

**SUMMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE  
NATIONAL STRATEGY ON COMMUNITY  
SAFETY AND CRIME PREVENTION,  
PHASE II  
Summary Report**

**February 2004**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL STRATEGY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4. EVALUATION FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
4.1 Relevance .....	3
4.1.1 Relevance of the Four Funding Programs .....	4
4.1.2 Federal Involvement in Community-level Crime Prevention.....	4
4.1.3 Priority Groups.....	5
4.2 Success .....	5
4.2.1 Partnerships.....	6
4.2.2 Coordination of Crime Prevention Activity.....	7
4.2.3 Measuring Community Capacity to Respond to Crime.....	8
4.2.4 Balance Between Social Development and Traditional Approaches to Crime Prevention.....	8
4.2.5 Integration of Project Results into NCPC Policy/Programming.....	9
4.2.6 Contribution to Strategy and Program Objectives .....	9
4.2.7 Identification of Effective/Innovative CP Approaches and Creation of CP Products .....	10
4.2.8 Leveraging and Sustainability.....	11
4.3 Program Design and Delivery .....	12
4.3.1 Administrative Processes - Weaknesses .....	12
4.3.2 Project Implementation and Evaluation.....	12
4.3.3 Promotion and Dissemination.....	13
4.3.4 Multidisciplinary Capability to be a Policy Centre.....	14
4.3.5 Implementation of Mid-Term Evaluation Recommendations .....	14
<b>5. CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>6. RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSE.....</b>	<b>15</b>

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

This is the summary report of the Summative Evaluation of Phase II of the National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention (henceforth the Strategy or NSCSCP). Phase II was implemented in 1998, with an initial funding level of \$32 million per year. In 2000, a midterm evaluation of the Strategy<sup>1</sup> was conducted to provide feedback on the overall structure and functioning of Phase II.

In July 2001, Phase II was expanded, for which additional funding of \$145 million was provided for the years 2001 to 2005. This evaluation is focused on the 1998–2001 pre-expansion period and fulfills a commitment made by the Department of Justice in its Phase II submission to Treasury Board. While this evaluation of Phase II occurs after the program was renewed and expanded, findings and recommendations from this study hopefully will prove useful to the Strategy during its expansion period and beyond.

The fact that the Summative Evaluation took place as the Expansion was being implemented means that the views of those consulted for this evaluation may have been affected by their experience and impressions of the Expansion. This evaluation does not examine or reflect on changes introduced more recently as a result of the Expansion.

## **2. OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL STRATEGY**

The Strategy is an initiative of the federal government designed to prevent crime through coordination of various partner stakeholders, facilitation of community-based solutions to crime, and increasing public awareness of effective social development approaches to the prevention of crime. The Strategy aims to reduce crime and victimization by focusing on the underlying factors that put individuals at risk, such as family violence, school problems, and drug abuse. Funding is focused on four designated priority areas: children, youth, Aboriginal persons and their communities, and the personal security of women and girls. A large number of regional and national stakeholder groups and individuals play a role in the Strategy.

Phase II of the Strategy (pre-Expansion) is composed of three elements:

- 1) the National Crime Prevention Centre which administers the Strategy and delivers the programs;

---

<sup>1</sup> *Mid-term Evaluation of the National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention Phase II*, Department of Justice, Canada (2001).

- 2) the four programs of the Safer Communities initiative which provide funds to community-level projects intended to address the root causes of crime: the Business Action Program for Crime Prevention (BAP), the Crime Prevention Investment Fund (CPIF), the Crime Prevention Partnership Program (CPPP) and the Community Mobilization Program (CMP); and
- 3) the Promotion and Public Education Program, which carries out the marketing of the Strategy.

### **3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

The objectives of the National Strategy are:

- to promote integrated action of key partners to reduce crime and victimization;
- to develop and implement community-based solutions to problems that contribute to crime and victimization, particularly as they affect children, youth, women and Aboriginal persons; and
- to increase public awareness and support for effective approaches to crime prevention.

These objectives form the basis of this evaluation. Using multiple lines of evidence, the evaluation addresses some 35 issues concerned with the continued relevance, success, design and delivery, and leveraging and sustainability of the Strategy<sup>2</sup>.

The evaluation methodology includes:

- a review of Strategy documents including previous evaluation reports of the Strategy;
- a review of the files of 108 Business Action Program (BAP) and Crime Prevention Investment Fund (CPIF) projects.
- a review of Crime Prevention Partnership Program (CPPP) and Community Mobilization Program (CMP) files (reviewed under the Project Impact Study, 2002 - a sub-study of this evaluation);
- a survey of 77 BAP and CPIF project sponsors (sponsors of the two other programs were surveyed in the Project Impact Study, as well); and
- interviews with 72 key informants representing various stakeholders in the Strategy.

---

<sup>2</sup> For detailed information on the study issues, methodology and findings, please see the *Summative Evaluation of Phase II of the National Strategy for Community and Safety Crime Prevention: Technical Report*, Department Of Justice, Canada (2003).

## **4. EVALUATION FINDINGS**

Evaluation findings are presented under the four headings of relevance, success, design and delivery, and leveraging and sustainability.

### **4.1 Relevance**

Relevance issues address whether or not the Strategy is doing the right things and if it still needs to or should keep doing them. In this way, the need for the continued existence of the program is assessed. There is also a need to reflect on the underlying rationale of the Strategy and the philosophical basis upon which it was founded. In this case, the key elements behind the rationale of the National Strategy include:

- there is a need for federal involvement in the area of community safety and crime prevention;
- through partnerships, the National Strategy will foster a more coordinated and integrated approach to crime prevention, particularly at the federal level;
- communities are in the best position to develop and implement effective crime prevention measures;
- there is a need to support a balanced approach to crime prevention, which supports both traditional and social development approaches.

For key informants, the emphasis on community partnership and raising awareness of Crime Prevention through Social Development (CPSD) are the key factors contributing to Strategy's relevance. Many thought that the need for the funding programs would continue for some time, since community capacity could not be built in the short-term. Key informants also say that there is still a need to raise public awareness of CPSD, as it is still not a well-understood concept. In this way, the objectives of the Strategy and the funding programs are seen as relevant since they emphasize raising public awareness and the engagement of all sectors of society in CPSD through partnerships and community involvement.

#### **4.1.1 Relevance of the Four Funding Programs**

The four funding programs under the Safer Communities Initiative are described as follows:

- The Community Mobilization Program (CMP) is intended to help communities develop comprehensive and sustainable approaches to crime prevention and undertake activities that deal with the root causes of crime.
- The Crime Prevention Partnership Program (CPPP) aims to support the involvement of organizations across the country that can contribute to community crime prevention activities through the development and dissemination of information, tools, and resources that facilitate community participation in all phases of crime prevention.
- The Crime Prevention Investment Fund (CPIF) supports promising and innovative crime prevention through social development demonstration projects in high-need areas across the country.
- And the Business Action Program on Crime Prevention (BAPCP) aims to engage the private sector as active partners, leaders, and resources on crime prevention within communities and, through their efforts, raise public awareness about crime prevention.

The objectives of the four funding programs appear to be complementary. Taken together, they should support federal involvement in community safety and crime prevention, foster a range of partnerships and greater coordination and integration of crime prevention efforts as well as stimulating community-based development and implementation of crime prevention measures. Such an investment in crime prevention would contribute to a greater balance between traditional and social development approaches to crime prevention. As such, the objectives of the four Safer Communities funding programs are seen here and by a majority of stakeholders to be very relevant. As well, the community focus of the Strategy continues to be seen by a majority of stakeholders as appropriate for addressing the root causes of crime.

#### **4.1.2 Federal Involvement in Community-level Crime Prevention**

More specifically, most key informants thought that federal government involvement in community-level crime prevention activities is appropriate, needed and complementary to what municipal and provincial/territorial governments do in this respect. Continued need at the community level, leadership and resources are identified as the predominant rationales for continuing federal involvement.

### **4.1.3 Priority Groups**

Overall, while most key informants feel that there is a continued need to target resources on each of the four priority groups, some groups are seen to be favoured over others. Based on the samples of projects reviewed, the evaluation notes that the Strategy priority groups of youth (13-17 years) and children (12 years and under) were the primary foci of virtually all funded projects. While there were regional variations, overall there was less frequent focus on the other two priority groups of women and girls and Aboriginal persons, particularly the latter group.

Since criminal behaviour is seen to originate at an early age, it was felt that to be effective, crime prevention activities should be targeted on the priority groups of “children” and “youth”. Also, it was felt by some key informants that other initiatives and programs provided by other departments and levels of government also address the priority group ‘women and girls’.

Half of the key informants see no need for additional priority groups. The remaining respondents most frequently suggest visible minorities, persons with disabilities, and gays/lesbians as potential new priority groups. This evaluation did not document information that would support adding these groups as additional priorities and the question of new priority groups would need to be explored further. According to the file review, other than strategy priority groups, “families”, the “community in general” and “young adults” were the groups most frequently targeted by funded projects.

## **4.2 Success**

Success issues look at what has been accomplished as a result of the Strategy and the extent to which its objectives have been achieved. There is a need to reflect on the appropriateness of the design of the Strategy to support the achievement of the objectives, since the program infrastructure developed for the National Strategy is relatively new. Another issue concerns the clarity of roles within the NCPC and with external advisory bodies, the Department of Justice and the Ministry of the Solicitor General, and more generally to other federal departments and provincial/territorial partners. A final consideration is the capacity of the NCPC to monitor performance and to integrate results information into its decision-making processes.

#### **4.2.1 Partnerships**

As noted above, a key objective of the Strategy is to promote integrated action of key partners to reduce crime and victimization. Partnerships are perceived as promoting better networking, mobilization, information sharing, and financial and in-kind contributions. Furthermore, they are perceived as a means by which strategic thinking on how best to address the root causes of crime could occur.

There is ample evidence that the Strategy has been effective in encouraging the participation of social development NGOs and community groups in addressing the root causes of crime and victimization. There are a wide variety of partner organizations participating in funded projects. These include provincial and territorial governments, NGOs, education organizations, police and criminal justice organizations, social service organizations, business and business associations. Partnerships are found to vary not only by funding program but also by region. The variety of partner organizations suggests that broad-based participation in crime prevention is being achieved. Broad-based participation is believed to contribute to the effectiveness and innovativeness of projects by bringing multi-sectoral expertise to the crime prevention “table”.

For a majority of key informants, the Strategy has not been as successful in engaging the private sector. How key informants arrive at this conclusion is not clear. From the survey, key informants suggest that the percentage of funded projects including businesses as partners are 34 percent of CMP, 10 percent of CPPP, 11 per cent of CPIF and 27 per cent of BAP<sup>3</sup>. While this question was not part of the file reviews of the CPIF and the BAP, the file reviews of the CMP and the CPPP indicate that the percentages of funded projects including businesses as partners are 21 percent for the CMP and 29 per cent for the CPPP<sup>4</sup>. While the file review data is limited, 21 per cent of CMP and 29 per cent of CPPP projects including businesses as partners suggests that the Strategy has, in fact, had considerable success in involving the private sector as partners in crime prevention projects. It might be worthwhile for the NCPC to consider and communicate to stakeholders what constitutes success when it comes to engaging the private sector in the Strategy.

---

<sup>3</sup> BNCP key informants noted that there were a number of reasons for the lack of success in involving the private sector. These reasons included the fact that the BNCP had been without a director for a period of time, there were insufficient resources allocated to the program, and the BAP is still in its infancy.

<sup>4</sup> It should be noted that the CMP files reviewed had incomplete documentation and that partnerships were also created after projects were up and running. It can be surmised that this accounts for much of the response difference between the survey of project sponsors and the file review. The discrepancy between the CPPP survey and file review is more difficult to explain. Potentially, there could be a definitional issue causing problems. These discrepancies may need to be explored further in any future evaluations.



The majority of CPIF and BAP project sponsors said they were satisfied with their partnerships. Partnerships have been, according to key informants, not only successful but also sustaining. Almost all of the key informants agree that partnerships were necessary for the success of the Strategy. Partnerships are seen as the means for obtaining community buy-in and sharing of responsibility for crime prevention. Partnerships are serving to promote networking, mobilization, information sharing, and are contributing to sustaining financial and in-kind contributions.

#### **4.2.2 Coordination of Crime Prevention Activity**

Most key informants think that federal government departments do not work well together in crime prevention. With at least ten departments involved in the Strategy, managing any overlap between departments and the challenges involved in developing a shared focus are seen to be major obstacles to coordination of crime prevention activity at the federal level.

The majority of key informants think that the Strategy has been effective in coordination with provincial/territorial governments. However, it was felt that more effort was needed to enhance coordination with municipalities where understanding and awareness of CPSD and the Strategy is believed to be low.

Most key informants feel that the Strategy was doing a reasonably good job of fostering a more horizontal/integrated approach to crime prevention (across levels of government and the private sector). Only the representatives of other Department of Justice initiatives (DOJI) felt that the Strategy could be doing a better job in this respect.

While the evaluation could not document specific issues or examples, key informants feel that there is a general problem with regard to coordination of crime prevention activities within the Department of Justice. It is felt that there is little in the way of mechanisms in place to enhance this type of coordination. For instance, for the pre-expansion period, all DOJI key informants felt themselves to be aware of, at least, the basics of Strategy activities, but less of the details. Through the interviews, some DOJI suggested that they had a low level of understanding of exactly what the NCPC did. This may be due, in part, to the perception among some DOJI representatives that the NCPC does not do enough to share information and keep other groups apprised of what they do. However, by the same token, it is equally possible that other DOJI could be doing more in this respect.

### **4.2.3 Measuring Community Capacity to Respond to Crime**

Almost all key informants indicate that the Strategy has helped to increase community capacity to respond to crime and victimization issues. According to ninety-one per cent of key informants, the Strategy has helped to build community capacity by: providing funding that has enabled communities to get organized and take some action; increase awareness/educating; share lessons learned about CPSD; develop tools/resources; develop skills among community members (e.g., proposal writing and project management); and facilitate the development of partnerships, networking and mobilization of people and resources. Qualifications include: much funding has been provided in communities where there was some pre-existing capacity; tools have been developed but not always disseminated due to a lack of funding; community mobilization is difficult to measure; and there is a lack of follow-up on CMP funding, so communities are still reacting on an incident-by-incident basis.

The evaluation is not able to assess the extent to which the Strategy has helped to increase community capacity to respond to crime, as there was, at the time this study was conducted, insufficient evaluation evidence on which to base this assessment.

### **4.2.4 Balance Between Social Development and Traditional Approaches to Crime Prevention**

While all key informants acknowledge that the Strategy is focused on CPSD (in accordance with its mandate), some disagree on whether or not it was ever within the mandate of the Strategy to strike a balance between CPSD and traditional approaches to crime prevention. Others note that some progress has been made but more work needs to be done to find the optimal balance between, and to integrate, the two approaches. Some voiced the opinion that the national vision of CPSD provides a balance to the traditional reactive response to crime adopted by some provinces/territories and communities. Of those who indicated that the emphasis on CPSD vis-à-vis traditional methods of crime prevention has been less than ideal, their concerns focus on what is perceived to be insufficient involvement of traditional players such as the police and the lack of integration of CPSD with traditional approaches on the crime prevention continuum.

#### **4.2.5 Integration of Project Results into NCPC Policy/Programming**

Key informants point to a need for improved integration of project results into policy and programming decisions. About half of the interviewees said that project results were being integrated at least to some extent. A few noted that CPIF, in particular, showed promise in this respect and the file review supports this view as well.

Insufficient dissemination was frequently mentioned by key informants as contributing to the problem of a lack of integration of project results into NCPC policy and program decisions. According to key informants, project results could potentially have a greater influence on policy and programming if there was more comprehensive distribution of project and evaluation results to and within the NCPC.

#### **4.2.6 Contribution to Strategy and Program Objectives**

There is a general consensus among key informants that the strategy's funding programs contributed to the achievement of Strategy objectives at least to some extent. Key informants saw the four funding programs as primarily contributing towards the goals of *assisting communities in developing community-based solutions to crime* and *promoting integrated action of key governmental and non-governmental partners*. They also saw funding programs as making contributions toward *increased public awareness and support*, although to a somewhat lesser degree.

For Phase II of the Strategy, there are some reservations about the extent to which funding programs have contributed to the achievement of the strategy's objectives. In particular, the review of CMP project files reveals few needs assessments of projects and evaluations of project outcomes or results. Given that the CMP does not include a systematic requirement for needs assessments nor are evaluations done of funded projects, it is difficult to assess or explain the extent to which CMP funding is contributing to the attainment of strategy objectives. In the case of the CMP, it would be worthwhile if some mechanism were put in place or if the Fund could be more systematic about how funded projects have or are contributing to the attainment of strategy objectives.

Key informants generally perceive the programs to have attained their own objectives at least to some extent. It was felt, however, that objectives can be better attained by: raising awareness of the projects' products through enhanced information sharing and evaluation; increasing

community “buy-in” in projects; and augmenting human resources to support implementation, monitoring, and communications.

#### **4.2.7 Identification of Effective/Innovative CP Approaches and Creation of CP Products**

A key objective of Phase II of the National Strategy is to increase public awareness and support for effective approaches to crime prevention. After five years, the National Strategy was expected to have produced, among other things, an increase in the capacity of communities to respond to crime and victimization and an increased knowledge about effective crime prevention. In the longer term, it was expected that this result would contribute to reduced crime and victimization and the fear of crime as well as an increase in support and resources for alternatives to traditional criminal justice responses to crime.

At the time of the evaluation, half of the key informants were able to identify effective and innovative crime prevention approaches funded under the Strategy. Of those who did identify approaches, most mentioned more process-type results such as awareness-raising and encouraging participation in the projects, rather than crime prevention, per se.

On the basis of the survey and file review findings, it can be concluded that funded projects have been successfully implemented and have had some positive impacts that contribute to the formal goals and objectives of the National Strategy programs. The findings from the review of project files/reports generally support the perceptions and opinions expressed by key informants, lending credibility to the latter findings. Unfortunately, many of the project files/reports that were reviewed had limited information and documentation, in particular, pertaining to project impacts. Thus “hard” evidence of project impacts was difficult to obtain for the purpose of this study.

According to the program profile for Phase II, the funding programs, Research and Policy and Communications, Promotion and Public Education were all to participate in and be responsible for some aspect of researching, analyzing or disseminating lessons learned; Communications, Promotion and Public Education could not realistically do this alone. About a quarter of key informants suggested that insufficient evaluation and communication infrastructures contributed to the lack of knowledge on the effectiveness of funded approaches. The review of the BAP and CPIF project files, in particular, certainly appears to support this; few projects had actual outcomes that could be reported on at this point.

#### **4.2.8 Leveraging and Sustainability**

Leveraging concerns the extent to which the federal investment in crime prevention has leveraged additional support for crime prevention (in terms of additional funding, in-kind support or in terms of providing communications support). In simple terms, leveraging means using funds already secured from one source (in this case the federal government) to attract additional investment from other partners. Sustainability here is the extent to which the projects supported under the National Strategy have continued after federal funding has been discontinued.

There is ample evidence, both quantitative administrative data as well as perceptual evidence from the key informant and project sponsor interviews to suggest that federal government funding through the Strategy has enabled sponsors to leverage additional support, particularly non-financial resources. Most project partners offered in-kind contributions and participated in networking/mobilization, and approximately half also provided financial contributions. A review of BAP and CPIF project files suggests that CPIF committed funding amounted to \$30,652,402, which leveraged an additional \$35,654,649 from project partners. According to the budgets submitted by project sponsors, BAP committed funding was \$3,395,541 and leveraged an additional \$10,441,412.74 from project partners. Project partners typically delivered as much or even more than they originally promised.

Regarding sustainability, most key informants are of the opinion that, once funding for a project ends, the project ends. However, the survey of project sponsors under the Project Impact Study revealed that 74 per cent of completed CMP projects and 65 per cent of CPPP projects continued after federal funding ended. As such, over half of the CMP and CPPP projects were sustainable beyond the period of federal funding, particularly projects serving youth. Most of these projects lasted for two years or less after the termination of program funding. 29 per cent of CMP and 14 per cent of CPPP projects continued after program funding for two years or more. Moreover, three-quarters of these projects secured financial and/or in-kind contributions from alternative sources, typically some of the same and some new partners, to enable them to continue their work.

With respect to BAP and the CPIF, four sponsors of the seven completed BAP projects indicated that their projects continued after BAP funding ended, while for the four completed CPIF projects, only one sponsor indicated that the project continued after funding had ended.

All sponsoring organizations in the survey have continued to be involved in community safety and crime prevention.

### **4.3 Program Design and Delivery**

This component of the evaluation assesses the appropriateness of the program design to support the achievement of the objectives of the National Strategy. The study focused on process and management issues with an emphasis on providing recommendations (if required) to change or fine-tune the management structure of the National Strategy in the future. The evaluation examined coordination and integration mechanisms that have been put in place to support the federal and federal/provincial/territorial linkages. In addition, the evaluation looked at the efficiency and effectiveness of the administrative processes supporting the grants and contributions funding programs. And finally, the capacity of the performance measurement strategy and associated data collection practices to support the ongoing monitoring and management of the National Strategy were examined.

For most aspects of program administration, over half of the sponsors reported being satisfied. However, there are few program administrative processes with which large proportions of sponsors were very satisfied.

#### **4.3.1 Administrative Processes - Weaknesses**

Project sponsors gave low ratings for: program marketing (in particular for the BAP and the CPIF); clarity of application requirements (in particular for the CPIF); and timeliness of program response (CPIF). Staff issues (turnover and insufficient staff) at NCPC are the most frequently mentioned factor hampering delivery and outcomes. Also identified are communication and dissemination, and poor management of expectations up-front during the application/funding process.

#### **4.3.2 Project Implementation and Evaluation**

All project sponsors, but particularly sponsors of BAP projects, said their projects were implemented as planned. Sponsors of CMP projects were the least likely to have said this. The primary reasons for why projects were not implemented as planned included: insufficient time

and money for implementation, and low target group participation and partner involvement. BAP and CPIF sponsors were not satisfied with the guidance on project implementation and delivery provided by the Project Advisory Committee established for their project.

Two-thirds of CPIF evaluators were satisfied with their relationship with the NCPC in facilitating the implementation and delivery of their evaluation. However, two-thirds of sponsors did not find it easy to integrate the evaluation process into their projects.

### **4.3.3 Promotion and Dissemination**

The fact that, before Phase II of the Strategy, NGOs' awareness of the Strategy was low and that NGOs currently represent a large proportion of project sponsors suggests awareness of the Strategy has risen significantly among NGOs.

However, word of mouth remains the main source of awareness for project sponsors of each program. Much smaller proportions heard about the program through other projects and the NCPC newsletter and publications. Indeed, only five per cent of CMP project sponsors indicated that they learned about the program from NCPC publications.

The review of Strategy documents and its website indicates that a wide variety of products (tools, newsletters, reports) have been produced. The material available on the website is more plentiful, better organized and accessible than it was in the summer of 2002.

In general, key informants see dissemination as problematic and the reason for a number of other shortcomings, such as a lack of integration of project results in NCPC policy and programming. On the other hand, sponsors perceive their own dissemination efforts to be quite successful.

There has been an increase in demand for Strategy products in hardcopy form, suggesting, to some extent, that public understanding and interest in CPSD is increasing. However, there is no evidence of the degree to which these products have been found useful or are increasing CPSD awareness, let alone reducing crime.

NCPC is a founding member and provides funding for the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime (ICPC) and a NCPC representative sits on the Policy Committee of the ICPC. The NCPC has participated in and made contributions to several other international initiatives.

#### **4.3.4 Multidisciplinary Capability to be a Policy Centre**

Key informants, generally, felt that the NCPC was able to manage the Strategy in a cross-departmental manner to some extent. However, the general consensus among key informants from other Department of Justice Initiatives (DOJI) was that the NCPC is not viewed as a policy centre for crime and victimization issues in the federal government.

For their part, Inter-departmental Working Group (IWG) members gave the NCPC a somewhat low rating when asked the extent to which the NCPC was able to manage the Strategy in a cross-departmental manner.

A number of key informants from different groups indicated that part of the problem with having the NCPC recognized as the policy centre for crime and victimization issues (since, as a multidisciplinary initiative, it could potentially become a focal point for policy development in these areas) had to do with the lack of an overarching structure in which to carry out policy collaboration across DOJ initiatives and other government departments. There was also some question concerning whether or not there was the necessary resources (human, financial, expertise) available to meet the challenges of working horizontally.

#### **4.3.5 Implementation of Mid-Term Evaluation Recommendations**

Progress has been made overall, though slowly. In general, recommendations regarding greater coordination, improved organizational structure, and stronger policy/research/evaluation capacity are seen as having been implemented to a greater extent than other recommendations. Recommendations regarding tailored strategies at the community level, a greater focus on sustainability, and more effective promotion/communications are seen as being in the process of implementation during Phase II with accelerated progress hampered to some extent by a lack of human resources.

### **5. CONCLUSIONS**

The logic of Phase II of the NSCSCP is that after five years the National Strategy is expected to produce, among other things, an increase in the capacity of communities to respond to crime and victimization and an increased knowledge about effective crime prevention. As a result and in



the longer term, it is expected that the Strategy will reduce crime and victimization and the fear of crime as well as increase support and resources for alternatives to traditional criminal justice responses to crime.

Through its funding programs, the NSCSCP has increased investment in community-based crime prevention and the number of community-based crime prevention projects. For the most part, projects have been successfully implemented and have had some positive impacts that contribute to the goals and objectives of the National Strategy. Results vary depending on the program, but most projects are successful in securing alternate sources of funding and continue after program funding had ended.

There are a wide variety of organizations that have partnered in funded projects and this suggests that there is broad-based participation in the Strategy. While at the beginning of Phase II of the Strategy, a majority of NGOs and community-based agencies were not very aware of the mandate of the Strategy, let alone its products and funding opportunities, today, the majority of initiatives are sponsored by NGOs and community-based agencies and this would suggest that awareness of the strategy has risen considerably.

The Strategy has produced a wide variety of crime prevention tools and resources. While promising, it is unfortunate that it cannot be determined at this time the extent to which these tools and resources are useful or have contributed to increased knowledge about effective crime prevention.

This evaluation concludes that the National Strategy has had varying success but, overall, has demonstrated positive movement towards the achievement of its short- and medium-term objectives. Following the logic of Phase II of the NSCSCP, it is reasonable to expect that, in time, the long-term objectives of the Strategy are likely to be achieved as well.

## **6. RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSE**

**Programs:** The evaluation suggests that there is a need for some structural changes to program administration. The primary suggestion is to have more structured communications among the four funding programs so that, for example, when a CMP project has proven to be successful, there should be a clear mechanism in place to expand the project via one of the other funding programs, or when a project is deemed inappropriate for one program, that it be referred to another program.

- 1. The NCPC should review the extent to which coverage of the funding programs should be and is complimentary to each other and identify and implement opportunities that will contribute to more integrated funding coverage where needed.**

**Management Response:** Many responsibilities within the NCPC are crosscutting and overlap with other groups within the NCPC. It is for this reason that we support this recommendation. Within NCPC's Strategic Plan its intention is to finalize a decision-making framework designed to identify roles and responsibilities in a clear, cohesive and efficient fashion. The NCPC is committed to the effective delivery of the National Crime Prevention Strategy and is currently working on a CMP Evaluation Strategy with the intention of developing similar evaluation strategies for the other Safer Communities Initiative Programs. These Evaluation Strategies will include standardized final reporting templates to assist NCPC in identifying where there are gaps in knowledge and should allow for more structured communications among the Strategy's funding programs.

- 2. To support internal coordination and external delivery, the NCPC should assess the extent of administrative integration between funding programs and identify and implement opportunities for better administrative integration.**

**Management Response:** NCPC will assess its current coordination and delivery mechanisms. In part this will be accomplished by developing a procedures manual that will outline a clear set of administrative policies, procedures and directives designed to enhance integration of its funding programs. In addition, as part of this review, NCPC will examine the current operational structure of its funding programs in an effort to determine their continued applicability and, if determined necessary, identify alternative delivery models. Timeframes for the development of the procedures manual as well as the review of its funding programs will be dependent on available resources.

- 3. A measure(s) should be put in place so that the NCPC is able or more systematic in assessing the extent to which CMP funded projects are contributing to Strategy objectives.**

**Management Response:** Building on the revised CMP Application Kit, NCPC is initiating work on a CMP Evaluation Strategy. The evaluation strategy will include a revised program and a project-level CMP logic model, as well as final reporting template. The combination of the revised Application Kit and the Evaluation Strategy will provide NCPC with the opportunity to

systematically track funded CMP projects to better ensure the activities and anticipated outcomes of CMP funded projects are contributing to the Strategy's objectives.

**Communication:** The Promotion and Public Education Program of the National Strategy plays an integral role in ensuring the progress and overall success of the Strategy's goal and objectives. This evaluation reaffirms a finding from the 2001 mid-term evaluation that there is a need to strengthen the dissemination and marketing of the Strategy. As of this evaluation, word of mouth remains the main source of awareness with respect to the Strategy and the funding programs.

Further, while there are numerous examples of tools and resources developed with Strategy funding and indications these products are being distributed, there is no clear indication of the degree to which these products have been found useful or are increasing CPSD awareness. Also, the finding that only half of the key informants were able to identify effective and innovative crime prevention approaches funded under the Strategy and that most mentioned more process-type results rather than crime prevention per se suggests that the strategy is either having limited success in either identifying effective crime prevention practices or increasing knowledge among stakeholders of those practices or both.

More follow-up and evaluation activities would help to assess effective crime prevention practices, the communication of these practices and the utility of Strategy communication products. More effective dissemination would contribute to a greater understanding of the Strategy generally, increased community awareness of and capacity/"buy-in" in crime prevention through social development in particular, and a greater likelihood that the objectives of the funding programs will be reached.

**4. It is recommended that the NCPC endeavour to identify effective crime prevention practices and implement new and/or enhanced measures that will increase knowledge of effective practices among stakeholders.**

**Management Response:** NCPC will continue doing this primarily through the Safer Communities Initiative. More specifically, funding programs like the Crime Prevention Investment Fund program that are designed to support both the implementation and rigorous independent evaluation of innovative program models with the goal of determining key components of successful programs and the potential for these new approaches to be replicated in other settings across the country. In addition, it is anticipated that the recently developed CMP Application Kit and soon to be developed CMP Evaluation Strategy will support NCPC in its knowledge development areas. We note that NCPC's program funding areas are just one

component of the knowledge development arena and that current initiatives such as the Knowledge Development in Focus Areas exercise linked to NCPC's Strategic Plan have moved the Centre further forward with regards to knowledge development. Other areas of the NCPC strategic plan like the Public Awareness strategic priority (in place to ultimately ensure that Canadians are aware of, and understand the concept and benefits of using a crime prevention through social development approach) will develop a communications/public education strategy to promote the broader efforts and objectives of the National Strategy. This communications/public education strategy will identify target audiences in order to develop key messages for maximum impact.

**5. It is recommended that the NCPC assess the effectiveness of the dissemination and marketing of the Strategy.**

**Management Response:** As part of NCPC's Public Education Campaign, and its Strategic Plan, the Centre will be undertaking a variety of evaluations of its dissemination and marketing activities. The intention is to get a better sense of the effectiveness of these activities in communicating the Strategy's experiences and knowledge. In addition, it is anticipated in the final year of the Strategy's expansion that a communication's sub-study will be supplement the work coordinated through the NCPC Strategic Plan.

**Coordination:** There were mixed views on the extent to which the Strategy has enhanced coordination of crime prevention activity. On the one hand, coordination was seen as having been enhanced under the Strategy, particularly with provincial/territorial governments. On the other hand, the Strategy was seen as somewhat lacking with respect to coordination with municipalities and within the federal government and, particularly, the Department of Justice.

**6. It is recommended that the NCPC identify and pursue specific opportunities/strategies to enhance coordination with municipalities.**

**Management Response:** As part of the new Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness the National Crime Prevention Centre is prepared to continue its existing coordination efforts as well as pursue new opportunities/strategies within the Federal Government with a specific focus on municipalities. There is a growing acceptance among key stakeholders within Canada and around the world that crime and victimization levels can be significantly reduced through a comprehensive city/community wide approach. As such, through its Strategic Plan NCPC is currently coordinating its efforts with other federal departments to integrate or fill gaps where there is already significant crime prevention activity

in a given city/community. This strategic priority is based on the assumption that NCPC is now ready to work with partners to plan and implement a limited number of comprehensive safer city/community strategies. It is anticipated that the knowledge gained from these comprehensive city/community interventions will inform critical policy and programming crime prevention decisions at all levels of government. The timeframe for the implementation of opportunities/strategies to enhance coordination with municipalities is dependent on both human resources/staffing and resource constraints.

**Inter and Intra-departmental Coordination:** When asked about NCPC's ability to manage the Strategy in a cross-departmental manner, Inter-departmental Working Group members gave the NCPC a relatively low rating of 2.2 on a 5-point scale. IWG members identified managing the overlap between departments and the difficulty in developing a shared focus as almost insurmountable obstacles to effective inter-departmental coordination on crime prevention. A number of key informants for this evaluation suggested that there has been collaboration regarding crime prevention-related activity among federal departments, but mainly on an ad hoc basis. Also, key informants suggested that limited resources across departments (especially human resources) and "red-tape" were added challenges to interdepartmental coordination. The consensus was, however, that, even if the Strategy was having difficulties in fostering a more horizontal/integrative approach, the NCPC was on the right track and that progress has been made.

Similarly, when asked about the extent to which the Strategy has contributed to enhanced coordination of crime prevention activity among DOJ initiatives, many key informants suggested that there was a general challenge with regard to coordination of crime prevention activities within the Department and a specific challenge with respect to coordination between NCPC and other DOJ in particular.

Also, representatives of other DOJ expressed concerns about overlap between their initiative and the Strategy, suggesting that their specific initiative had objectives similar to the Strategy. Finally, there is a perception among DOJ representatives that the NCPC may not be doing enough to share information and keep other groups informed of what it is doing.

This evaluation did not specifically assess whether the NCPC was doing enough to share information with other groups nor whether other DOJ were doing as much or more in this respect. However, feedback from key informants generally and IWG and DOJ representatives in particular with respect to NCPC's success in managing the strategy inter and intra-departmentally would indicate potential issues that should be explored further.

- 7. It is recommended that the NCPC engage in more proactive consultations with representatives of DOJ initiatives on how to better communicate and coordinate crime prevention activities.**

**Management Response:** The NCPC is committed to enhancing existing communication and coordination of the federal government's crime prevention activities. As part of the new Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness the NCPC will pursue new opportunities to consult with other federal departments. This level of coordination is designed to fill gaps in knowledge specific to the field of crime prevention. Where there are gaps in knowledge identified, NCPC will, as appropriate, coordinate with other federal initiatives to increase its knowledge base. For instance, through NCPC's Strategic Plan Comprehensive Community-Based Strategies priority area it will seek to integrate or fill gaps where there is already significant crime prevention activity in a given community and coordinate efforts by joining partnerships with other federal, provincial/territorial and municipal sectors.

**Multidisciplinary Capability to be a Policy Centre:** Within the general issue of coordination are doubts about NCPC's ability to serve as a policy centre for crime and victimization issues in the federal government. A basic problem was said to lie with the lack of an overarching structure in which to carry out policy collaboration across DOJ initiatives and other government departments.

- 8. It is recommended that the NCPC explore challenges associated with a horizontal and integrated approach to crime prevention at the federal level and options that might encourage greater collaboration and integration of crime prevention activities and policy across government departments.**

**Management Response:** Launched in 1998 by the Departments of Justice Canada and Solicitor General Canada, the National Strategy is built upon horizontal partnerships. With the creation of the new Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness the administration of the National Strategy is now the responsibility of one federal department. The NCPC is committed to enhancing and strengthening its capacity for linkages and partnerships with other federal departments. Through a series of measures, including the Comprehensive Community-Based priority area of NCPC's Strategic Plan, the NCPC will consider and adopt improvements that will encourage greater collaboration and integration of crime prevention activities in Canada.

**Organizational Structure:** There was consensus among interviewees and this evaluation notes that progress has been made since the mid-term to improve organizational structures within the NCPC and regional offices. Staffing challenges, including insufficient staff and turnover of staff, however, were the most frequently mentioned factors hampering the quality and timely across the board delivery and achievement of strategy objectives. For example, a July 2002 NCPC organization chart shows that, at that time, 33 per cent of positions overall and 53 percent of positions in Program Development and Delivery were not staffed. Subsequent expansion of the strategy without additional resources for program delivery as well as a hiring freeze in 2002 can only continue to limit implementation of the Strategy as originally planned.

**9. It is recommended that the NCPC assess at the earliest opportunity the impact of staffing challenges and resourcing levels on its ability to deliver the Strategy as planned.**

**Management Response:** It is anticipated that within the new environment at Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness and with a renewed commitment for the National Crime Prevention Strategy opportunities will be present to address these issues in a more complete and systematic way. However, NCPC supports this recommendation and it will introduce a number of sub-studies to final year of its evaluation in an effort to determine the impact these challenges had on the National Strategy.

## MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN (MAP)

Summative Evaluation of Phase II of the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS), covering 1998/2001 (Final report, DOJ: February 2004)

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION	ACTION BY	DATE
<p><b>Recommendation 1</b></p> <p>The NCPC should review the extent to which coverage of the funding programs should be and is complementary to each other and identify and implement opportunities that will contribute to more integrated funding coverage where needed.</p>	<p>NCPC's internal and external consultations, as part of its current renewal process, as well as its recent involvement in PSEPC Grants and Contributions Departmental Review, have provided a good opportunity to take stock and revisit funding activities and programs. The current drafting of new sets of Terms and Conditions benefits from these recent exercises and will contribute to a greater integration of NCPC's funding programs. As a result, NCPC is proposing a renewed and streamlined program funding platform, going from 6 to 3 programs.</p> <p>Also, the development of program evaluation strategies for its anticipated new funding streams has been set up as a high priority for 2005-2006. Drawing from what had already been accomplished through the development of a streamlined CMP application guide, NCPC will develop tools and resources (from standardized application forms to final reporting templates) to assist NCPC in identifying gaps in knowledge, and to allow for more structured communications among the Strategy's funding programs. NCPC has also commissioned an evaluation of the Strategic Fund; its results will contribute to redesigning the Strategy's programs with a focus on integration. In addition, an in-house NCPC-wide evaluation training is currently underway, to provide programs officers with the proper skills to reinforce the evaluation component right from the project development stage. All those activities aim toward a more coherent program environment.</p>	<p>Mgmt team PDD<sup>1</sup> Unit Evaluation Unit</p>	<p>2005 and ongoing</p>

<sup>1</sup> Program Development and Delivery



## MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN (MAP)

Summative Evaluation of Phase II of the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS), covering 1998/2001 (Final report, DOJ: February 2004)

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION	ACTION BY	DATE
<b>Recommendation 2</b> To support internal coordination and external delivery, the NCPC should assess the extent of administrative integration between funding programs and identify and implement opportunities for better administrative integration.	As part of the process of preparing for renewal NCPC assessed its current coordination and delivery mechanisms. The ongoing implementation of the Grants & Contributions Informanagement System (GCIMS), and the development of a CMP application guide specifically designed to feed into the GCIMS database, are certainly important steps undertaken toward integrated program delivery.	Mgmt team PDD Unit Evaluation Unit	2004 and ongoing
	In addition, as part of its renewal process, NCPC have examined the current operational structure of its funding programs in an effort to determine their continued applicability. As a result, NCPC has proposed a renewed and streamlined program funding platform, going from 6 to 3 programs.	Mgmt team PDD Unit Evaluation Unit	Fall 2004
	Transitions Committees set up to elaborate the anticipated renewed Strategy program delivery environment, will be tasked to develop procedures manual that will outline a clear set of administrative policies, procedures and directives designed to enhance integration of funding programs. Timeframes for the development of the procedures manual as well as the review of its funding programs will be dependent on available resources.	Mgmt team PDD Unit Evaluation Unit	Spring 2005

## MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN (MAP)

Summative Evaluation of Phase II of the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS), covering 1998/2001 (Final report, DOJ: February 2004)

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION	ACTION BY	DATE
<p><b>Recommendation 3</b></p> <p>A measure(s) should be put in place so that the NCPC is able or more systematic in assessing the extent to which CMP funded projects are contributing to Strategy objectives.</p>	<p>The transformation of the NCPS overall program delivery framework is an underpinning dimension of its renewal process. Building on the experience gained from its program funding activities during the Expansion, a renewed Strategy will streamline funding from 6 to 3 programs, which will respond to community needs for increased access, a simplified funding process, longer-term funding and increased ground level support. This will translate into the possibility to grow projects from smaller one year activities to more comprehensive multi-years efforts, allowing time for initiatives to demonstrate an impact.</p> <p>A more strategic and integrated approach also means fewer but bigger projects, benefiting from additional monitoring and ongoing audit activities. By embedding the renewed Strategy's overarching knowledge development component, the funding programs will increasingly provide evidence toward the Strategy's objectives.</p>	<p>Mgmt team PDD Unit Evaluation Unit</p> <p>Mgmt team</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>2005 and ongoing</p>

## MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN (MAP)

Summative Evaluation of Phase II of the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS), covering 1998/2001 (Final report, DOJ: February 2004)

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION	ACTION BY	DATE
<p><b>Recommendation 4</b></p> <p>It is recommended that the NCPC endeavour to identify effective crime prevention practices and implement new and/or enhanced measures that will increase knowledge of effective practices among stakeholders.</p>	<p>Given the proper renewal resources, the NCPC plans to implement a thorough knowledge development/transfer strategy. Supported by a dedicated Knowledge Development Unit, by a funding stream specifically focusing on research and knowledge development, by an in-house clearing house, and closely tied in with a strategic research agenda, this knowledge development and transfer function will become an integrated and overarching feature in NCPC's operational structure and organizational culture. As outlined in its priorities for 2005-2006, the NCPC will also seek to enhance partnerships with academics and crime prevention researchers and practioners, both at the national and international levels, to promote and support the advancement of effective prevention approaches to crime and victimization. Such a knowledge development and dissemination mechanism will insure NCPC is well positioned to properly demonstrate the fulfillment of its mandate.</p>	<p>Mgmt team KD Unit<sup>2</sup></p>	<p>2005 and ongoing</p>

<sup>2</sup> Knowledge development Unit. This Unit, and its name, are still tentative at this point.

## MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN (MAP)

**Summative Evaluation of Phase II of the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS), covering 1998/2001 (Final report, DOJ: February 2004)**

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION	ACTION BY	DATE
<b>Recommendation 5</b> It is recommended that the NCPC assess the effectiveness of the dissemination and marketing of the Strategy.	As mentioned in the Mid-term Evaluation of the Expansion of phase II of the NCPS, Public education, Research and CPSD awareness were directly affected by cutbacks during year II and III of the Strategy's Expansion. Thus, the various initiatives undertaken that were envisioned to assess effectiveness of the dissemination and marketing of the Strategy were still only works in progress January 2004.	Mgmt team Communications Unit	2003-2004
	The integrated knowledge development and dissemination mechanism depicted in recommendation 4 will provide additional channels through which measurement of usage of NCPC products and CPSD awareness will be possible. Embedded in the renewed Strategy's RMAF, adequate performance indicators will be developed to determine what happens to NCPC products (who uses them and how). It will be this new Knowledge Development Unit responsibility to gather and provide the required data.	Mgmt team KD Unit Evaluation Unit	2005 and ongoing

## MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN (MAP)

Summative Evaluation of Phase II of the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS), covering 1998/2001 (Final report, DOJ: February 2004)

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION	ACTION BY	DATE
<p><b>Recommendation 6</b></p> <p>It is recommended that the NCPC identify and pursue specific opportunities/strategies to enhance coordination with municipalities.</p>	<p>As part of the new Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness the National Crime Prevention Centre has been poised to continue its existing coordination efforts as well as to pursue new opportunities and strategies within the Federal Government with a focus on municipalities. There is a growing acceptance among key stakeholders within Canada and around the world that crime and victimization levels can be significantly reduced through a comprehensive city or community wide approach. As such, through its Strategic Plan NCPC has been and is still coordinating its efforts with other federal or provincial departments and with municipalities to integrate or fill gaps where there is already significant crime prevention activity in a given city/community. For example, NCPC is working closely with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, and is supporting the Mayor's Safety Plan in Toronto. In the last 2 years, the Strategy has also been instrumental in forming coalitions for comprehensive initiatives in a number of municipalities including Winnipeg, five sites in Québec, and sites in B.C., in Atlantic Canada and in the North.</p> <p>In its renewal process, the Strategy has made a clear commitment to pursue specific opportunities/strategies to enhance coordination with municipalities.</p>	<p>Mgmt team Policy Unit PDD</p>	<p>2003 and ongoing</p>

## MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN (MAP)

Summative Evaluation of Phase II of the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS), covering 1998/2001 (Final report, DOJ: February 2004)

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION	ACTION BY	DATE
<b>Recommendation 7</b> It is recommended that the NCPC engage in more proactive consultations with representatives of DOJ initiatives on how to better communicate and coordinate crime prevention activities.	The NCPC is committed to enhancing existing communication and coordination of the federal government's crime prevention activities, as outlined in recommendation 8. But as part of the new Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, and within the Community and Partnerships Branch, the NCPC has already established strong and promising intra-departmental partnerships with Correction and Criminal Justice, and Aboriginal Policing. NCPC is also pursuing ongoing collaboration with PLEIB.	Mgmt team Policy Unit PDD	2003 and ongoing

## MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN (MAP)

Summative Evaluation of Phase II of the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS), covering 1998/2001 (Final report, DOJ: February 2004)

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION	ACTION BY	DATE
<p><b>Recommendation 8</b></p> <p>It is recommended that the NCPC explore challenges associated with a horizontal and integrated approach to crime prevention at the federal level and options that might encourage greater collaboration and integration of crime prevention activities and policy across government departments.</p>	<p>Launched in 1998 by the Departments of Justice Canada and Solicitor General Canada, the National Strategy is built upon horizontal partnerships. With the creation of the new Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness the administration of the National Strategy is now the responsibility of one federal department. The NCPC is committed to enhancing and strengthening its capacity for linkages and partnerships with other federal departments. Currently, the NCPC participates in 16 federal initiatives including the <i>Urban Aboriginal Strategy</i>, <i>A New Deal for Cities and Communities</i>, the <i>National Homelessness Initiative</i>, the <i>Youth Justice Initiative</i> and the <i>Family Violence Initiative</i>.</p> <p>Through additional measures, including the Comprehensive Community-Based priority area of NCPC's Strategic Plan and the renewal of the Interdepartmental Group on Crime Prevention, the NCPC will consider and adopt improvements that will encourage greater collaboration and integration of crime prevention activities in Canada.</p>	Mgmt team Policy Unit	Ongoing

## MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN (MAP)

Summative Evaluation of Phase II of the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS), covering 1998/2001 (Final report, DOJ: February 2004)

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTION	ACTION BY	DATE
<p><b>Recommendation 9</b></p> <p>It is recommended that the NCPC assess at the earliest opportunity the impact of staffing challenges and resourcing levels on its ability to deliver the Strategy as planned.</p>	<p>Enhanced A-based funding and thus stabilization of the organization is the pivotal dimension underlying the current Strategy's renewal process. It is anticipated that the renewed Strategy will provide the required environment to retain existing staff and secure their set of skills, which is key to an effective delivery of the Strategy. High among NCPC's priorities for 2005-2006 is the anticipated work to be done in close collaboration with the HR section of the Department to coordinate the creation of new positions, the hiring of new personnel, as well as to confirm the many current employees who are filling their position on a temporary status.</p>	<p>Mgmt team PSEPC HR</p>	<p>2005-2006</p>