Summative Evaluation of the Arts Culture and Diversity Program

**Corporate Review Branch
Evaluation Services**

December 2006

Table of Contents

Acronyms

ACDP	Arts, Culture and Diversity Program
CCA	The Canadian Conference of the Arts
CCAP	Canadian Conference of the Arts Program
CCD	Coalition for Cultural Diversity
CRA	Canada Revenue Agency
DAPB	The Arts Policy Branch, Department of Canadian Heritage
DIAB	International Affairs Branch, Department of Canadian Heritage
FTE	Full-time equivalent
ILC	International Liaison Committee of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity
INCD	International Network for Cultural Diversity
INCP	International Network on Cultural Policy
MAI	Multilateral Agreement on Investment
NGO	Non-government organization
NIICD	New International Instrument on Cultural Diversity
PAA	(Canadian Heritage's) Program Activity Architecture
PCH	Department of Canadian Heritage
RMAF	Results-based Management and Accountability Framework
The Convention	*The UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*
UNESCO	United National Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

Executive Summary

Introduction

The Arts, Culture and Diversity Program (ACDP) of the Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH) was established in 2002, with the following objective: To strengthen Canada's cultural sector through:

- information, policy analysis and advice provided to the Department on policy issues that affect the cultural sector, including cultural diversity; and,
- links established and maintained within the cultural sector itself as well as between the cultural sector and the broader community, in Canada and abroad.

Two organizations have received funding under the ACDP: the Canadian Conference of the Arts (CCA) and the Coalition for Cultural Diversity (CCD). Through its funding for the CCA, the ACDP also supports the International Network for Cultural Diversity (INCD), whose secretariat is housed at the CCA.

In accordance with Treasury Board Secretariat's Transfer Policy, a summative evaluation of the program is required prior to its renewal by March of 2006. This evaluation was conducted from October 2005 to January 2006 and was intended to answer a range of questions that focus on the traditional evaluation questions of rationale and relevance, success or impact, and cost-effectiveness of the program. The issue of performance measurement was also addressed.

Methodology

This report draws from research carried out by Beals, Lalonde & Associates Inc.

The study methodology included:
- a review of seminal documents, such as the Treasury Board Submission, Results-based Management and Accountability Frameworks for the CCA and the CCD, and Contribution Agreements;
- a review of program administrative and funding files, including CCA, CCD and INCD information products and activity reports;
- a review of media reports and published literature; and
- interviews with 34 key informants, including PCH and other government officials, Executive Directors and Board members of the CCA, CCD and INCD, representatives of international organizations, and a range of other informed stakeholders.

Limitations

The report discusses inherent issues related to the lack of specificity of the objectives of the program, and the resulting difficulties that lie in identifying its relevant impacts. As a result of these issues, information on results relies heavily on key informant interviews.

Findings

Rationale and Relevance

Consistency with Priorities

Both Government of Canada and PCH priorities include a strong focus on arts and culture as important keys to establishing a Canadian identity both nationally and internationally, as well as a commitment to the adoption and ratification of the *UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions* (the Convention). This focus and commitment are reflected in the objectives and activities of the ACDP.

Continuing Need

The Department continues to need input from the arts and culture sector on a wide range of cultural issues to support policy development.

While the Convention has been adopted by UNESCO, it will not come into force until it is ratified by at least 30 countries. During the current phase of the process, when Canada seeks to have at least 30 countries ratify the Convention, the activities of the CCD and the INCD will continue to be relevant. It is felt that since the constituencies of the two organizations differ, their efforts can complement each other. Since Canada cannot achieve its goals in this arena without significant international support, funding the CCD (which focuses on the cultural industrial sector) and the INCD (which represents the interests of more community-based cultural organizations and individuals) can help mobilize the desired international support. Once the required ratifications have been secured, there will be a need to revisit the question of whether the ACDP should continue to fund activities related to the implementation of the Convention in Canada.

Success/Impact

A challenge in this evaluation has been the absence of a clear definition of the meaning of "strengthening the sector" and the focus in the stated objectives on activities rather than results. The activities targeted by ACDP have three main thrusts: the provision of information, analysis and policy advice to the department, the promotion and maintenance of linkages within the arts and culture sector and with the broader Canadian and international communities, and the adoption and ratification of the Convention. While the CCA and the CCD provide policy advice to the Department, the Program elements dealing with the Convention primarily reside with the CCD and the INCD. All are involved in creating and maintaining linkages with the arts and culture community.

Providing Information, Research and Policy Advice

The organizations funded by the ACDP have conducted research and shared the results with their members, the Department and other stakeholders in Canada and abroad. They have conducted internal consultations to develop positions, and in some cases, to explain the positions of their various constituencies, and presented those positions to the Department.

Both the CCD and the INCD presented positions and engaged in discussions with the Canadian negotiators of the Convention – Canada's final position in those negotiations was more in line with that proposed by the CCD, but both contributed to the process.

Policy advice, on the types of internal Canadian issues normally addressed by the CCA, was less important during the period under evaluation, as the Department was more focused on program renewal than policy development. The CCA has contributed to government policy in past years and is expected to continue to do so as issues important to the arts and culture sector emerge.

Maintaining Linkages in Canada and Internationally

While the issue of linkages is positioned as an objective of the Program, it is rather a means to an end. That is, such linkages must be effected if the expected results are to be achieved. The evaluation found, in fact, that the CCA and the CCD have established on-going relationships with their member organizations, and foster their involvement through regular communications (such as newsletters) and conferences.

Within Canada, the CCA is the only national organization that brings together artists, cultural workers, arts organizations, labour groups, arts educators, cultural industry organizations and concerned citizens from across Canada – over 250,000 individuals are represented. The CCA also acts as the Secretariat to the INCD Secretariat. The INCD, which has 300 members, represents individual artists and cultural activists, cultural organizations and creative industries from all continents, sectors and disciplines of the cultural community, ranging from new media artists to traditional artisans, from 72 countries, particularly in the developing nations of the world.

The CCD includes 38 Canadian associations that represent creators, artists, independent producers, broadcasters, distributors and publishers working in the fields of publishing, film, television, music, performing arts and visual arts. It has been instrumental in the creation of similar coalitions in other countries, which together have successfully lobbied for the adoption of the Convention. It is expected that the CCD will continue to assist these sister organizations in their efforts to lobby their individual governments to ratify the Convention.

Adoption of the UNESCO Convention

The adoption by UNESCO of the Convention is a concrete indicator that the main objective of the CCD and the INCD has been achieved. This success is credited in large part to the activities of the two organizations.

Alternatives

Cost-Effectiveness

The Department's practice is to seek input from stakeholders when developing policies. The organizations funded by the ACDP conduct research and consult internally with their members to develop cogent positions for presentation to departmental policy makers, and are thus efficient mechanisms for accessing the input from the arts and culture sector.

The CCA has created and maintains important linkages within the sector, and serves as an important intermediary between government and the sector. As long as the Department continues to need input from the arts and culture sector on its policies, funding the CCA will remain a cost-effective mechanism for doing so.

With combined funding from the ACDP of $380,000 in 2004-05, both the CCD and the INCD contributed significantly to the accomplishment of Canada's objective of adopting the Convention. They also leveraged those funds so that 50 per cent and 66 per cent, respectively, of their funding came from other sources.

Overall, the ACDP has returned good value for the investment.

Design and Delivery

The program which preceded the ACDP provided core funding to the CCA. The transition to project funding, and the addition of cultural diversity to the issues, has not been reflected in the objectives of the program, except in a very superficial way. Specifically, the objective "To strengthen Canada's cultural sector" was appropriate when a single organization was given core funding, but needs to be more focussed if projects are to be well defined and if results are to be measured.

As stated under *Continuing Need*, it is appropriate to support the activities of both the CCD and the INCD. There is currently an uneasy relationship between the two organizations however, which has the potential to damage Canada's credibility and its efforts to encourage countries to ratify the Convention.

Recommendations

1. Develop clear and measurable objectives for the Program with expected results that focus on the impacts to be achieved.

    Management Response: Accepted.

    A new integrated RMAF/RBAF has been developed by the Department and approved by Treasury Board Secretariat. The new RMAF/RBAF sets out clear and measurable objectives for the Program and
    identifies expected results that focus on impacts to be achieved rather than on activities to be carried out, as recommended by the Summative Evaluation.

    Implementation Schedule: May 2006.

2. Clearly define the expected roles and responsibilities of all ACDP recipients in advancing the ACDP's objectives, in particular those for the CCD and the INCD, both independently and in relation to each other, and ensure these expectations are clearly communicated to the recipients and articulated in their Contribution Agreements.

    Management Response: Accepted.

    This recommendation will be implemented when we develop Contribution Agreements with each of the Program recipients, which will occur once Program renewal has been approved. The process of defining the expected roles of each of the recipients has already begun and will culminate with a clear articulation of our expectations in their Contribution Agreements.

    Implementation Schedule: Summer 2006.

3. Develop an effective performance measurement strategy that encourages the collection of data on impacts rather than activities and undertake to collect appropriate baseline information, which can be used to measure progress in objectives achievement.

    Management Response: Accepted.

    As stated in the response to Recommendation 1 above, a new integrated RMAF/RBAF that presents clear and specific objectives and expected results, reflecting the findings of the Summative Evaluation, has been drafted by the Department and approved by the Treasury Board Secretariat.

    Implementation Schedule: May 2006.

4.   Re-assess the need to fund activities and organizations related to the implementation of the Convention in Canada once it is ratified by the required number of countries.

Management Response: Accepted.

Significant progress has been made towards the ratification of the Convention, with more than 20 countries having ratified by November 2006. Canada is currently working to have at least 60 countries ratify the convention, to ensure that it has broad global support. Entry into force of the Convention is expected in 2007. The government will continue to assess on an on-going basis the need to fund activities and organizations related to ratification and implementation of the Convention.

Implementation schedule: Upon ratification of the UNESCO Convention.

1. Introduction

The Canadian Conference of the Arts Program, the pre-cursor to today's Arts, Culture and Diversity Program (ACDP), was first established in 1976, under the Department of the Secretary of State. When established, the Canadian Conference of the Arts (CCA) was the single recipient under the program, and it then received core (operating) funding. In 1995, the Program was moved to the newly created Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH). In the same year, the Program was moved from funding on a grants basis to finding on a contribution basis, in line with the focus on enhanced accountability that was then just starting to emerge in the federal government.

The Coalition for Cultural Diversity (CCD) was first funded in 1999, through PCH's Community Partnerships Program. In 2002, the CCD and the CCA were combined under the ACDP, based on the "fit" between its goals and the ACDP focus on cultural diversity, which had been principally delivered through the work of the International Network for Cultural Diversity (INCD) during the tenure of the Canadian Conference of the Arts Program.

In 2004-05, the Government of Canada invested $870,000 in the ACDP, of which $670,000 was to support the CCA, including $180,000 for (INCD) and $200,000 was to support the CCD.

1.1 Purpose of this Evaluation

The ACDP was established in 2002. In accordance with Treasury Board Secretariat's Transfer Policy, a summative evaluation of the program is required prior to its renewal by March of 2006. This evaluation focuses on fiscal years 2002/2003 to 2004/2005[1], though available information for 2005/2006 was considered when it was available.

1.2 Structure of Report

This report is divided into several sections. Section 2.0 describes the history of the ACDP and provides a detailed program profile. Section 3.0 describes the research methods used in conducting this evaluation while Section 4.0 presents the evaluation's findings. Section 5.0 concludes and Section 6.0 provides recommendations.

---

[1] The results quoted in this report actually are the culmination of activities from prior periods.

2. Program Profile

2.1 History

In June of 2002, the Canadian Conference of the Arts Program, a long-established program within the Department of Canadian Heritage, was altered and expanded to become the ACDP. The objective of the ACDP is to strengthen Canada's cultural sector by providing sector-specific information and policy advice, and by establishing and maintaining links within and between the sector and the broader community, domestically and internationally.

The new program funds the Canadian Conference of the Arts and the Coalition for Cultural Diversity (CCD). It also funds the International Network for Cultural Diversity through the CCA.

2.1.1 The Canadian Conference of the Arts

The CCA is a non-government organization (NGO) established in 1945. It is a membership organization, with memberships available to and held by both organizations and individuals. Today, it represents the collective interests of over 250,000 individuals. Its members and supporters are artists, cultural workers, arts organizations, labour groups, arts educators, cultural industry organizations and concerned citizens from across Canada.

When the CCA was established there were few, if any, other groups that looked after the interests of the arts and culture sector. Thus, for many years, the CCA was the sole voice of and for arts and culture in Canada. Consultation with its members and others in the cultural sector has always been key to the work of the CCA, as has advocacy for the arts and culture sector and interface with the federal government and its interests. Thus, the CCA was well positioned to take on the role it first assumed under the Canadian Conference of the Arts Program (CCAP) in 1976, through which it collaborated closely with the federal government on all matters relating to the arts and culture sector.

Under the ACDP, the CCA advises the Minister and departmental officials on a regular basis, and the Department considers the CCA to be a useful spokesperson and intermediary between the arts and culture sector and the Government of Canada. According to the Terms and Conditions of the ACDP, the CCA is responsible for:

- building capacity and consensus on policy issues;
- maintaining and enhancing communications;
- strengthening links between the arts and the broader community; and
- promoting international cultural diversity.

2.1.2   The Coalition for Cultural Diversity

The CCD was formed in 1998 out of the growing opposition to the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI). It was established by Quebec's leading professional associations of the cultural milieu and broadened its membership in the fall of 1999 by inviting all leading Canadian cultural professional associations to join its ranks. The CCD was to work closely with the CCA for the development of a New International Instrument on Cultural Diversity.

The Coalition now includes 38 Canadian associations that represent creators, artists, independent producers, broadcasters, distributors and publishers working in the fields of publishing, film, television, music, performing arts and visual arts.

The single principle that binds all members of the CCD together is their shared belief that cultural diversity is a fundamental human right and that countries and governments must be free to adopt the policies necessary to support the diversity of cultural expression and the viability of enterprises that produce and disseminate this expression. The Coalition defends the following principle: *Cultural policy must not be subject to the constraints of international trade agreements.*[2] Thus, the CCD is, in many respects, a "single issue" organization dedicated to the development, adoption, ratification and implementation of a New International Instrument on Cultural Diversity (NIICD) that establishes the principles essential to cultural diversity and that enshrines the fundamental right of countries and governments to adopt the policies necessary to support this diversity. That instrument is the *UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions* (the Convention), which was adopted at the 33rd UNESCO General Conference in Paris, in October 2005. The CCD has been consistently credited both nationally and internationally, as an effective champion of the Convention.

The CCD, headquartered in Montreal, houses the secretariat for the International Liaison Committee of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity (ILC), which was co-established by the French CCD.

2.1.3   The International Network for Cultural Diversity

By the late 1990s, the Canadian arts and culture sector had matured and the CCA represented a diverse and multi-faceted constituency, which included individuals, organizations representing individual artists (like ACTRA, for example) and a range of powerful industry-specific organizations (like the Canadian Film and Television Producers Association). PCH (which is charged with helping create an environment in which Canada's heritage is preserved and made accessible, artistic expression can flourish, cultural markets can develop, and Canadian audiences can have increased access to Canadian cultural products and services) recognized the arts and culture sector as one of the most important vehicles for establishing Canadian identity, both at home and

---

[2] CCD website

abroad. In addition, increasing globalization and specific discussions on the MAI led PCH to recognize the imperative to protect cultural sovereignty and cultural diversity.

As a result, in 1998, the Minister of Canadian Heritage invited international Ministers of Culture to attend an international meeting on cultural policy in Ottawa. The meeting brought together 22 culture ministers from a cross-section of countries from both the northern and southern hemispheres, and from both industrialized and developing economies. It resulted in the foundation of the International Network for Cultural Policy (INCP), whose secretariat is housed by PCH. The Canadian Conference of the Arts, in collaboration with the Swedish Joint Committee of Literary and Artistic Professionals, organized a parallel conference of Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) that eventually led to the establishment of the International Network for Cultural Diversity (INCD) in September 2000.

Today, the INCD is a worldwide network of artists and cultural groups dedicated to countering the homogenizing effects of globalization on culture. It represents individual artists and cultural activists, cultural organizations and creative industries from all continents, sectors and disciplines of the cultural community, ranging from new media artists to traditional artisans. There are now 300 members, and organizations from 72 countries that belong to the network, which has a particularly strong presence in the developing nations of the world.

The INCD has been an important player in Canada's efforts to develop a new international instrument on cultural diversity. Indeed, the first draft of the chosen instrument - *The UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions* (the Convention) - was developed by the INCD. The INCD's secretariat has been housed within the CCA since its inception, and the National Director of the CCA is a member of the network's steering committee. The INCD secretariat has been funded by PCH since its inception, first through the CCAP, and then through the ACDP. PCH's directive was clear at that time, i.e., harmonize and coordinate the work of the CCD and the INCD, which were funded by two different PCH programs.[3]

2.2 Objectives, Expected Results and Activities

The objective of the ACDP is to strengthen Canada's cultural sector through:

- information, policy analysis and advice provided to the Department on policy issues that affect the cultural sector, including cultural diversity; and

- links established and maintained within the cultural sector itself as well as between the cultural sector and the broader community, in Canada and abroad.

---

[3] Department of Canadian Heritage, *Audit of Single Recipient Programs – Coalition for Cultural Diversity*, June 23, 2004, page 12.

2.2.1 Expected Results and Outcomes

As described in its Terms and Condition, the ACDP was designed to lead to increased:

- research, analysis and consensus on policy issues to assist arts and cultural organizations and networks of cultural researchers;

- arts and cultural sector capacity to interact with appropriate government departments, to improve awareness of the impact and contribution of Canadian arts, culture and diversity, and to connect the arts to Canadian community life through enhanced communication tools;

- work towards national consensus on cultural policy issues and creation of a stronger connection among Canadian artists and arts and cultural associations; and

- domestic and international activity to develop policy advice and build consensus around the importance of cultural diversity and the elaboration of international policy instruments such as the New International Instrument on Cultural Diversity (which became the Convention).

2.2.2 Eligible Activities and Expenditures

Program activities include:

- timely and in-depth research and development;

- enhanced information sharing, awareness-building and communication with the cultural community, government and general public through a web site, regular preparation and distribution of documents and bulletins, meeting and conference participation and organization, and participation in the broader community activities; and

- awareness and consensus building, both domestically and internationally, on policy issues relating to cultural diversity.

2.2.3 The Two Major Funding Recipients

The objectives, expected results and activities are reflected in the Contribution Agreements with, and Results-based Management and Accountability Frameworks (RMAF) of, both the CCA (which includes the INCD) and the CCD. The activities are logically linked to the expected results, which in turn, may reasonably be expected to lead to a stronger arts and culture sector.

The Canadian Conference of the Arts

The CCA's RMAF states that the CCA's objective is to strengthen the cultural sector through:

- information, policy analysis and advice provided to PCH on policy issues that affect the cultural sector, including cultural diversity; and

- links established and maintained within the culture sector itself as well as between the sector and the broader community, in Canada and abroad.

Though the RMAF does not include intended results, it seems likely that they would closely resemble those of both the ACDP overall, and the CCD, given the similarity in both the objectives and activities specified for the ACDP, the CCA, and the CCD.

The CCA's activities include:

- building capacity and consensus on policy issues;

- maintaining and enhancing communication;

- strengthening links between the arts and the broader community; and

- promoting international diversity.

The Coalition for Cultural Diversity

The CCD's RMAF, which was developed when the ACDP was established in 2002, states that the CCD's objective is to strengthen the cultural sector through:

- information, policy analysis and advice provided to PCH on policy issues that affect the cultural sector, including cultural diversity; and

- links established and maintained within the culture sector itself as well as between the sector and the broader community, in Canada and abroad.

The CCD's expected results and outcomes include:

- research, analysis and consensus on policy issues to assist arts and cultural organizations and networks of cultural researchers;

- cultural sector capacity to interact with appropriate government departments, to improve awareness of the impact and contribution of Canadian arts, culture and diversity through enhanced communication tools;

- work towards national consensus on cultural policy issues and creation of a stronger connection among Canadian artists and arts and cultural associations; and

- domestic and international activity to develop policy advice and build consensus around the importance of cultural diversity and the elaboration of international policy instruments such as the New International Instrument on Cultural Diversity (which became the Convention).

The CCD's activities include:

- building capacity and consensus on cultural diversity and trade negotiation issues by enhanced information sharing, awareness-building and communication with the cultural community, government and general public;

- strengthening links among cultural associations, the general public and public and political authorities through participation in and organization of meetings and conference

- undertaking communications projects such as web site maintenance and enhancement, regular preparation and distribution of documents and participation in conferences; and

- promoting national and international cultural diversity by building awareness and consensus, both domestically and internally, on policy issues.

2.3   Program Reach

The beneficiaries of the Arts, Culture and Diversity Program include:

- individual artists and members of arts and cultural organizations and associations, who benefit from the information, communication, and connection to others in their sector, throughout Canada and abroad, that the program facilitates;

- government officials and politicians, who benefit from the policy and consultation input they receive through the program, on a range of issues that affect the arts and culture sector both domestically and internationally; and

- the Canadian public, which receives the benefits of a vibrant and robust arts and culture sector that provides both entertainment, and an enriched understanding of and pride in our national identity.

2.4   Governance

The ACDP is funded by the Department of Canadian Heritage. Within the Department, the ACDP is co-managed by the Arts Policy Branch (DGAP) and the International Affairs Branch (DGIA).

The DGAP in the Cultural Affairs Sector has program funding authority. While DGAP is responsible for all official functions (receiving and dispensing funds, and signing off on documents like Treasury Board submissions) operationally, it oversees only the CCA's

participation in the program and is responsible for developing and monitoring the CCA's yearly Contribution Agreement. DGAP allocates approximately .75 FTEs to all tasks associated with the program. These include the services of a manager, a senior analyst and a Program Officer who is the primary point of contact between PCH and the CCA.

The DGIA, which resides within the International and Intergovernmental Affairs Sector, has functional responsibility for both the CCD and INCD. A Program Officer is the primary point of contact between PCH and the CCD, and PCH and the INCD. DGIA is operationally responsible for developing and monitoring the CCD's three-year Contribution Agreement, and for the INCD portions of the CCA's yearly Contribution Agreement. The branch allocates approximately .5 FTEs to this program. Because DGIA does not have signing authority, it must pass all official documents and requests to DGAP for signature.

2.5 Resources

Table 1 below shows the funds for each year since 2002-2003, as well as the actual expenditures for each organization. The amounts for the CCA include an allocation for the INCD. The CCA and CCD were each eligible to receive "conditional funding" if they obtained private sector contributions in an equal amount.

Table 1 - CCA and CCD Budgets (Base Contributions and Conditional Funding) and Total Actual Expenditures, 2002-03 to 2005-06				
Canadian Conference of the Arts (CCA)	**2002-03**	**2003-04**	**2004-05**	**2005-06**
Base Contribution	$690,000	$690,000	$690,000	$690,000
Conditional Funding	$100,000	$100,000	$100,000	$100,000
Total	**$790,000**	**$790,000**	**$790,000**	**$790,000**
Total Actual Expenditures	**$640,000**	**$619,306**	**$670,000**	**(1)**
Coalition for Cultural Diversity (CCD)				
Base Contribution	$100,000	$100,000	$100,000	$100,000
Conditional Funding	$100,000	$100,000	$100,000	$100,000
Total	**$200,000**	**$200,000**	**$200,000**	**$200,000**
Total Actual Expenditures	**$194,925**	**$195,650**	**$200,000**	**(1)**
Footnotes: 1. Data for 2005-06 not available.				

3. Methodology

This report draws from research carried out by Beals, Lalonde & Associates Inc.

3.1 Evaluation Questions

This summative evaluation is intended to answer a range of questions that focus on the traditional evaluation questions including: rationale/relevance; success/impact; and cost-effectiveness of the program.

The specific evaluation questions that correspond to each of these general foci are shown below. An additional question on performance measurement has also been addressed.

Rationale/Relevance

- Are the ACD Program's objectives and activities still consistent with current government and departmental priorities?

- Is there still a need for the federal government to support the CCA and the CCD?

Success/Impact

- To what extent has the information, policy analysis and advice provided by the CCA and the CCD on policy issues affecting the arts and cultural sector, including cultural diversity, contributed to strengthening Canada's arts and culture sector?

- To what extent have the links established and maintained by the CCA and the CCD within the arts and cultural sector and between the sector and the broader community in Canada and abroad contributed to strengthening Canada's arts and culture sector?

- Has the ACD Program been successful in achieving its objectives and expected results within budget and without unwanted consequences?

Performance Measurement

- Is the ACD Program collecting the right information?

Cost-effectiveness/Alternatives

- Are the most efficient and effective means being used to achieve the government's objectives?

- Does the ACD program duplicate, overlap or work at cross purposes with other government support programs that support Canada's arts and culture sector and cultural diversity?

The evaluation also considered the following expenditure review questions:

- Does the program area or activity continue to serve the public interest?
- Is there a legitimate and necessary role for government in this program area or activity?
- Is the current role of the federal government appropriate, or is the program a candidate for realignment with the provinces?
- What activities or programs should or could be transferred in whole or in part to the private/voluntary sector?
- Are Canadians getting value for their tax dollars?
- If the program or activity continues, how could its efficiency be improved?
- Is the resultant package of programs and activities affordable? If not, what programs or activities would be abandoned?

These expenditure review questions are addressed by and through the evaluation questions.

3.2   Lines of Inquiry

The study methodology included:

- a review of seminal documents;
- a review of program and administrative files;
- a review of funding files (CCA and CCD information products and activity reports);
- a review of media reports and published literature; and
- key informant interviews.

3.2.1 Review of Seminal Documents

Evaluators reviewed the seminal documents for the ACDP, which included the documents that led to the establishment of the ACDP, the Terms and Conditions for the program, the RMAFs for both the CCA and the CCD, and both current and previous Contribution Agreements for the CCA and the CCD.

3.2.2 Review of Program, Administrative, and Funding Files

This activity included a review of the diverse contents of the Program's funding files. File contents included financial statements, Ministerial briefing notes, reports produced by the CCA , CCD and INCD, activity reports, and correspondence associated with all of the preceding items. Seven of the files supplied by DGIA (for the CCD and INCD), and seven files supplied by the DGAP (for the CCA) were subjected to an in-depth review. Because there were considerably more files than could be studied, the reviewers scanned large numbers of files (45 in DGIA, and about the same number in DGAP) in order to select ones that appeared to be fairly representative.

3.2.3   Review of Media Reports and Published Literature

This task consisted of reviewing published documents regarding the activities and achievements of the CCA, CCD and the INCD. Only documents provided by the Project Authority or available on the Web were studied. Media reports provided by the Project Authority were also reviewed, with a strong focus on "opinion pieces" – in order to help inform the evaluation team's appreciation of how Program efforts were received by the Canadian public/media.

3.2.4   Key Informant Interviews

Thirty-four interviews were conducted with PCH and other government officials, Executive Directors and Board members of the CCA, CCD and INCD, representatives of international organizations, and representatives of a range of other stakeholders familiar with the work of the program overall, or with one of the funding recipients. Each interview was conducted in the official language of choice of the interviewee, and was either conducted in person or by telephone (or in one case, via an emailed response to the interview guide). Interviews lasted between half-an-hour and two hours in length, with the majority taking about one-and-a-half hours to conduct.

3.3   Limitations

The line of enquiry which yielded the most information was the key informant interviews. Other sources of data contained very little information directly relevant to the evaluation questions. In addition, the lack of specificity in the ACDP Terms and Conditions, and their focus on activities rather than results, meant that much of the documentary information also dealt with activities. Thus, information on results comes almost solely from the key informant interviews.

4. Findings

4.1 Rationale and Relevance

4.1.1 Are the Program's objectives and activities still consistent with current government and departmental priorities?

There was both strong consensus among all key informants and ample evidence to support consistency from the perspective of the Government of Canada.

- Speech from the Throne on October 5th, 2004 *"What makes our communities vibrant and creative is the quality of their cultural life. The Government will foster cultural institutions and policies that… promote diversity of views and cultural expression at home and abroad."*

- Speech from the Throne February 2nd, 2004: *"Another defining characteristic of our communities and of our reputation around the world is the vitality and excellence of our cultural life…. The Government will continue its leadership in the creation of a new international instrument on cultural diversity…and promote and disseminate our cultural products and works around the world."*

- Prime Minister's Response to the February 2nd, 2004 Speech from the Throne: *"A world made small and integrated has changed the international rules of the game globalization must be made to work for everyone if it is to work at all. Few countries are as well positioned as is Canada to be the catalyst to make this happen."*

This message was further emphasized in the Prime Minister's September 22nd 2004 address to the 29th Session of the United Nations General Assembly. He reaffirmed Canada's support for the proposed UNESCO convention for the protection of diversity of cultural contents and artistic expression. He focused on the need to modernize international institutions to meet the new challenges facing a globalized world, and he situated Canada's support for the UNESCO initiative to secure a convention on diversity of cultural contents and artistic expression within this context.

On a departmental level, the ACDP responds to the Strategic Outcome: *Canadians express and share their diverse cultural experiences with each other and the world*, through the *Sustainability of Cultural Expression and Participation* Program Activity. The Department's Program Activity Architecture (PAA) states that "Support [to the CCA and the CCD] is used to engage the arts sector in federal arts policy and to solicit high-quality policy analysis and advice in order to foster a stronger Canadian cultural life."

The Program contributes directly to the "build strong organizational partnerships" component of the Strategic Outcome. It also contributes to policy development within the Department itself, and to the departmental priority: UNESCO International

Convention for the Protection of the Diversity of Cultural Contents and Artistic Expressions.

It seems clear that strengthening the arts and culture sector remains a priority of the Government generally, and the Department of Canadian Heritage, specifically. That commitment has been demonstrated through recent funding decisions. A major investment in arts and culture, introduced in 2001, provided almost $740 million to all aspects of the creative process encouraging excellence among Canada's artists, promoting arts and culture among the population as a whole and providing cultural industries with the means to prosper in the 21st century. On December 15, 2004, the Minister of Canadian Heritage announced that this initiative would be extended for another year with a budget of up to $192 million, and Budget 2005 extended the program for another four years, at $172 million per year.

4.1.2   Is there still a need for the federal government to support the CCA and the CCD?

Need for a Strong Voice

The implicit but unarticulated role of the CCA under the ACDP is to serve as a strong voice and policy proponent for the arts and culture sector. Key informants were consistent and unequivocal in stating that long-standing issues (e.g., copyright, status of the artist, taxation, foreign ownership, funding) remain and demand address. A number of interviewees felt that these issues are cyclic – that is:

- they are not likely to ever be fully-resolved, but will recur as they are affected by emerging issues, and

- there is also an ebb and flow to Government involvement in arts and culture-related policies. During the years examined by this evaluation, there was not a major policy focus on domestic arts and culture issues, but there has been in the past and likely will be again in the future.

There was also considerable agreement on the need for a strong voice to help the sector identify and deal with emergent issues like new technologies, the sustainability of the sector, arts management and governance issues.

Other Needs Filled by the CCA through the ACDP

A number of key informants described the role of the CCA, in relationship to the federal government, as being more than a strong voice. Two additional roles mentioned by some interviewees warrant additional consideration.

The first is the CCA as an "advance scout" that identifies new issues on the far horizon, and eventually brings those that merit attention onto the federal agenda. Many of the long-standing issues identified above (such as copyright and status of the artist) emerged in this fashion. It is conceivable that other issues championed by the CCA but not now

accepted by the federal government (e.g. National Arts Policy) might go through the same kind of evolution.

The other important role of the CCA mentioned by key informants was its function as an "incubator" – a group that fosters and supports incipient organizations that eventually mature and become independent. Indeed, the Canada Council was established this way in the 1950s. A more recent example cited was the Cultural Human Resources Council. Soon, the INCD will join the ranks of once-incubated and eventually independent organizations, and a number of interviewees speculated that ArtsSmart (program, started in 1998 and housed at the CCA, which provides seed money to a wide range of locally initiated arts-integration programs, to engage young people in artistic activity) may eventually mature in this fashion also.

Key informants who talked about these dimensions of CCA's role appeared to view them as important contributions to strengthening the arts and culture sector.

Need for Action Related to the UNESCO Convention

Under the ACDP, the work of both the CCD and the INCD has been focused on the development of the UNESCO Convention. Evaluators wanted to know if this element of the ACDP is still required, since the Convention has now been adopted.

There appeared to be a consensus on the need for Canada to now work towards ensuring that the Convention is ratified. This requires ratification by at least 30 countries, but many well-informed interviewees said that at least 60, and more appropriately 80+ ratifiers will be required in order for the instrument to have the international weight required. Many key informants foresaw that a final task related to the Convention, once it is ratified, will be ensuring a quality implementation by monitoring policies and activities at the federal and provincial levels. Some felt that there may not be an on-going need for both the CCD and the INCD in this implementation activity, and that there may not be a need for either the CCD or the INCD, once a quality implementation has been effected.

While there was considerable agreement on the need for action related to the Convention by the CCD, there was less consistency on whether the INCD's involvement should continue under the ACDP. Its continued involvement was strongly advocated by some key informants, including PCH officials. A number of other key informants felt that the CCD had been more effective than the INCD, including one who felt there was no role for INCD in the ratification of the Convention since it is the role of UNESCO to promote ratification. However, one key informant did not share these views and stated that both the CCD and INCD had been valuable in articulating their arguments, and that the INCD will have a role to play in ratification by promoting the Convention nationally and internationally.

Need for Federal Funding

The evidence gathered clearly indicates an on-going need for services provided by the recipient organizations under the ACDP. But is federal funding still required to ensure that those services are provided?

PCH provides approximately:

- 35 per cent of the total funding for the CCA (independent of the INCD);
- 50 per cent of the total funding for the CCD; and
- 33 per cent of the total funding for the INCD.

This represents a substantial percentage of each organization's total budget, and it would seem unlikely that any of the funding recipients could continue to deliver the services they have under the ACDP without PCH funding.

4.2   Success/Impact

4.2.1   To what extent has the information, policy analysis and advice provided by the CCA and the CCD on policy issues affecting the arts and cultural sector, including cultural diversity, contributed to strengthening Canada's arts and culture sector?

The Canadian Conference of the Arts

Key informant descriptions of the recent performance of the CCA were very consistent. Most interviewees reported that the organization has gone through challenges over the last five years related to governance and the impact of a major revision of membership procedures.

It must be remembered, however, that the CCA has had a long and generally successful tenure with PCH. The fact that it has not performed as well recently as it has during most if its relationship with PCH does not neccesarily mean that it failed to provide information, analysis and advice on policy issues affecting the arts and culture sector. There is ample evidence from both key informants and from file reviews, that numerous accomplishments can be attributed to the CCA during this evaluation period. For example, it:

- provided policy advice to government in the form of position and discussion papers, meetings with Ministers, presentations to Standing Committees (including a yearly presentation to the Finance Standing Committee);

- provided an external policy analysis capacity - for example, the CCA completed a study a few years ago of the impact of the withdrawal of funding and sponsorship from tobacco companies. PCH used this information in discussions with other Departments, but was not successful in affecting government policy in line with the CCA's position;

- was a strong advocate of the major investment in arts and culture introduced in 2001 and for increased investment in the Canada Council;

- advocated for a Cultural Capitals of Canada program, and initiated the successful multi-phased ArtsSmart project;

- presented two well-attended policy conferences each year, on a range of topics, including:

  o National Policy Conferences focused on What's New, Synchronizing Arts Policy and Practice in 2002, The Creativity Gap: How the Arts Inspire an Innovative Society, in 2003, and From Art to Action: Moving Forward on the Status of the Artist, in 2004; and
  o The Chalmers Conferences focused on Creative Management in 2003, Advocacy and Elections in 2004, and Advocacy and the Parliamentary Process, in 2005.

- provided helpful information, research, analysis and advice to its members, notifying them of relevant research and cultural data they would otherwise be unlikely to locate on their own. For example, a number of key informants noted that statistical information made available by the CCA was particularly helpful as they developed funding applications; and

- was pivotal in establishing the INCD, having been the agency to whom the Minister of Canadian Heritage turned in 1998 to help organize an NGO conference to parallel the planned conference for international Ministers of Culture. The CCA has also housed the INCD secretariat.

While the CCA's policy role was not seen to have the impact achieved in earlier successes, the cyclic nature of government needs must also be considered. A PCH informant noted that the Department has been in more of a "program" than a "policy" mode in recent years and, therefore, has not needed the kind of policy input it has sometimes required in the past.

The Coalition for Cultural Diversity

When considering the success of the ACDP, key informants uniformly credited the CCD as having been the driving force (or one of the driving forces – the INCD being the other) behind the adoption of the UNESCO Convention. The importance of the adoption of the Convention cannot be over-stated. One key informant described it this way: "*The whole thing was a miracle. There's never [before] been an instrument of any kind done in seven years.*" Another said: "*Something like this has never happened before in the entire international cultural community.*"

From its inception, the CCD provided information, policy analysis and advice designed to raise awareness and mobilize support for the Convention both domestically and internationally. The CCD was credited with keeping the Convention high on the

Minister's agenda, and having significant influence on the development of related PCH policy.

Just a few discrete examples of other CCD information and policy activities include:

- Discussion Paper - *Initial Response to UNESCO's Draft Text for the Convention on Protection of Diversity of Cultural Contents and Artistic Expressions;*

- Discussion Paper - *Essential Elements of a Convention on Cultural Diversity*

- more than 60 documents and discussion papers made available on their website, on free trade and cultural protection;

- advice and information (through meetings and correspondence) to National Arts Service Organizations (NASOs) to apprise them of and promote their involvement in "their" issue; and

- advice and information (through international meetings, seminars, and conferences) to promote the need for a Convention and the development of "sister coalitions" in other countries.

CCD constituents, including PCH, were advised of these information and policy products through the numerous communication vehicles described later under Linkages, and were able to access them through the CCD website.

International Network for Cultural Diversity

Since the establishment of the ACDP, the INCD has functioned within the CCA, and it was commonly acknowledged as the "arm" of the CCA that focused on cultural diversity. This is reflected in the 2004-2005 CCA Contribution Agreement (CA): "*The INCD undertakes domestic and international activity to develop policy advice and build consensus around the importance of cultural diversity and the elaboration of international policy instruments such as a Convention on Cultural Diversity. The INCD collaborates with other Government and NGO networks with similar interests in cultural diversity...and builds networks with civil society groups.* This description is bolstered by additional descriptions in the CA of proposed activities for the INCD. From the CA information, it thus seems safe to deduce that the key INCD objectives are:

- building awareness of and support for cultural diversity;

- promoting the Convention as a vehicle to promote and protect cultural diversity; and

- recruiting and communicating with members.

Although the INCD's objectives appear to be well understood by officials within PCH, the CCA, CCD and the INCD, other key informants often either did not understand the

INCD's role or they disagreed with it. This issue is addressed later in the Cost-effectiveness and Alternatives section of this report.

Key informants agreed that the INCD has built a significant international network of NGOs who, at least partially because of INCD efforts, share an awareness of and commitment to supporting cultural diversity. Individuals and organizations from 72 countries belong to the network, which has a particularly strong presence in the developing nations of the world. A key informant who was familiar with the INCD's efforts abroad during the 2002-04 period credited the group with helping to define the debate with cultural groups overseas. Representatives of both China and Brazil have sought guidance from INCD representatives on how to promote and protect their own cultural diversity.

The INCD has sponsored three major international conferences, and is credited by key informants with using these to build awareness, promote the Convention, and create linkages with members. The organization has a monthly newsletter, and another important communication vehicle is the often-accessed INCD website.

As previously noted, the INCD has been an important player in Canada's efforts to develop a New International Instrument on Cultural Diversity, and actually developed the first draft of what eventually matured into the Convention. While most key informants felt the CCD had been more responsible for the adoption of the Convention than the INCD, all key informants agreed that the INCD had been actively involved and effective in working to accomplish this success.

The vast majority of INCD efforts have been directed towards promoting cultural diversity and building support for the Convention at the international level. Key informants felt the group has been considerably less successful at the same kind of promotion domestically. This makes sense, since the group is international. However, the lack of a domestic focus has probably led to key informant confusion related to the role of INCD.

While the INCD has experienced considerable success in building membership, key informants within the INCD felt that less effort had been dedicated to this than to the other two objectives, and that more effort should be directed at expanding membership in the future.

4.2.2   To what extent have the links established and maintained by the CCA and the CCD within the arts and cultural sector and between the sector and the broader community in Canada and abroad contributed to strengthening Canada's arts and culture sector?

Canadian Conference of the Arts

There is considerable evidence of the CCA's success in establishing and maintaining linkages – much of it already documented above. The annual policy conferences provide an outstanding opportunity for members of this increasingly diverse sector to convene

and focus on issues. The CCA has also used its policy interventions to help constituents understand and create linkages with government – for example, each year selected members attend the presentation to the Standing Committee on Finance. Interviews and file reviews also revealed an extensive communications capability, through bulletins and the CCA website.

Other related accomplishments include the role CCA played in the creation of Arts Summit, and its on-going linkages with many other groups including for example the Cultural Human Resources Council, the Voluntary Sector Initiative, and the Canadian Association of Fine Arts Deans.

There was conflicting evidence on the CCA's role in the creation of the Canadian Coalition for the Arts. Some respondents viewed this as a demonstration of the organization's success at creating linkages. Others saw it as a failure, feeling that had the CCA been more effective during this period, it would have taken on the advocacy task assumed by the Coalition, rather than spawning a new organization to take on the job.

Coalition for Cultural Diversity

Key informants, the file review, and the media review all provided ample evidence of the CCD's success in creating and establishing linkages. The CCD has produced numerous information and communication vehicles setting out its position, and has identified key international partner associations to explain ramifications of failure to protect cultural industries and to promote advocacy of the Convention in their own countries. It hosted events with the same purpose in mind. For example, in 2001-02, CCD activities included the successful organization of the *First International Meeting of Professional Associations from the Cultural Milieu.* Follow-up missions to meet with cultural professional organizations in their home countries resulted in seven new coalitions starting before the end of 2002. This was described by a number of key informants as the CCD's "modus operandi" and great success: aligning themselves with the "right" groups in other countries, and urging and helping them to form their own coalitions and lobby their own governments.

Other examples of the host of "linkage" accomplishments include:

- national newsletter (The Coalition Update) issued six to eight times each year;

- international newsletter (Coalition Currents) also issued six to eight times a year;

- website with both a public and members-only component, and a well-maintained "News" section;

- active participation in a number of UNESCO conferences; and

- attendance of a vast array of international meetings, seminars, and conferences.

Knowledgeable key informants estimated that the vast majority of the CCD budget goes to travel, creating networks, and further developing linkages.

4.2.3 Has the ACD Program been successful in achieving its objectives and expected results within budget and without unwanted consequences?

The objectives and expected results for the ACDP are detailed in section 2.2. The findings related to information, policy analysis and advice, and linkages have already been addressed. Other factors against which success was to be assessed are discussed in this section. Note that those factors differ for the CCA and the CCD.

The Canadian Conference of the Arts

(a)   Research

Separating policy work from research is difficult. One can and should confidently assume that research was required for many of the policy achievements previously cited. In addition, though many interviewees felt that the CCA's greatest research successes were in the past, key informants within the organization were able to cite significant recent research achievements. For example:

- The CCA is currently working on an update to its definitive *Review of Federal Policies for the Arts in Canada (1944-1988).* The new document is to offer a "*unique, important, and useful survey* [inventory] *of federal cultural policy from 1988 to the present, divided by cultural subsector.*"

- A new research piece titled *Treating Artists with Respect: the Presumption of Independent Contractor Status* is nearing completion. This report will form the basis of interventions with the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) regarding the presumption of employment for contracted actors and musicians.

- *Government Spending on Culture in Canada: 1992-93 to 2002-03* was published in July 2005.

- Many research reports are cited and available on the CCA website.

(b)   Achieving Consensus

A number of key informants took issue with the concept of "achieving consensus" as a mandated result for the CCA. The predominant opinion expressed was that the CCA constituency is varied and includes numerous parties with conflicting interests (for example individual artists and their unions, versus production companies), and, consequently, it is not realistic to expect a consensus on anything other than extremely broad issues (such as taxation, foreign ownership, or the need for cultural protection via the Convention).

Key informants felt that the CCA had done a reasonably good job of identifying and achieving consensus at a very broad level (for example, on the need to develop Status of

the Artist legislation, and to deal with a range of employment and taxation issues) but has not been effective at achieving consensus on more specific issues or aspects of these broad issues, because of the conflicting interests of many of its constituents.

A more realistic expectation of the CCA when dealing with less-broad issues, according to the key informants, is ensuring that the range and scope of opinion within the sector is understood and conveyed to government.

(c)   Improving Capacity to Interact with Appropriate Government Departments

Assessing against this result poses some difficulties, given that "capacity" is not defined; and there is no baseline against which to compare capacity, to see if it has "improved."

Nevertheless, there are indications of success in this sphere. As previously noted, CCA's policy work has resulted in numerous presentations and high-level meetings. Interviews and file reviews clearly indicated that interactions have not been limited to issues falling solely within the purview of PCH. There has also been considerable interaction with Canada Revenue Agency, the Department of Justice, and with the former Human Resources Development Canada.

(d)   Improving Awareness

The caveat expressed above, regarding the absence of a baseline (in this case for measuring awareness) applies here also. While there is no empirical evidence to support it, many key informants felt that media stories have made the Canadian public more aware of the impact and contribution of arts and culture than in the past, but that the CCA has not been a factor in that enhanced awareness.   Even key informants within the CCA felt that the organization had not been successful as a social marketer. This is particularly pronounced in Quebec, where the media review revealed minimal awareness of the organization, which appears to be best-known in Ontario.

(e)   Domestic and International Activity Related to Cultural Diversity and the Convention

The INCD has been the vehicle for CCA's activity as it relates to promoting and protecting cultural diversity and the Convention, as previously discussed. However, evidence of a close working relationship between the CCD and the INCD was not found in the file review or in the key informant interviews. In fact, the evidence suggests that the two organizations often did not co-operate on common issues. The CCA's participation in advancing the government's objectives in this area will be curtailed when the INCD severs its relationship with the CCA later this year.

(f)   Results Achieved within Budget and Without Unwanted Consequences

The budget allocated to the CCA was described earlier, and all of the results described above were achieved given that funding level, even though the CCA was not funded to the maximum allowable.

There were no unwanted consequences identified by key informants or by the evaluation team through its research.

The Coalition for Cultural Diversity

(a)   Research, Analysis and Consensus

The many discussion and policy papers either developed by the CCD or made available through its website, demonstrate that considerable research and analysis has been conducted or identified and disseminated by the CCD.

The fact that the Convention has been adopted and that the CCD is credited with driving that process through its mobilization efforts suggest that it has been successful in achieving a consensus within the narrow borders of its mandate.

(b)   Improved Awareness

As noted directly above, CCD's target audience is a relatively narrow one - large cultural industry associations. Domestically, the media review strongly indicated that the CCD appears to have been more successful in enhancing awareness of its mission and mandate within this sector in Quebec (where the CCD originated) than elsewhere. The previously discussed success the CCD has achieved in promoting the development of similar coalitions in other countries indicates that it has enhanced the awareness of the need for the Convention, internationally.

(c)   Results Achieved within Budget and Without Unwanted Consequences

All of the results described above were achieved within budget. There were no unwanted consequences identified by key informants or by the evaluation team through its research.

4.2.4   Is the ACD Program collecting the right information?

Identifying the "right information" has been a challenge for all parties to the ACDP because of a failure to do the necessary groundwork for performance measurement. For example:

- The CCD's RMAF includes no performance indicators.

- The CCA's RMAF has no intended results (or simply repeats the two overall objectives as intended results). It does include performance indicators – many of which would demand a very high level of effort to collect. For example, one indicator is "maintained or increased representation of membership and sector concerns re: arts/cultural policy issues". The data source cited is the CCA activity report. This measurement approach implies that evaluators are going to go through those reports, count relevant items, and compare those to previous counts. This is not

practical, given the time-challenged parties to the ACDP and the absence of a database.

This focus on performance measurement information that is activity-focused and labour-intensive to collect may have been exacerbated by the attempts of program management to respond to the February 2003 audit of the CCA, which called for more detail in activity reporting. That drive for additional detail was evident in CCD files from the same period. This excerpt comes from a covering letter recommending the release of a 10 per cent holdback for the 2003-2004 fiscal year: *"The CCD's activity report is well detailed and provides a brief description of activities under the categories provided below. Also provided is a listing of the CCD's activities and results at year end. It should be noted that this is the first year that the CCD has submitted a report on results. Their report could benefit from some improvements (e.g., some of the results reported beg the question…can you be more specific?").*

There was considerable evidence in both file reviews and interviews within PCH of a clear commitment to gathering the activity-focused information identified as required in Contribution Agreements and RMAFs. There were many rounds of iterative correspondence surrounding reporting, for both the CCD and the CCA. There is considerable information in program files on the activities carried out by the funded organizations, such as detailed listings of meetings and conferences attended, bulletins published, and research conducted. Key informants in recipient organizations perceive the reporting burden as overwhelming and unrealistic.

It is clear that the right information has not been collected. The "right information" would have been information that would have been useful in measuring the **impacts** of the ACDP – what the program **achieved,** as opposed to what it **did**. Except for the adoption of the UNESCO Convention, there is very little information on the impacts of the many activities reported.

4.3   Cost-Effectiveness/Alternatives

4.3.1   *Are the most efficient and effective means being used to achieve the government's objectives?*

The Canadian Conference of the Arts

Although it is not stated in these terms in the CCA's RMAF, one of the objectives for its funding under the ACDP is to serve as a conduit between the Government and the arts and culture sector, transmitting sectoral concerns to the Government and translating the Government perspective in terms meaningful to the sector.

Numerous key informants praised the efficiency and effectiveness of this relationship. There was great consistency in the contention that Government would not have the credibility, "reach", resources or know-how to get sectoral input without the CCA. A number of interviewees used almost the same words in saying "*If there were no CCA,*

Government would need to create one." There thus emerged a strong consensus that as long as the Government wants or needs this kind of input from the arts and culture sector, funding the CCA through the ACDP is an effective and efficient way to obtain it.

A number of key respondents characterized the level of CCA funding as very tight but acceptable given the overall federal climate of fiscal constraint. The same degree of acceptance was not evident when discussing the **type** of funding received. Until 1995, the CCA received core funding, and interviews and file reviews show that moving to the project-based approach characteristic of grants and contributions has never been well-accepted. In *Creativity is the Driving Force of Economic Growth*, a pre-budget submission presented to the Standing Committee on Finance, the CCA called for a return to core funding because "*the sheer volume of accountability measures…is out of all proportion to the (usually quite small) amounts of money involved.*" Despite this, key informants in both PCH and the CCA acknowledge that there is still a tendency for recipients and funders to act as if the ACDP is a core-funding program. This results in a very heavy reporting burden that appears to be pro-forma, given that a more conceptual and fundamental approach to working on a project basis has not been internalized.

The Coalition for Cultural Diversity and the International Network for Cultural Diversity

The success attributed to both the CCD and INCD in bringing about the development and adoption of the Convention has already been discussed. In talking about that success, many key informants noted that it was all the more compelling for having been achieved with total combined budget for both organizations, of a maximum of $400,000 per year. There was a consensus that the ACDP funding has been used (and indeed leveraged, as the CCD[4] and INCD[5] enlisted other groups to support a position crucial to Canadian interests) extremely effectively and efficiently.

Concerns About Duplication and Clarity

In previous sections of this report, concerns were noted, primarily by officials not associated with PCH, the CCA, CCD or the INCD, about the respective roles of the CCD and the INCD. A few speculated on whether both organizations are still required to promote and protect Canada's commitment to cultural protection in general, and the Convention in particular. One comment conveys both the logic and the nuance of this sort of speculation: *"The CCD is lean, mean, well-informed, effective. It has earned every penny they've received and had a huge impact on government policy…With the CCD, funding is perfectly clear. With the INCD, there is no transparency at all – who knows where it comes from?… [There is] duplication of messages and the possibility of getting them mixed up."*

---

[4] CCD received $100,000 per year from the Government of Quebec, and over $100,000 per year from its member organizations.
[5] INCD received funds from foreign governments (France, Sweden, Switzerland), the Ford Foundation, the Smithsonian Institute, and the Rockefeller Foundation, in amounts ranging from $5,000 to over $160,000.

Other key informants were lucid in their perceptions of the similarities and differences between the two groups:

- *"Since INCD members come from the third sector (NGOs, researchers, racial and indigenous groups, ethical and human rights groups) the INCD's perspective for development is to promote the local language, indigenous culture…community culture as opposed to industrial culture. The CCD works with a very narrow portal. It works primarily with the cultural industrial [part of the sector] helping protect the market of its members."*

- *"There might appear to be substantial overlap between the CCD and the INCD. This, however, is more apparent than real. The CCD is a national organization, driven by domestic and cultural industries, with a national board and a large domestic agenda. The INCD is an international organization, driven by community-based organizations around the world, with an international steering committee and a large international agenda."*

As previously noted, those most closely involved with the CCD and the INCD (i.e., PCH officials and CCD and INCD representatives) clearly understood the respective roles of the two organizations.

Concerns about CCD/INCD Relationship

While the degree of overlap in organizational mandates may not be an issue, the fashion in which it is handled is. Numerous interviews described a tense relationship between the CCD and the INCD.

One interviewee said, for example: *"There is definitely conflict between the INCD and CCD – a long and protracted struggle between the two, an unwillingness to cooperate. …it gets internationally embarrassing."*

No key informant who described the tense relationship between these two groups ascribed it to the normal frictions to be expected in a high-stress arena. All positioned it as an inefficient and ineffective aspect of the ACDP - one that could undermine ACDP's ability to win support for the ratification and implementation the Convention.

Program Management

The responsibility for the ACDP is split within PCH. The DGAP has signing authority for the CCA, including the INCD, and the CCD, but the DGIA has functional authority for both the CCD and INCD. This occasions some concerns about effectiveness and efficiency.

- Documents must be passed from one PCH branch to another, and each "pass" can occasion a delay.

- The signing authority needs to review items before signing them. Given the length and quantity of some of the activity reporting, this can be extremely time-consuming. It also raises the issue of work duplication in DGAP and DGIA.

Both DGIA and DGAP have, however, recognized the potential for delay built into their relationship, and have developed and documented clear and effective protocols to help avoid or reduce the potential for delay. Both groups follow these protocols and are confident that any delays in payment are attributable to the normal friction between funders and recipients, as recipients are late in their submissions or fail to include required information.

4.3.2   Does the ACD Program duplicate, overlap or work at cross purposes with other government support programs that support Canada's arts and culture sector and cultural diversity?

The only issue of duplication and overlap that arose during the research (without a specific query from the interviewer) was in the CCD/INCD relationship, as previously discussed.

There are some provincial organizations with mandates similar to that of the CCA. However, only the CCA offers the national coverage which seems appropriate to the ACDP.

5. Conclusions

5.1 Rationale and Relevance

The Arts, Culture and Diversity Program is well-aligned with current Government and departmental priorities. The Program is relevant. However, the fact that it is relevant should not be taken to mean that it is necessarily in the public interest to continue the Program, or that the current funding recipients should be included if and when it is renewed. There are a number of dimensions to consider, when assessing if there is still a need for federal funding for the ACDP, in whole or in part.

Does the Government still want and need the information, policy analysis and advice on arts, culture and diversity issues, and does it require the linkage capabilities provided by the CCA? Given that both Government and departmental priorities include a strong focus on arts and culture as important keys to establishing a Canadian identity both nationally and internationally, coupled with the likely inaccessibility of the sector to the government without a credible intermediary, there appears to be a clear need to continue the existing relationship between the Government and the CCA. Further, given that the PCH contribution to the CCA constitutes a substantial part of the organization's total resources, continued funding also appears to be appropriate.

The CCD and INCD are both funded under the "cultural diversity" phrase embedded in the current ACDP objectives, and respond to the expected result of developing policy advice and building consensus around the importance of cultural diversity and the "elaboration" of the Convention. At this point (since the Convention has now been adopted by UNESCO), the focus of the CCD and INCD activity around the convention is promoting its ratification and implementation. In addition, the INCD is tasked with general promotion and protection of cultural diversity.

Is this necessary? Recent Government communications clearly convey a commitment to protecting Canadian culture from the effects of homogenization that seem inevitable if free trade does not include appropriate exclusions. Since Canada cannot achieve its goals in this arena without significant international support (in the form of at least 30 votes for ratification) it seems that funding the CCD and/or the INCD, which can help mobilize the desired international support, is both appropriate and necessary.

But are both the CCD and INCD required to achieve Canadian objectives? Given that they have different constituencies, and that support from nations with both well-developed cultural industries (the focus of the CCD's constituents) and from developing countries where art and culture is more community-based and less industrial (the focus of the INCD's constituents), it seems that, despite a few dissenting opinions expressed during this evaluation, continuing to fund both groups (neither of which could continue to function to the level they do currently without PCH support) in their efforts to ratify and

implement the Convention is in Canada's best interests. The benefits of funding INCD's more general efforts to promote cultural diversity may be less relevant.

5.2   Success

Section 5.2.4 below discusses the evaluation dilemma caused by the activity-driven nature of the ACDP Objectives and Expected Results. Because of that dilemma, in this section, conclusions can be confidently delivered about the degree of success experienced in carrying out activities, but any conclusions on the actual impact of those activities must of necessity be more conjectural.

5.2.1   The Canadian Conference of the Arts

During this evaluation period (2002-2005) the CCA was less effective than it has been in the past. Nevertheless, it continued to provide policy analysis and advice on issues affecting the arts and culture sector, and to establish and maintain links as specified in the ACDP objectives.

In so doing, it conducted research helpful both to the sector and to the Government, and demonstrated its ability to work with a number of federal departments. It also helped strengthen the arts and culture sector by continuing to perform its long-established but previously unrecognized role incubating new groups within the sector, and serving as an advance scout for upcoming issues.

The CCA was successful at forging consensus around a few very broad policy issues but was less successful at helping to achieve consensus on more specific issues. This is attributable to having an impractical expectation embedded in the ACDP's intended results, rather than to a failure in the CCA performance. It is not realistic to expect a group with the diverse constituency of the CCA to achieve consensus on any but the broadest of issues.

So the CCA was generally successful at meeting its objectives and generating the expected results. But did its efforts contribute to the primary objective of the program – to strengthen the arts and culture sector? Given the absence of both a definition of a strong sector and a baseline to determine whether that sector is stronger or weaker than it was previously, a definitive conclusion cannot be drawn. However, there are indications that the CCA, under the ACDP, did contribute to the development and maintenance of a strong arts and culture sector, given that:

- the CCA was successful in carrying out most of its mandated activities; and

- those activities appear to be consistent with a sector that is financially sound, well-managed, rooted in and responsive to communities, and protected against the predations of cultural homogenization.

5.2.2 The Coalition for Cultural Diversity

The findings on the CCD clearly demonstrate that the CCD was successful at meeting the activity-focused objectives and results set out for it under the ACDP. In the case of the CCD, which is an acknowledged "single objective" organization, its impact or achievements can be gauged against that single objective, even though it is not enshrined in the official program documents (except as an expected outcome). That objective was to help develop and ensure the adoption of the Convention. The Convention was adopted and the CCD was instrumental in making that happen.

5.2.3 The International Network for Cultural Diversity

The INCD was also directly involved with the Convention and given considerable credit by key informants for contributing to its adoption. The fact that the Convention was developed and adopted may be regarded as a demonstration of the INCD's impact. However, adopting, ratifying and implementing the Convention is not the sole focus of ACDP funding for the INCD. Expected results for the ACDP include developing policy advice and building consensus around the importance of cultural diversity, which has been translated into the INCD's focus on countering the homogenizing effects of globalization on culture.

Given the absence of specific intended results and corresponding performance indicators, it is not possible to be conclusive about the INCD's success in this element of its operations. However, given that it did carry out mandated activities, and that those activities appear to be consistent with the goal of countering the homogenizing effects of globalization, it seems likely that the INCD had a positive impact in this sphere also.

5.2.4 Program Design

This section provides context for the discussion of performance measurement; and assistance for those who will be editing, refining, or re-writing the Terms and Conditions for the upcoming renewal.

Analyzing the Objectives

The structure of the ACDP's objectives must be discussed in order to provide necessary context for the response to the evaluation question about performance measurement.

The program's stated objectives are to "strengthen Canada's cultural sector through:

- information, policy analysis and advice provided to the Department on policy issues that affect the cultural sector, including cultural diversity; and

- links established and maintained within the cultural sector itself as well as between the cultural sector and the broader community, in Canada and abroad."

Nowhere in the Terms and Conditions or other program documents (Contribution Agreements and RMAFs) is there any elaboration on the Program's primary objective – "to strengthen Canada's cultural sector." What does a strong cultural sector look like? What are its characteristics? Of those, which pertain to the ACDP?

Rather than expanding on the intended **end** for the program (a strong sector), the seminal program statement instead focuses on the **means** - **how** that still amorphous and undefined objective is to be achieved. Thus, the Program's objectives statement is primarily activity-driven. This "trickles down" resulting in stated Program results which tend to be outputs (tasks to be accomplished) rather than outcomes (an external consequence attributed to a program, that is considered significant in relation to its commitments.)

Impact of the Current Objectives

Given the structure of the program's objectives, both Program staff and evaluators must focus on activities rather than results. This has considerable fall-out:

- When objectives are activity-driven, success is relatively easy to assess. Have funding recipients done what they said they were going to do?

- Impact (results) – the heart of summative evaluation efforts - is very difficult to assess. Assume evaluators find that the program was generally successful – recipients did what they said they were going to do. But were those the right things to do? And were they done well? What was achieved? Did those activities help build a strong arts and culture sector?

- The focus on activities also leads to burdensome reporting requirements, given that all parties focus on what was done, not what was achieved. During the file review, evaluators encountered extremely long and detailed activity reports, noting meetings, consultations, research efforts, etc. The degree of detail they found supports the contention of many key informants within recipient organizations, that reporting requirements are onerous. Monitoring these efforts must also demand considerable time from program staff.

Performance Measurement

As noted in the findings, all involved parties are working hard to provide what they've believed is the information required to assess program performance. However, because of the structure of the program and the performance measurement frameworks, the end result has been more like an exercise in accounting than accountability.

Collecting performance information has been an onerous task. This has implications when considering the potential for delays. PCH staff reported that from their perspective, when funding has been delayed it has often been occasioned by the need for repeated interactions with recipients in order to elicit ever more reporting detail. If the program's objectives become better defined and more measurable, this aspect of client-relations is

likely to improve. This, in turn, may ease the potential accountability issues that reside in the split reporting between DGAP and DGIA, since it may be practical for DGAP to review more focused activity reports.

Because the structure of the program objectives has resulted in all involved parties collecting information that reflects only what was done, not what was achieved, the evaluators conclude that the right information is not being collected.

5.3   Cost-Effectiveness/Alternatives

The ACDP has shown a very good return on the dollars invested in it. The CCA provides access to the arts and culture sector that would be both elusive and expensive in the absence of a credible intermediary like the CCA. The CCD and INCD have leveraged very modest budgets to enlist the international community in working to achieve Canadian goals, namely the adoption of the Convention.

Given how closely-related the CCD and INCD mandates are and the degree of overlap between them, there is the potential for confusion as "outsiders" try to understand the workings of the ACDP. Existing program documentation does not provide the kind of clarity required. However, once the respective roles of the CCD and the INCD are well-understood, the logical conclusion is that both organizations should fit well into the ACDP.

The existing fit of both the CCD and the INCD within the ACDP is not being maximized due to the relationship that exists between these two organizations. While a certain range of differing viewpoints and agendas can be expected from organizations with constituencies as varied as those of the CCD and the INCD, the lack of co-operation and conflicting approaches by the two organizations has worked to undermine the objective of advancing a common Canadian goal for cultural diversity. Unless these organizations attempt to sort out their relationship and develop a strategy for working together, this lack of co-operation could undermine Canada's credibility with the international arts and culture community and diminish the Canadian government's capacity to enlist support for the Convention. It will also demand resources from both organizations that would be better spent on dealing with the protection of cultural diversity.

In the preceding section on findings, the split program management responsibilities for the ACDP was identified as potentially ineffective. However, DGAP and DGIA have taken positive steps to allay the potential inefficiency inherent in this arrangement, and program staff reports that the protocols they've developed appear to be working.

6. Recommendations and Management Response

1. Develop clear and measurable objectives for the Program with expected results that focus on the impacts to be achieved.

   Management Response: Accepted.

   A new integrated RMAF/RBAF has been developed by the Department and approved by Treasury Board Secretariat. The new RMAF/RBAF sets out clear and measurable objectives for the Program and
   identifies expected results that focus on impacts to be achieved rather than on activities to be carried out, as recommended by the Summative Evaluation.

   Implementation Schedule: May 2006.

2. Clearly define the expected roles and responsibilities of all ACDP recipients in advancing the ACDP's objectives, in particular those for the CCD and the INCD, both independently and in relation to each other, and ensure these expectations are clearly communicated to the recipients and articulated in their Contribution Agreements.

   Management Response: Accepted.

   This recommendation will be implemented when we develop Contribution Agreements with each of the Program recipients, which will occur once Program renewal has been approved. The process of defining the expected roles of each of the recipients has already begun and will culminate with a clear articulation of our expectations in their Contribution Agreements.

   Implementation Schedule: Summer 2006.

3. Develop an effective performance measurement strategy that encourages the collection of data on impacts rather than activities and undertake to collect appropriate baseline information, which can be used to measure progress in objectives achievement.

   Management Response: Accepted.

   As stated in the response to Recommendation 1 above, a new integrated RMAF/RBAF that presents clear and specific objectives and expected results, reflecting the findings of the Summative Evaluation, has been drafted by the Department and approved by the Treasury Board Secretariat.

   Implementation Schedule: May 2006.

4. Re-assess the need to fund activities and organizations related to the implementation of the Convention in Canada once it is ratified by the required number of countries.

    Management Response: Accepted.

    Significant progress has been made towards the ratification of the Convention, with more than 20 countries having ratified by November 2006. Canada is currently working to have at least 60 countries ratify the convention, to ensure that it has broad global support. Entry into force of the Convention is expected in 2007. The government will continue to assess on an on-going basis the need to fund activities and organizations related to ratification and implementation of the Convention.

    Implementation schedule: Upon ratification of the UNESCO Convention.

APPENDIX A - Evaluation Questions, Performance Indicators and Data Sources

Appendix A – Evaluation Questions, Performance Indicators and Data Sources

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Data Source/Collection Method
Rationale and Relevance		
1. Are the ACD Program's objectives and activities still consistent with government and departmental priorities?	• Alignment of the ACD Program's objectives and expected results with government policies and priorities. • Alignment between the ACD Program's objectives and expected results and PCH's strategic outcomes	• KI interviews with senior PCH managers • Literature/media material review • Document review (i.e., TB Submissions, Ts & Cs, PCH's PAA, policy statements, Throne Speeches, Standing Committee minutes, etc.)
2. Is there still a need for the federal government to support the CCA and CCD?	• Current need by PCH and other government officials for policy analysis and advice on cultural issues • Current need for CAA's and CCD's efforts to build and maintain capacity/links/communications within the cultural sector and between the cultural sector and the broader community, in Canada and abroad • Current need for the CCA and the CCD to continue to build consensus on cultural policy issues • Current need for the CCA and the CCD to continue to work towards the ratification of the NIICD	• KI interviews with senior PCH, other government, CCA, CCD, international organization and other association officials & academics / subject matter experts • Literature/media material review • Document review
Success		
3. To what extent has the information, policy analysis and advice provided by the CCA and the CCD on policy issues affecting the arts and cultural sector, including cultural diversity, contributed to strengthening Canada's arts and culture sector? 4. To what extent have the links established and maintained by the CCA and the CCD within the arts and cultural sector and between the sector and the broader community in Canada and abroad contributed to strengthening Canada's arts and culture sector? 5. Has the ACD Program been successful in	• Usefulness of CCA and CCD research, policy analysis and information on arts and culture issues to government officials • Increased arts and sector capacity to interact with government departments & raise awareness of the sector • Improved links / communications established by the CCA and the CCD within the arts and culture sector and between the sector and the broader community, in Canada and abroad • Evidence of leveraged resources • Improved awareness of the impact and contribution of Canadian arts, culture and diversity.	• KI interviews with PCH, other government, CCA, CCD, international organization and other association officials & academics / subject matter experts • Literature/media material review • Document review (contribution agreements, position papers, reports on policy conferences & results, etc.) • File review (CCA & CCD newsletters, quarterly and annual activity reports, minutes of meetings with government departments & other arts and culture organizations, etc.)

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Data Source/Collection Method
achieving its objectives and expected results within budget and without unwanted consequences?	• # and success of initiatives to promote arts & culture • Increased national consensus on cultural policy issues • Progress toward a national accord with non-profit sector • Utility of CCA's INCD secretariat • Evidence of progress towards consensus / elaboration of new international cultural policy instruments • Strengths & weaknesses of Canadian input to consensus / elaboration of NIICD • Evidence of the CCA's and the CCD's contribution to the above outcomes • Unintended Impacts • Evidence of unexpected impacts	• CCA and CCD financial reports (leveraging) • CCA and CCD websites developed and traffic
Cost-Effectiveness/Alternatives		
6. Are the most efficient and effective means being used to achieve the government's objectives?	• Program delivery efficiency within PCH • Evidence that the ACD Program could be transferred to another level of government or to the private sector.	• ACD Program budget, expenditure and O & M data • KI Interviews with PCH, CCA & CCD officials, academics/subject matter experts • Review of CCA and CCD activities against ACDP priorities
7. Does the ACD program duplicate, overlap or work at cross purposes with other government support programs that support Canada's arts and culture sector and cultural diversity?	• Evidence of overlap & duplication with mandates and activities of other government programs and NGOs	• KI Interviews with PCH, CCA, CCD and other association officials and academics and informed individuals • Literature review • Document review

APPENDIX B - Data Collection Guides

Interview Guide

This document positions the questions to be asked under each evaluation question. The final versions, to be shared with interviewees, will show only the questions relevant to them. Note that some questions address more than one issue, but they are shown only once for the sake of simplicity. Note also that not all questions may be appropriate for stakeholders at the international level. We may also want to adapt some of the questions to reflect the situation/knowledge of particular interviewees.

Interview guides to be sent to interviewees prior to the interview should include a statement of the program's objectives, namely:

The main objective of the Arts, Culture and Diversity Program is to strengthen Canada's cultural sector through:
- information, policy analysis and advice provided to the Department of Canadian Heritage on policy issues that affect the cultural sector, including cultural diversity; and,
- links established and maintained within the cultural sector itself as well as between the cultural sector and the broader community, in Canada and abroad.

The evaluation question	PCH and OGD staff	CCA and CCD staff and members	External stakeholders
1. Are the ACD Program's objectives and activities still consistent with government and departmental priorities?	1. How does the ACDP respond to government and PCH policies and priorities? 2. How does the ACDP align with PCH's strategic outcomes?		
2. Is there still a need for the federal government to support the CCA and CCD?	3. Does the federal government still need to foster linkages within the arts and culture sector? Between that sector and the rest of Canada? Between that sector and the international community? Why? 4. What contribution do you expect in the future from CCA and CCD on the development of arts and culture policies? 5. What, if any, role do you see for the CCA and CCD in the ratification of the NIICD? 6. Does the federal government still need the kind of arts and culture community information, analysis and advice provided by the CCA and the CCD? Why? 7. Is there a need for PCH to continue funding the CCA/CCD/INCD?	1. Does the federal government still need to foster linkages within the arts and culture sector,? Between that sector and the rest of Canada? Between that sector and the international community? Why? 2. If there is still a need, what are the benefits to Canadian society of the federal government continuing to fund your organization? 3. What issues still require your involvement in order to build a consensus? 4. What, if any, role do you see for your organization in the ratification of the NIICD? 5. What are the benefits to Canadian society of the federal government continuing to fund your organization?	1. Does the federal government still need to foster linkages within the arts and culture sector? Between that sector and the rest of Canada? Between that sector and the international community? Why? 2. If there is still a need, what are the benefits to Canadian society of the federal government continuing to fund the CCA/CCD/INCD? 3. In your view, what issues still require active involvement by the CCD/CCD/INCD? Why? 4. What role do you see for the CCA/CCD/INCD in the ratification of the NIICD?

3. To what extent has the information, policy analysis and advice provided by the CCA and the CCD on policy issues affecting the arts and cultural sector, including cultural diversity, contributed to strengthening Canada's arts and culture sector?	8. How have the CCA/CCD/INCD contributed to arts and culture policies, including the development of the NIICD? 9. How useful have CCA/CCD/INCD been in presenting a consensus position to government policy makers? (examples?)	6. What research has your organization conducted to contribute to the development of government policy on arts and culture? (examples?) How were the results used? Were reports disseminated? How and to whom? 7. How have you developed your positions on arts and culture issues in order to provide policy advice to government? Was consensus achieved? (examples?) 8. What has been the result of your contribution to the development of government policy on arts and culture? (examples?) 9. Has your organization increased its capacity to interact with government policy makers? 10. Have there been any issues/problems encountered in your relationship with government policy makers?	5. What processes are you aware of that have been used to develop positions on arts and culture issues for presentation to government policy makers? How successful was it? (i.e. was consensus achieved? Did CCA or CCD play a leadership role in seeking consensus?) 6. What has been the impact of CCA and CCD on government policy?
4. To what extent have the links established and maintained by the CCA and the CCD within the arts and cultural sector and between the sector and the broader community in Canada and abroad contributed to strengthening Canada's arts and culture sector?		11. Since 2002, has your organization maintained or increased the linkages between arts and culture stakeholders? (Examples?) 12. Since 2002, has your organization maintained or increased the linkages between the arts and culture community and the broader Canadian and international community? (Examples?) 13. What role did your organization play in the development and successful adoption of the NIICD? 14. What has your organization done in terms of raising awareness of the arts and culture sector among Canadians? What have been the results of those activities? 15. What progress has been made towards a national accord with the non-profit sector? To what extent can your organization take credit for this progress? 16. Can you provide usage data for your website and any feedback from users?	7. Since 2002, what changes have you seen in : • the amount and quality of linkages between arts and culture stakeholders (Examples?) • the amount and quality of linkages between the arts and culture community and the broader Canadian and international community? (Examples?) • the level of awareness of the arts and culture sector among Canadians? 8. What was the contribution of CCA and CCD to those changes? 9. Have other organizations played a significant role in promoting linkages and awareness? 10. What progress has been made towards a national accord with the non-profit sector? What was the CCA's contribution to this progress? 11. What role did the CCA and the CCD play in the development and adoption of the NIICD?
5. Has the ACD Program been successful in achieving its objectives and expected results within budget and without unwanted consequences?	10. How effectively has CCA, CCD used the funding received through ACDP? 11. Have there been issues/problems in how they've discharged their roles under the ACDP ?	17. Was the level of funding provided under the ACDP sufficient in light of the outcomes/results expected? 18. Have you encountered any unexpected (positive or negative) consequences because of your participation in the ACDP?	12. Have there been any unexpected (positive or negative) consequences of the work undertaken by the CCA/CCD/INCD?

6. Are the most efficient and effective means being used to achieve the government's objectives?	12. Is the ACDP the most effective and efficient means of meeting the government's objectives? 13. Please assess the "fit" of the INCD within the CCA. What benefits have accrued to Canada in having it there? 14. Could and should the ACDP, in whole or in part, be transferred to another government department or to the private sector? 15. Should other organizations have access to funding under the ACDP? 16. Is the internal organization of the ACDP within PCH efficient? Is it effective? How could it be improved, i.e., made more efficient and/or more effective?	19. How dependant is your organization on funding under the ACDP? What other sources of funding, especially non-governmental funding, have you acquired? 20. Is funding your organization an efficient and effective way for government to achieve its objectives? Why? 21. How well did the INCD fit within the CCA? What benefits have accrued to Canada from housing the INCD Secretariat within the CCA? 22. Should other organizations have access to funding under the ACDP?	13. Please assess the fit of the INCD within the CCA. What benefits have accrued to Canada from housing the INCD Secretariat within the CCA? 14. Is funding the CCA and the CCD an efficient and effective way for government to achieve its objectives? Why? 15. Could and should the ACDP, in whole or in part, be transferred to another government department or to the private sector? 16. Should other organizations have access to funding under the ACDP?
7. Does the ACD program duplicate, overlap or work at cross purposes with other government support programs that support Canada's arts and culture sector and cultural diversity?	17. Do the ACDP mandate and activities duplicate, overlap, or work at cross purposes with other government programs and/or NGOs? If so, which programs or NGOs?	23. Do the ACDP mandate and activities duplicate, overlap, or work at cross purposes with other government programs and/or NGOs? If so, which programs or NGOs? 24. What other federal government programs provide funds to your organization?	17. Do the ACDP mandate and activities duplicate, overlap, or work at cross purposes with other government programs and/or NGOs?
8. Is the ACDP collecting the right information?	18. The CCA and CCD are required to submit quarterly and annual activity reports. Do they provide the required information? 19. What other performance information does the Program collect? How is it managed? 20. What resources are allocated to managing this performance information? 21. How are results on the ACDP reported? How often, i.e., frequency?		

File Review Template

File/document: _____

If applicable: Organization: Number of members:

Contents

Contribution agreements		Progress reports	
Financial statements		Activity reports	
Policy/position papers		Annual reports	
Minutes of meetings		Reports on consultations	
Research reports		Ministerial correspondence	
Other types of documents (please list)			

Information relevant to evaluation questions

1. Are the ACD Program's objectives and activities still consistent with government and departmental priorities? 2. Is there still a need for the federal government to support the CCA and CCD?

Objectives quoted in contribution agreements (by year, if they vary)		
Activities supported by the agreement(s)		
Expected results quoted in contribution agreements (by year, if they vary)		
Sources of funding	ACDP (Amount and % of total budget):	
	Matching funding (i.e. conditional $100K from the private sector)	
	Other federal government sources (Amount and % of total budget):	
	Other sources (source, amount and % of total budget):	
Evaluator's assessment of fit with government and departmental priorities		

3.   To what extent has the information, policy analysis and advice provided by the CCA and the CCD on policy issues affecting the arts and cultural sector, including cultural diversity, contributed to strengthening Canada's arts and culture sector?

Evidence that information, policy analyses and advice were provided and considered	

4.   To what extent have the links established and maintained by the CCA and the CCD within the arts and cultural sector and between the sector and the broader community in Canada and abroad contributed to strengthening Canada's arts and culture sector?

Conferences, meetings, etc. sponsored by CCA, CCD or INCD Secretariat	Event and objectives	Participants/Targets	Results	
Initiatives (events, publications, campaigns) to promote arts and culture	Initiative and objectives	Participants/Targets	Results	
Communications tools/materials produced				

5.   Has the ACD Program been successful in achieving its objectives and expected results within budget and without unwanted consequences?

Research conducted and disseminated	
Progress towards achieving national consensus on policy issues (by issue, including on NIICD)	
Progress towards achieving a national accord with non-profit sector	
Issues/problems encountered and their resolution	
Unwanted consequences	

8. Is the ACD Program collecting the right information?

What information does the file/document contain to demonstrate that the following data is collected:	
Identification of issues/needs	
Number and types of participants in events/consultations	
Number and types of communications tools/materials	
Minutes of meetings between PCH and CCA, CCD and INCD	
Distribution and application of dollars	

Other relevant information:

Media Review Guide

Note: The purpose of the review of the media reports is not to collect quantitative information on how often the CCA, CCD or INCD were mentioned in the media. Rather, the purpose is to gauge what the community thinks of the organizations and what they do (activities) and have done (results). Consequently, letters to the editor, opinion pieces and editorials will be particularly relevant.

Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Information sought	Source	Evidence found
Rationale and Relevance			
Are the ACD Program's objectives and activities still consistent with government and departmental priorities?	Opinions expressed about CCA, CCD and INCD and how they fit within government priorities		
Is there still a need for the federal government to support the CCA and CCD?	Mentions, in relation to the CCA and CCD, of the need for federal government funding for: • policy analysis and advice • building and maintaining capacity/links/ communications within the cultural sector and between the cultural sector and the broader community, in Canada and abroad • building consensus on cultural policy issues • building consensus on cultural policy issues where leadership was provided by other organizations • work on the ratification of the NIICD		
Success			
To what extent has the information, policy analysis and advice provided by the CCA and the CCD on policy issues affecting the arts and cultural sector, including cultural diversity, contributed to strengthening Canada's arts and culture sector?	Mentions of: • the contribution of the CCA and CCD to the development of policies related to arts and culture • the contribution of the CCA and CCD to the development of policies related to cultural diversity in the arts and culture sector		

To what extent have the links established and maintained by the CCA and the CCD within the arts and cultural sector and between the sector and the broader community in Canada and abroad contributed to strengthening Canada's arts and culture sector?	• Mentions of CCA and CCD creating links or brokering joint activities/initiatives:
	  • between organizations within the arts and culture sector
	  • between the sector and the broader community in Canada and abroad
	• Mentions of the CCA and CCD related to trade negotiations and the NIICD		

Has the ACD Program been successful in achieving its objectives and expected results within budget and without unwanted consequences?	Not applicable		

Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Information sought	Source	Evidence found
Cost-Effectiveness/Alternatives			
Are the most efficient and effective means being used to achieve the government's objectives?	Not applicable		
Does the ACD program duplicate, overlap or work at cross purposes with other government support programs that support Canada's arts and culture sector and cultural diversity?	Not applicable		
Performance Measurement			
Is the ACD Program collecting the right information?	Not applicable		

Guide for the Literature review

The purpose of the literature review is to provide a context for the operation of the program. It is therefore not meant to answer specific evaluation questions, but rather to explore the environment in which the program operated, and any trends or relevant issues that emerged since its creation in 2002. We will therefore review publications (web articles, articles in journals of the arts and culture sector, published analyses) that deal with issues that may be within the purview of the CCA and the CCD, namely:

- issues of importance to artists and their organizations (e.g. status of the artist, copyright)

- the need for and capacity to provide policy advice to government

- the role of government in the arts and culture sector and in promoting cultural diversity at the international level

- the contribution of the arts and culture sector and diversity to the Canadian community

- the need for stronger linkages between organizations and the state of those linkages

- strengths and weaknesses within the arts and culture sector

- overlap or duplication with other government programs

Without seeking particular publications that deal with the issue, we will also be alert to any mentions of the contribution of the CCA, CCD and INCD to the above issues.

APPENDIX C - List of Key Informants

KEY INFORMANTS

Jacques Paquette
Assistant Deputy Minister, International and
Intergovernmental Affairs and Sport, PCH

Cynthia White Thornley
Director General, Arts Policy, PCH

Robert Hunter
Director, Strategic Arts Support, Arts Policy,
PCH

Michel Bourque
Manager, ACD Program, PCH

Katka Selucky
ACD Program, PCH

Artur Wilczynski
Directeur, Relations internationales et
rayonnement, PCH

Kirsten Mlacak
Director, International Policy, Planning and
Programs, PCH

Annie Laflamme and
Heather Wallace St-Louis
International Affairs Branch, PCH

John Hobday
Director, Canada Council for the Arts

Doug George
Director, Intellectual Property,
Information and Technology Trade Policy
Division,
International Trade Canada

Andrew Terris
CCA Interim Nat'l Director June-Oct 2005

Megan Williams
CCA Nat'l Director; 1999-2004

Robert Spickler
President, CCA Board of Directors

Robert Pilon
Executive Vice-President, Coalition for
Cultural Diversity

Pierre Curzi
Co-président de la Coalition pour la diversité
culturelle, Président, UDA

Garry Neil
Executive Director, INCD

Leonardo Brant
Coordinator, Cultural Diversity Institute,
Brazil,
Co-Chair of the INCD Steering Committee
for 2004-2005

Max Wyman
Canadian Commission for UNESCO

David A. Walden
Secretary-General, Canadian Commission

Rafael Segovia
General Coordinator, Civic Council for

for UNESCO

Katerina Steenou
Directrice Division des Politiques
culturelles, UNESCO

Susan Wallace
Executive Director, Canadian Actors' Equity
Association

Sheila Roberts
Consultant (based in Saskatchewan)

Michel Beauchemin
in his capacity as Secrétaire général,
Alliance pour les droits des créateurs

Susan Annis
Executive Director,
Cultural Human Resources Council

Simon Brault
DG National Theatre School of Canada

Peter Grant
Senior Partner, McCarthy's
Author of Blockbusters and Trade Wars
Le Marché des Etoiles

Deborah Abramowicz
Coordonnatrice,
Coalition française pour la diversité
culturelle

the Arts and Cultural of Morelos, Mexico

Lucy White
Executive Director
PACT

Anne-Marie Desroches
Directrice des affaires publiques,
Union des artistes

Lorraine Farkas
Director, Planning, Research and
Communications
Canadian Artists and Producers
Professional Relations Tribunal

Keith Kelly
formerly senior manager at Canada
Council and former CCA National
Director

Lori Baxter
Director, Arts Now
former Executive Director of Greater
Vancouver Alliance for Arts and Culture

Laurent Lapierre
Professeur au HEC

Scott McIntyre
President and Publisher
Douglas and McIntyre Publishing Group