

ASSESSMENT
OF THE
CULTURAL STATISTICS PROGRAM:
PHASE TWO REPORT
RECOMMENDATIONS

DPA Consulting Ltd.
January, 1982

P
91
C655
C83
1982
v.1

Queen
P
91
C655
C83
1982
v.1

Industry Canada
Library Queen
JUL 20 1998
Industrie Canada
Bibliothèque Queen

ASSESSMENT
OF THE
① CULTURAL STATISTICS PROGRAM:
PHASE TWO REPORT
RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMUNICATIONS CANADA
JUL 4 1985
LIBRARY - BIBLIOTHÈQUE

DPA Consulting Ltd.
January, 1982

ASSESSMENT OF THE CULTURAL STATISTICS PROGRAM: PHASE TWO

RECOMMENDATIONS

Following the study team's presentation of the findings and recommendations of the assessment of the CSP, the Joint Coordinating Committee (J.C.C.) requested that two reports be prepared. The two reports were a report on the assessment findings and a separate report presenting the recommendations.

This report presents the recommendations on the three parts of the assessment:

1. The joint conduct of the Program;
2. The CSP processes; and
3. Program products and services.

Within each of the three parts the recommendations have been listed in a decreasing priority ranking. Recommendations are cross referenced to the findings contained in the main report.

I CSP as a Jointly-Sponsored Program (Section VII)

The CSP, during its five-year life, has made significant progress towards the establishment of a uniform set of time-series data on key aspects of culture in Canada. A substantial and heterogeneous body of users of the CSP data was identified in Phase One. Evidence exists of important policy uses of the data by the principle client, DOC (Arts and Culture) and other users. Recall, however, that the study team did not examine the question of the effectiveness or cost-effectiveness of the existing Program.

However, problems now exist with the functioning of the CSP as a

jointly sponsored program. These problems do not warrant major organizational changes. Both ADM's responsible for the Program are committed to making a joint program work to their mutual satisfaction. Recommendations to achieve this are:

1. Do not expend resources or cause disruptions associated with major organizational changes. Modify the existing program to deal with the problems identified. (Parts 4, 5)
2. Continue to locate the program in Statistics Canada but institute a much more business-like approach to the relationship between DOC and STC officials. (Part 5.1)
3. The role of the J.C.C. should be defined to set priorities and strategies and to conduct an annual accountability session on the program. To achieve this role the formal statement of membership in the J.C.C. should be redefined to include the respective ADM's of DOC and STC. (Parts 3.1, 4, 5.1)
4. Create an Executive Committee of the J.C.C. responsible for ensuring that the program works by overseeing the implementation of the recommendations accepted by the J.C.C. Details on this committee are contained in recommendations #9 and #10. (Part 5.1)
5. Formal joint project teams are critical to the conduct of the CSP as a Joint program and must be formed for each survey. (Parts 3.2, 4, 5.1)
6. The manager of the individual project teams should come from STC but individual team members from both Departments should be appointed and held accountable for progress on the individual surveys. (Parts 3.2, 4, 5.1)
7. Project team members should be called upon periodically to report to the J.C.C. Executive committee on project status. (Parts 3.1, 3.2, 4, 5.1)

8. A formal working agreement should be struck by representatives of both Departments on the management responsibility for the program to be assumed by the DOC. (Parts 4, 5.1)

9. The Executive Committee should be chaired by the Director General, Planning and Coordination, Arts and Culture Branch, DOC. The Manager of the CSP and the manager of the Research and Statistics Program, Arts and Culture, DOC should also serve on this Committee. (Part 5.1)

10. The responsibilities of the Executive Committee should be to direct and monitor the conduct of the CSP and report to the J.C.C. on the program. The first tasks of the committee should be to:

- ensure that formal joint project teams are formed;
- ensure that DOC specifies its data requirements within specified time limits; and,
- ensure that a DOC product line is developed. (Parts 3.1, 3.2, 4, 5.1)

Overall, the Committee would be accountable to the J.C.C. for the implementation of all of the recommendations in this report selected by the J.C.C. for implementation.

II Program Processes (Section V)

Recommendations

1. An examination of the duties and responsibilities of the Assistant Director of the Division, should be conducted and a clear division of responsibilities be enunciated to ensure overall control and management

- of the Program. (Part 8.2.1.2)
2. The role of the Chief, Analysis Section be carefully defined to ensure that:
 - a) subject matter specialty is not allowed to dominate time and energy at the expense of management and control responsibilities; and
 - b) the reporting relationship of analysts is through the unit heads. (Part 8.2.1.2)
 3. The role and responsibilities of the Unit Heads be defined to include;
 - a) responsibility for development of analysts; and
 - b) responsibility for designating project managers and monitoring project schedules, costs and outputs. (Part 8.2.1.2)
 4. CSP management re-assess the role of the analyst in order to provide for: (a) a more intensive participation in all aspects of the program step detail processes; (b) a deliberate program of development and training for analysts; and (c) the means to assess workload levels for analysts on an ongoing basis to determine the potential for easing unit heads workloads and effecting savings. (Part 8.2.1.3)
 5. CSP institute a formal project management approach, using analysts to the greatest extent possible. (Part 8.2.3)
 6. DOC define, with the agreement of STC, its preferred role, at each level of the process step detail. Particular attention should be paid to clarifying the role of DOC in defining its overall data needs.

(Part 8.2.3)

- 7) Formal project reviews, with written reports, should be the responsibility of the project manager and should involve all participants, including DOC staff, immediately following the final clean file stage.

An outline of the project review approach is detailed at the end of the Part 2 Recommendations (Part 8.2.6)

- 8) Effective April 1st the budgets for the Program should be broken down by;

- i) Management Overhead,
- ii) Analysis function, and
- iii) Operations function,
- iv) The major step detail components.

(Part 8.2.4)

- 9) All other current REMAP breakdowns by projects and special requests be continued on a project basis, but reflecting the breakdown in Recommendation 9, for each project. (Part 8.2.4)
- 10) Early steps be taken to create project documentation files, similar to the Operations file on the Actors Survey, as a repository for future operational use and development training. (Part 8.2.5)
- 11) Detailed time usage and other cost data be compiled and assessed for both main frame and mini-computer use to determine the most cost-effective method of producing CSP clean file data. (Part 8.2.7.1)
- 12) Alternative methods of dissemination, such as newsletters, that would reduce heavy publication costs, should be studied. This should include greater use of straight table presentations of data for Bulletins,

with complete descriptions of all clean file data available, and the data base methodology used.

(Part 8.2.7.2)

- 13) New efforts be made to obtain machine transfer compatibility between Canada Council and CSP survey forms, in time for the 1981 Performing Arts survey.
(Part 7.1)
- 14) An examination of the feasibility of providing sub-project resource utilization and scheduling data for the separate disciplines of the Performing Arts should be conducted to provide details on the actual costs involved. (Part 7.3)
- 15) The feasibility, utility and service connotations of providing separate releases of data for performing arts disciplines should be explored. (Part 7.4)
- 16) The use of a single, optional type survey form for Performing Arts should be explored as a possible way of reducing survey costs. (Part 7.4)

Detailed Project Review Approach under Recommendation 7.

Area 1 - Pre Consultative Stage - Decisions

Was sufficient information provided to the J.C.C that:

Highlighted significant factors relating to the project concerned

Placed the project in context with the program priorities

Identified the costs and benefits

Clearly defined the project objectives?

Did the J.C.C provide the required level of direction as a basis for conducting the project?

Area 2 - Pre Consultation - Objectives/Needs

Were CSP inputs timely, meaningful at each level e.g. sample population, data content, new issues etc.?

Were DOC inputs timely, meaningful for specifying needs and providing feedback on data quality and content?

Did the pre-consultation plans prove to be realistic for the subsequent process steps?

Area 3 - Consultation Stage

Was consultation conducted in the breadth planned and within times scheduled?

Were suggestions/proposals for change fully considered?

What specific changes resulted and what was their impact on the product?

What were the DOC and CSP specific inputs and what was their level of effectiveness?

What costs were incurred to complete the consultation step?

Area 4 - Survey Development Stage

Were mailing lists changes made, on what basis and what was planned v.s. actual timing?

Were content or data methodologies changes made, to what effect and were changes made within planned scheduling?

Were all changes examined, cleared and implemented with DOC and CSP inputs?

Were edit programs and output requests completed satisfactorily and within scheduled time frames?

Were Central Statistics Canada services used:

To What Extent?

With what quality satisfaction level?

At what cost?

Were they delivered within planned schedules?

What decisions was taken on main frame-mini computer use

With what result?

At what cost?

What were the inputs on survey design;

By analysis section?

By operations section?

By DOC staff?

By others?

At what cost and with what results?

Area 5 - Data Collection Phase

Was mail out achieved within planned schedules/cost

and coverage?

What special problems were encountered in data collection?

What were they?

How were they resolved?

Were planned cut-off dates achieved?

If not, why not?

What were inputs of Analysis Section

Operations Section

DOC staff?

Other?

And with what results?

And at what cost?

What percentage of return was achieved?

Actual V.S. planned percentage?

Percentages by key dates?

What Levels of assistance offered or provided?

By type and cost estimate?

What was learned for future or other projects?

Area 6 - File Creation/Data Preparation Phase

Were scheduled dates achieved?

For preliminary clean file?

Final clean file?

If not, what were contributing factors?

Within Operations Section?

Within Analysis Section?

Within other areas?

What were costs and staff utilization figures?
and were they over/under planned?

Explain variances?

What was learned as contributions to future or
other projects?

Area 7 - Pre Analysis Extraction

Were output specifications followed?

Was output satisfactory for analysis
If yes, was it timely?

If no, what problems were encountered, how were they
resolved, who was involved?

If testing was done, what were the results?

If testing was not done, why not?

Were second round output requests made?

Why and with what result?

At what cost?

By whom?

What were total output costs and staff utilization?

What was learned as contributions to future or other projects?

Area 8 - Pre Publication Analysis

Was analysis completed within scheduled times?

What special problems were encountered and how were they resolved?

What input occurred?

By Analysis Section?

By Operations Section?

By DOC?

By others?

What were costs involved?

How was content or theme decided, by whom, and why?

Who edited for

Quality?

Theme?

Other factors?

And what were the results?

What tables were used and in relation to what total data available?

Why?

With what result?

What lessons were learned as contributions to future or other projects?

At a later date, following the publishing and disseminating of data a final review phase should occur as a products and services review.

Area 9 - Publishing and Disseminating

Were schedules for editing, translating, formating, typesetting, proofing and printing met?

If not, where and why reasons for delay?

What were costs?

By CSP Sections?

By DOC?

By Central STC services?

What lessons were learned as contributions to future or other projects?

III Program Products and Services (Section VI)

Products Recommendations

1. DOC is the principle client of the CSP. Immediate efforts should be made by DOC and STC officials to develop a product line tailor-made for DOC. (Part 1.2)
2. Acknowledge the heterogeneity in the CSP users by viewing the clean file as the major program product. In particular, reduce the emphasis on the publications. (Part 1.2)
3. Encourage the use of special requests through marketing of this product. This recommendation is particularly important if the emphasis on publications is reduced. (Parts 1.1, 1.2)
4. Encourage other major users (eg. Provincial Departments and Agencies, cultural organizations) to specify annual tabulations to be provided as soon as the clean files are prepared. These could be specified during the consultation steps. (Part 1.2)
5. Encourage more use of arrangements for providing users with access to the data tapes. (Parts 1.1, 1.2)
6. Continue to produce the service bulletin and place emphasis on using it as a means of informing users of the data that can be accessed as well as the various means of access. (Parts 1.1, 1.2)
7. Capitalize upon the STC strategic thrust to keep abreast of the potential applications of new technologies for disseminating and collecting information, eg. Telidon field trials and other innovative data collection experiments. DOC officials could capitalize upon their access to information on the application of new technologies through other branches in their Department. (Part 1.2)

Marketing Recommendations

8. Give priority to using the resources saved in producing publications, for conducting marketing activities. (Parts 1.2, 1.3)
9. Produce an innovative information document on the program to encourage use by a variety of groups. (Part 1.3)
10. Capitalize upon the STC strategic thrust towards marketing and information services, and volunteer the CSP for any pilot studies conducted. (Part 1.3)
11. On-site demonstrations using portable terminals can be a particularly effective way of marketing the program. The cost-effectiveness of such an approach should be examined. An example of a suitable event would be the seminars on the management of Arts and Culture Organizations which are conducted at the Banff School. (Parts 1.2, 1.3)

Analysis and Recommendations

12. Achieve closer cooperation between DOC and STC on the analysis to be conducted on the data. This would avoid duplication of efforts by the two Departments and provide for consistent interpretation of the data. (Part 2.1)

User-Education and Recommendations

13. Concomitant with reducing the emphasis on publications, attention should be paid to educating users on the use of the CSP and statistics. (Parts 1.2, 2.2)

Coordination/Clearinghouse Recommendations

14. Do not give priority to a coordination/clearinghouse service at this time. Other issues raised are more important to the

future of the program. (Part 2.3)

