

General conclusions based on evaluation findings are presented according to the three issues of relevance, success and cost-effectiveness.

### 1.7 Relevance

Evaluation findings clearly demonstrate that the AFCP addresses an actual need and is consistent with Departmental and government-wide priorities.

#### 1.7.1 A continuing need

The review of Program documents demonstrates an increasing urbanization of the Aboriginal population in recent years. This trend seems to be reflected in the evolution of the AFCs' role. The AFCs have become not only drop-in and referral centres but also direct providers of government services and programs. Findings from the qualitative impact assessment clearly demonstrate that AFCs are perceived by stakeholders as continuing to play a crucial role in helping Aboriginal peoples initially acclimatize themselves to their new environment and, once settled, in providing ongoing support in terms of their physical, spiritual and cultural needs. Results from the public opinion survey show that AFCs are perceived to be providing relevant and useful programs and services to urban Aboriginal communities, and are viewed as playing a crucial role in the life of the community. For instance, three-quarters of the respondents agreed that AFCs are a place for Aboriginal people to relate to their culture and feel connected to their community. Half of the respondents agree that the AFC helps Aboriginal people in their community to feel connected to the non-Aboriginal community.

As the AFCs developed to become not only drop-in and referral centres but also direct providers of government services and programs, core-funding has become an integral and necessary component for the successful functioning of most Centres. Key informants reported that, in large part due to the enduring presence of core funding provided by PCH, AFCs now function as recognized Aboriginal institutions, formerly absent from the urban context, and are considered by many as an essential element in the urban centres. However, the relative importance of core-funding in AFCs overall budgets varies greatly between regions and between Centres. In some cases, that funding accounts for only a very small portion of the budget. In others, core funding provided through the AFCP is vital to the mere existence of the Centre.

In summary, the need for the Program still exists, as the trend towards urbanization of the Aboriginal population in Canada is still prevalent today and will be for the foreseeable future. Results of the survey of Aboriginal people within communities where an AFC exists report that a majority of respondents perceive the services and programs provided by AFCs to be relevant to the community. Core funding plays an integral role for the NAFC, the PTAs and the AFCs who use this money to effectively leverage other resources to offer programs and services to their communities.

### 1.7.2 Alignment with Department and government-wide priorities

Evaluation findings demonstrate that this Program is congruent with current Government priorities and is aligned with the Departmental strategic outcomes.

The 2004 Speech from the Throne indicates that the government is focused on helping the Aboriginal Population become more integrated into society. In that Speech, the government restates its commitment to working with Aboriginal Canadians and provincial and territorial governments to create the conditions for long-term development and modern Aboriginal Governance. In addition, the Government expressed its determination to foster the social economy and cultural institutions that reflect a diverse and multicultural society.

AFCP has been one of the first programs where Aboriginal people living off reserve had the opportunity to acquire knowledge and develop skills and experience as administrators of service delivery institutions. Since 1996, the Program has been devolved to an Aboriginal organization. In this sense, it is an integral part of the conditions for long-term development and modern Aboriginal Governance. The Program also directly contributed to the establishment and development of an infrastructure of institutions that play a central role in the social economy and as cultural institutions in Canadian cities. Given that the Aboriginal population is expected to be the fastest growing segment of the Urban population, the existence and maintenance of such an infrastructure is clearly aligned to contribute to the achievement of government priorities.

The Aboriginal Friendship Centres Program has been included in the Department's Program Activity Architecture under the "Aboriginal Networks" sub-sub-activity. As such it is expected to contribute to the Strategic Outcome "Canadians live in an inclusive society built on inter-cultural understanding and citizen participation" by supporting activities that encourage equal access and participation in Canadian society, while fostering and strengthening Aboriginal cultural distinctiveness. Findings from the evaluation converge to demonstrate that the Program is aligned with those objectives. Evaluation findings also reveal that the AFCs are used for a variety of purposes by their target clientele, including social visits, education programs and services, cultural and language programs and services, employment programs and services, health programs and services, and child care, after-school, summer camp programs and services. Although not all of these programs and services directly relate to the mandate of the Department, it is evident that the role AFCs assume as a community centre, as well as the education and cultural programs it provides, directly contribute to the achievement of the Department's strategic outcomes.

### 1.8 Success

Evaluation findings clearly showed that the Program is having success in achieving its short-term and long-term outcomes.

#### 1.8.1 Immediate outcomes achievement

It can be concluded that PCH, through the AFCP, has contributed to the establishment of an infrastructure of Aboriginal Friendship Centres that is perceived by its targeted population to be



adequate, accessible and that is reaching its intended clientele. More than half of the survey respondents consider the AFC facilities and equipment to be adequate, while only one out of ten respondents consider them to be poor. That result suggests that some Centres might be perceived to be in poor condition. Overall, the targeted population is well aware (87% prompted and unprompted) of the existence of the Centres. Quite a high proportion of Aboriginal residents (67%) have been to a Centre at some point in their life and more than half of the survey respondents reported to have visited a Centre within the past 48 months. This is more than double the incidence of residents going to all other Aboriginal organizations combined. Use of AFCs is highest in small to moderate-sized communities, with between 5,000 and 20,000 people. Most of the people who use AFCs have gone there more than once. In fact, one in four use the Centres regularly (going to them every two months or more frequently); a number which is even higher in small to moderate-sized communities of 5,000 to 20,000 people. Programs and services seem to be widely used. Only one in five AFC visitors do not use these programs. The most popular is still the social drop-in aspect, suggesting that AFCs are still primarily used for their original function. Other services are all used about half to two-thirds as much as the drop-in. Virtually everyone who attends a program or uses a service is satisfied with it (at least four in five are), with little difference in satisfaction levels between the different programs. About half of visitors obtain referrals to a program or service and satisfaction levels are equally high on this front.

The document review demonstrated that AFCs are successful in accessing other sources of funding and entering into partnerships to offer programs and services. For instance, the NAFC database reports that a total 902 programs were offered in 2003-2004, with a total funding allocation of \$64.5 million. The percentage of AFCP funding over total non-program activities and total budgets vary greatly between regions and individual Centres. Data shows that AFCP funding accounts for 7% of the Centres' total budget in British Columbia, while it accounts for 25% in Saskatchewan.

In general, AFCs appear to be well grounded to their communities' needs, considering the level of use and satisfaction with services measured by the public opinion research. However, a couple of issues emerge from the interviews conducted for this evaluation:

- While all stakeholders reported that their targeted clientele was “all Aboriginal people”, regardless of their origins, document and administrative data review reveal that some communities, namely the Métis and the Inuit, are under-represented on the Centres' boards and among their clientele. In addition, the public opinion survey shows that Métis seem to be less apt to report using the AFCs. Moreover, it was represented by one key stakeholder that the Centres are not responsive to the needs of the Inuit population.
- Knowledgeable informants also reported that AFCs' program offerings correspond to what programs are available from federal institutions and other partners rather than to the community' formally assessed needs. However, it was also mentioned that usually those programs correspond to actual needs in the communities.

## 1.8.2 Final outcome achievement

The 2004 Impact Assessment of the Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program has demonstrated that there have been a number of positive impacts as a result of the Program. Qualitative evidence suggests that the Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program has enabled many urban Aboriginal people to improve their quality of life. There have, however, been a number of challenges, including an unequal distribution of services provided by the Friendship Centres and of capacity within Centres across Canada, as well as accessibility and funding issues.

Overall, based on the ratings provided in the public opinion survey, the urban Aboriginal population in general perceives the impact of the centres on their quality of life to be moderate. Between 51 and 61% provided a positive rating regarding contribution of AFCs through their programs to the health of Aboriginal people in their community; preservation of Aboriginal languages and cultures; the level and quality of education of Aboriginal people; the level of social support Aboriginal people enjoy; the sense of personal well-being and the sense of community; more than 40% rated positively AFCs' impact with regard to how well connected Aboriginal people feel to the non-Aboriginal community, to level of employment, and to how well prepared are Aboriginal peoples to find work and be employed.

The difference between these perceptions should not be seen as a divergence, but rather as the expression of situational differences. The people participating in the Impact Assessment were interviewed while they were directly involved with AFC, either as stakeholders or client. As such, there is no surprised that they reported unanimously on the positive and profound impact the AFC was having on their quality of life. The survey respondents were interviewed in a context where their involvement with the AFC was not immediate and were asked to provide general judgments based on their overall experience. It is expected that these kind of judgment would be more critical. While the qualitative assessment presents the "depth" (or the nature) of the AFCs' impact on the quality of life of its clientele, the public opinion survey reveals the extent to which this impact is felt throughout the community. From this perspective, the results are certainly positive, while it is clear that there is room for improvement regarding that impact.

## 1.9 Cost-effectiveness

The review and analysis of administrative data revealed that the average AFCP cost per participant was 29 dollars. This was calculated assuming \$15 million in AFCP funding, and 505,460 participants. When the cost was calculated for the target population the cost per participant dropped to 26 dollars. This was also based on the identified \$15 million in AFCP funding but took into consideration a total of 567,000 Aboriginal people, and included both adults and children. The amount of leverage reported was quite substantial. In 2002/03, AFCs multiplied each AFCP dollar by 8.91. The above findings suggest that while AFCP funding as a whole accounts for slightly more than one third of the non-program activities of the Centres, and approximately 13% of the total budget, AFCs in general are nevertheless able to leverage the core funding they receive from PCH in a very effective manner and are providing the AFCP with a very effective and efficient way of achieving its objectives. However, the great level of variation in funds leverage between regions and

AFCs suggest that the funding provided by AFCP is having more impact in some AFCs than in others.

A review of the documents provided no evidence that there was any overlap or duplication of work undertaken by other government departments. Interviews conducted for the impact assessment with stakeholders outside the Friendship Centres uncovered little evidence that the AFCs were duplicating the work of other organizations. Where duplication was identified, it tended to be in the larger cities. Most interviewees saw the Centres as unique in delivering culturally appropriate programs and services that complement non-Aboriginal agencies' efforts to reach out to the urban Aboriginal population. The growth in demand from the Aboriginal population is leading to more specialized and numerous agencies – a trend which will likely accelerate in the future. This said, the AFCs remain unique in their role as a well-recognized and accepted urban Aboriginal gathering place, one with an important cultural and catalytic role.

All interviewees reported that they work very hard to build partnerships so as to avoid duplication, and that they were confident there was very little if any duplication. In the rare case where there was an apparent duplication or redundancy, it would be attributable to flawed liaison/communication with other service providers. This is not to say that services provided are not similar to those provided by other agencies. Many interviewees noted that there were many similarities. But they said that all Friendship Centre programs are delivered through the filter of Aboriginal culture, which makes them unique.

## Recommendations, Management Response and Action Plan

Based on the evaluation findings and conclusions, it is recommended that:

- 1) The Program define expected outcomes related to core-funding provided to NAFC, PTAs and AFCs;

**Management Response:**

**Recommendation accepted**

Expected outcomes related to core funding to NAFC, PTAs and AFCs, such as the *capacity* of friendship centre organizations to support the interest of urban Aboriginal communities, are included in the APP RMAF.

Timeline:

RMAF approved: September 05

- 2) The Program, with NAFC and PTAs, encourage AFCs to conduct formal community needs assessments to ensure the programs and services they deliver are responsive to communities' needs.

**Management Response:**

**Recommendation accepted**

The Aboriginal Affairs Branch will work with NAFC and PTA to establish a process in which AFCs are encouraged to conduct formal community needs assessments.

Timeline:

Establish a process for AFCs needs assessments: Fall 05

- 3) The Program, with NAFC and PTAs, ensure there are no systemic barriers that prevent the full participation in and access to AFCs by all Aboriginal Peoples; and

**Management Response:**

**Recommendation accepted**

The Aboriginal Affairs Branch will work with NAFC and PTAs on AFCP policy related issues. This work will address systemic barriers that prevent the full participation in and access to AFCs by all Aboriginal Peoples.

Timeline:

Policy work completed: Fiscal year 06/07

- 4) The Program, with the NAFC and PTAs, explore how the differing circumstances of larger urban and smaller urban, rural or remote AFCs could be taken into consideration in order to maximize outcome achievement.

**Management Response:**

**Recommendation accepted**

The Aboriginal Affairs Branch will work with NAFC and PTAs on AFCP policy related issues. This work will address the differing circumstances of the various AFCs and make recommendations on how all friendship centre organizations can best maximize their outcome achievement and remain relevant in their communities.

Timeline:

Policy work completed: Fiscal year 06/07

# Appendix A: List of interviews

---

Peter Dinsdale, Executive Director, National Association of Friendship Centres

Josée Goulet, RCAAQ - Regroupement des centres d'amitié autochtones du Québec Inc.

Sylvia Maracle, OFIFC - Ontario Federation of Indian Friendship Centres

Ed Courtoreille, NT/NUFC - Northwest Territories/Nunavut Council of Friendship Centres, Hay River, Northwest Territories

Leonard Young, AFCS - Aboriginal Friendship Centres of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Ella Mayer, MAC - Manitoba Association of Friendship Centres, Winnipeg, Manitoba

Vern Jones, Soaring Eagle Friendship Centre, Hay River, Northwest Territories

Patsy Melenchuk, Dir., Admin. & Finance, Prince George Native Friendship Centre, Prince George, British Columbia

Ron Rice, Vancouver Aboriginal Friendship Centre Society, Vancouver, British Columbia

Jane Woodward, Canadian Native Friendship Centre, Edmonton, Alberta

Anita Campbell, Ma-Mow-We-Tak Friendship Centre Inc., Thompson, Manitoba

Louis Bourdeleau, Centre d'amitié autochtone de Senneterre Inc., Senneterre, Québec

Edith Cloutier, Centre d'Amitié Autochtone de Val d'Or, Val-d'Or, Québec

Rennie Simms, Labrador Friendship Centre, Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Labrador

Richard Jock, Chief Executive Officer, Assembly of First Nations

Jennifer Dickson, Executive Director, Pauktuutit Inuit Women's Association

Bob Brault, Senior Advisor, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians Division

Elizabeth Beckett, Program Consultant, Office of Prevention, Cessation and Education, Health Canada

Kevin Hill, Senior Program Officer, Aboriginal Operations, Human Resources and Skills Development Canada

Teresa Doré, Director, Aboriginal Programs Directorate, PCH

Michelle Langan, A/Manager, Aboriginal Programs, PCH

Ryan Jacobs, Program Officer, Aboriginal Programs, PCH

Wayne Restoule, Program Officer, Aboriginal Programs, PCH