



Industry
Canada

Industry
Canada

**Community Access Program
Rural Element
- Revised Evaluation Framework -**

January 2000

Canada

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Executive Summary	i
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Background/ Context	2
1.2 Study Methodology	2
1.3 Scope	3
1.4 Report Format	3
<u>PART I — ON-GOING PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT</u>	4
2.0 Profile	5
2.1 Objectives	5
2.2 Description	5
2.3 Resources	6
2.4 Performance Framework	6
3.0 Performance Measures	8
3.1 Definitions	8
3.2 CAP Performance Measures	9
4.0 Performance Information Sources / Methods and Gaps	10
4.1 Internal Sources of Information	10
4.2 External Sources of Information	12
5.0 Proposed Approaches to On-Going Data Collection	13
5.1 Overview of Approach	13
5.2 Skills Development	13
5.3 Internet Access	14
5.4 Awareness Building	14
5.5 Cost to Implement	15
<u>PART II — EVALUATION</u>	17
6.0 Evaluation Issues	18
6.1 Relevance	18
6.2 Success	19
6.3 Cost-Effectiveness and Alternatives	21
7.0 Proposed Approach to Data Collection for an Evaluation	22
7.1 Approaches	22
7.2 Link Between Issues and Proposed Approaches	23
8.0 Options for Future Evaluation	24
8.1 Option 1:	24
8.2 Option 2: Minimum	26

Executive Summary

Introduction

This study involved the development of an evaluation framework for the Community Access Program (CAP).

A detailed profile of CAP was prepared. This involved the development of a performance framework which identifies the activities, outputs, reach, near-term outcomes, intermediate outcomes and ultimate outcomes for the program.

It is important to note that this framework was originally completed in November 1998 but it has been revisited and revised in light of the pending evaluation study. The revised framework reflects the current situation with respect to data collection on both an on-going basis and for future evaluation.

ON-GOING PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

CAP Performance Measures

Key performance measures for CAP were identified across the performance spectrum of Resources, Reach and Results.

Performance Information Sources / Methods and Gaps

Interviews, conducted with CAP regional managers, staff, coordinators, and representatives of provincial committees, showed that a standard method to collect performance information did not exist. A wide discrepancy currently exists in the type of information collected.

The key internal sources for CAP performance information are the milestone reports. In some cases, the information currently collected through these reports appears to be complete and reliable. In other cases, however, interviewees indicated that this information was not provided consistently. Based on the experience of CAP to date, the milestone reports are currently being revisited and adjusted to more realistically reflect what volunteer-based CAP sites are able to gather and report on performance information through the milestone reporting system. In future, milestone reports will focus on: tombstone data; general information about site services offered and visitors/clients; the extent to which sites are networked with other sites; and, success stories where available.

The key external sources for CAP performance information are visitors/clients, CAP site coordinators and other stakeholders. The results presented in the performance framework which refer to the impact on clients, their opinions about services and their level of satisfaction with those services, will have to be measured through one-off, targeted surveys and other feedback mechanisms. It is not practical to attempt to obtain this information through the milestone reports and experience to date, indicates that volunteer-operated CAP

sites do not have the capacity to gather citizen/client information on an on-going basis.

The interviews demonstrated that only a few CAP sites have client feedback mechanisms in place, thus the need for targeted surveys.

***Proposed Approaches
to On-Going Data
Collection***

An approach for on-going data collection is proposed which will ensure that CAP and CAP site management have the required performance information for day-to-day management and that the client information which should feed into the evaluation issues is also collected where feasible.

There are three categories of CAP activities:

Skills Development — information on the resources for the skills development activity is suggested; information on the attendees at these events is also required. A survey completed immediately after a session with all participants and a telephone follow-up survey, approximately one month after the session, with a sample of participants is recommended;

Internet Access — the measurement strategy should include tracking of budgeted and actual resources; tracking of basic information on clients; and a brief contact soon after the interaction to measure satisfaction with, and usefulness of, access to the Internet; and,

Awareness Building — follow-up should be based on the incidence of such activities; nonetheless, the performance measurement strategy should include tracking of budgeted and actual resources for each activity; basic information on the number and profile of people reached by the activities; and measurement of change in awareness, and possibly contents recall, over time.

EVALUATION

Evaluation Issues

The general evaluation categories prescribed by Treasury Board were used to group a number of specific evaluation questions related to CAP as follows:

Relevance:

- I. Is there a need for a program:
 - To assist the establishment and sustainability of public sites and networks of sites for Canadians to access and use the Information Highway?
 - To support services offered through the public sites and networks that:
 - better inform citizens through the exchange of ideas and information?

- create greater public awareness of the benefits and opportunities of using information technologies and services?
- help individuals to more effectively use the services available through Information Highway technologies?
- create opportunity for economic and social benefits for the community by using information technologies?

To facilitate access by Canadians to online government programs and services?

Success:

2. To what extent is the program reaching its intended audience?
3. To what extent has the program achieved its goals and objectives?
4. What are the impacts and benefits of having access to CAP sites and services for:
 - business users?
 - home users?
5. How successful are the sites which are receiving / have received CAP funding?

Cost-Effectiveness and Alternatives:

6. Are results being achieved in the most cost-effective manner?
7. Is the program unique?

Any or all of these questions may be considered in a future evaluation, along with other issues which arise in the interim, depending on management concerns and priorities at that time.

***Proposed Approaches
to Evaluation Data
Collection***

In order to address the evaluation issues presented, the following approaches are proposed:

- review of milestone reports and other program files;
- review of literature, including literature on other programs;
- analysis of on-going client survey results;
- a survey of clients of the various CAP services;
- interviews with community leaders / experts;
- interviews with CAP site coordinators;
- interviews with representatives of other programs; and,
- site visits.

Options for Future Evaluation

Two options for future evaluation were identified at the time the evaluation framework was completed in November, 1998. These options are outlined below. Option 1 was based on an assumption, at the time, that the establishment of an on-going performance measurement system made sense for CAP sites. Experience since November 1998, however, has indicated that very few of the volunteer-operated CAP sites have the capacity to efficiently operate such a system. Therefore, Option 1 is no longer valid. On the other hand, Option 2, which is not based on any assumption about establishing an on-going performance measurement system remains valid and is a reasonable option under current circumstances.

1. Option 1 assumed that an on-going performance measurement approach would be put into effect in the near future and that therefore, maximum use of on-going information will be made. CAP administration and management will have access to current CAP site data and indicators. CAP sites will also be provided with on-going feedback. All approaches presented in the above section are to be used. However, the scope is reduced: fewer interviews are conducted with all stakeholder groups, these interviews are shorter in length and therefore do not probe as deeply into some of the issues.

Nonetheless, all issues are covered. Cost efficiencies are also gained because the on-going measurement strategies recommended earlier have been implemented. Therefore, an extensive amount of reliable data is already available.

The total estimated cost of this option is \$43,000; however, this cost does not include the costs involved with implementing and maintaining the on-going performance measurement strategies.

2. Option 2 assumes that while some on-going performance information is collected, this information will be limited to the elements currently contained in the milestone reports. Therefore, detailed client profile and outcomes information will not be available at the time of the evaluation. CAP administration and management will not have access to current CAP site data and indicators. CAP sites will not be provided with on-going feedback. Under this option, more interviews are completed. These interviews are longer in length because they probe more deeply into some of the issues.

Because the amount of on-going data which is available to the evaluators is limited, more initial data collection is required. The client surveys must include larger samples and be longer in length because, at the time of the evaluation, little or no client results information is available.

The total estimated cost is \$62,000; however, this cost does not include the costs involved with implementing and maintaining the on-going performance measurement strategies, which while lower than for the first option presented, could still be significant.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background/ Context

The Community Access Program (CAP) was launched by the Minister of Industry Canada on February 17, 1995, and is a key component of the federal government's Connecting Canadians initiative. This program is a joint venture of federal, provincial, and territorial governments, along with community volunteers, working to ensure that the economic and social benefits of the Information Highway are available to all Canadians through the establishment of public Internet access sites in schools, libraries and other community-based facilities. At the federal level, the program is managed by Industry Canada, but it is essential to take note of the fact that sites do not belong to the government. They belong to communities and they are run by volunteers in those communities.

This study involved the development of a performance measurement framework for all elements of CAP (i.e., Phases 1 and 2). Some evaluation options were identified for a future evaluation of CAP.

1.2 Study Methodology

The study involved:

- developing a performance framework based on CAP documents;
- holding a working session with CAP regional managers and staff to adjust the performance framework and to discuss measures, data sources, and gaps;
- conducting a series of interviews to obtain more depth on measurement and performance indicators;
- determining that the measures are complete by comparing CAP identified measures to those of other departments and agencies for similar outcomes;
- identifying the systems currently available in CAP to provide performance information;
- identifying gaps in current CAP systems to obtain the performance information required; and,
- where gaps were noted, determining what new systems or what change is required.

1.3 Scope

This framework does not address specific issues related to youth employment, francophone network and aboriginal sites. These are, however, included in general issues when profile considerations are noted.

The scope of the issues presented in this report are based on the program's profile as of June 1998. Because of its constantly changing nature, the framework and the issues will need to be updated prior to an evaluation of the program.

1.4 Report Format

PART I — ON-GOING PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT presents an overall approach for on-going performance measurement for CAP and is organized as follows:

- **Section 2** provides a program profile with a performance framework for CAP which delineates linkages between program objectives, activities, outputs, impacts and effects.
- **Section 3** describes the performance measures.
- **Section 4** provides an inventory of information sources or systems currently available which will address some of the performance information needs, discusses the gaps in the systems, and provides an overview of the new systems which need to be implemented to obtain the performance information.
- **Section 5** proposes an approach for on-going data collection.

PART II — EVALUATION presents options for a future evaluation of the program and is organized as follows:

- **Section 6** describes potential evaluation issues, indicators and sources according to the general evaluation categories prescribed by Treasury Board (i.e., relevance, success, cost-effectiveness and alternatives).
- **Section 7** proposes an approach for data collection for a future evaluation of the CAP.
- **Section 8** identifies two costed options for a future evaluation of the CAP.

PART I — ON-GOING PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

2.0 Profile

2.1 Objectives

CAP has three primary objectives:

- To assist the establishment and sustainability of public sites and networks of sites for Canadians to access and use the Information Highway;
- To support services offered through the public sites and networks that:
 - better inform citizens through the exchange of ideas and information;
 - create greater public awareness of the benefits and opportunities of using information technologies and services;
 - help individuals to more effectively use the services available through Information Highway technologies;
 - create opportunity for economic and social benefits for the community by using information technologies; and,
- To facilitate access by Canadians to online government programs and services.

2.2 Description

CAP is an initiative developed to help provide Canadians with affordable public access to the Internet and the skills to utilize it effectively. Under CAP, such public sites as local schools, libraries, and community centres act as "on-ramps" to the Information Highway and provide support on how to make the best use of the Internet.

CAP originally focussed on establishing 5,000 access sites in rural and remote communities. The 1998 Budget provided funding for the creation of up to an additional 5,000 Internet access sites in urban neighbourhoods across Canada. To date, about 4,000 rural and remote communities have been brought on-line by CAP partners, bringing Canada closer to the goal of establishing up to 10,000 access sites by the end of fiscal year 2000-01.

2.3 Resources

CAP is funded from the government's Jobs and Growth Agenda and also receives funding from Human Resources Development Canada's Youth Employment Strategy to help site managers and staff develop CAP sites.

Beginning in 1995, CAP was mandated to link 1,000 communities at a cost of \$22.5 million over four years. This original mandate was expanded to 1,500 communities in the 1996 Budget with an additional \$10.5 million. As part of the action plan to support jobs and growth

in rural Canada, the 1997 Budget committed an additional \$30 million to CAP to expand the links to 5,000 rural and remote communities. In the 1998 Budget, an additional \$133 million was provided to dramatically expand the program and create 5,000 public internet access sites in Urban Canada bringing the total commitment to 10,000 sites in rural, remote and urban Canada. Under the Youth Employment Strategy, a further \$9 million has been provided over the two year period 1997-98 and 1998-99, to support 1,000 youth jobs per year.

Over the life of CAP, through to the end of fiscal year 2000-01, the program is expected to spend \$196 million.

2.4 Performance Framework

2.4.1 Definitions

The performance framework simplifies government programs and services into five sequential categories:

Activities Activities are the things which an individual, an organizational unit, a program, a department and / or a government does in order to carry out a desired mandate. Activities typically generate costs of some kind. These need to be articulated in precise terms along with the activities performed.

Outputs Outputs are things one can count that occur as a result of activities. Outputs can include communication contacts which are produced and consumed instantaneously and they can include hard copy agreements, contracts or other physical evidence which is preserved over time. Outputs are typically considered to flow outside of a service / program function, however, they could include internal communications, plans or services.

Reach Reach is defined as the group, or groups, which are reached by program / service outputs. Clearly this may include clients as well as internal staff, co-delivery agents and other stakeholders / beneficiaries.

Direct outcomes Direct outcomes occur in the group(s) immediately reached by program / service outputs. Typically, the outcomes are a perceptual, attitudinal and / or behavioral response on the part of the group(s) reached. The response then leads to longer-term impacts along a causal chain.

Ultimate impacts The ultimate impacts of a program / service should relate to the mission and mandate of the program / service provided.

**2.4.2 CAP
Performance
Framework**

The CAP performance framework is presented on the next page. It is the culmination of a review of documents, the workshop, and interviews with CAP representatives.

Vision: To make Canada the most connected nation in the world				
Mission: To provide all Canadians with affordable public access to the Information Highway by March 31, 2001				
Resources		Reach	Results	
HOW?		WHO?	WHAT do we want?	WHY?
Activities	Outputs	Client / Co-deliverers	Direct Outcomes	Ultimate Impacts
<p>Phase 1</p> <p>Deployment of 5,000 rural and up to 5,000 urban CAP sites</p> <p>Negotiation with provinces / territories for MOAs</p> <p>Establishment of Strategic / Management Committees and Rural / Urban Committees (where warranted)</p>	<p>Funding provisions have varied over the history of the program.</p> <p>Doubling of financial resources and acceleration in deployment of CAP sites in rural and urban areas</p> <p>Strategic / Management Committees to leverage existing infrastructure</p> <p>Rural / Urban Committees to gain full strategic support of community-based organizations</p>	<p><u>Clients</u></p> <p>Public SMEs Employees Educators Students Youth Other Federal Government Departments - OGDs (e.g., Health Canada, HRDC, NRCan, Department of Justice)</p> <p><u>Co-Deliverers</u></p> <p>Provincial, territorial, or municipal governments Private not-for-profit organizations Social development organizations Public libraries Schools Community-based organizations, associations or networks First Nations and official language minority communities Voluntary sector</p>	<p><u>Clients</u></p> <p>Reasonable (accelerated) access by the general public Affordable public access to the Internet Clients trained to use the Internet / basic computer training Y2K readiness Public awareness of the benefits and opportunities of using information technologies and the Information Highway (including E-Commerce) Appropriate use of information technologies and the Information Highway Benefits derived from use of the Internet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - enhanced quality of business activity - exchange information and ideas <p>Behavioural influence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increased communications / reduced isolation barriers - use of information technology and the Information Highway outside of the CAP site - Canadian content on the Internet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Agreements with OGDs <input type="checkbox"/> Increased productivity of partnerships <p><u>Co-Deliverers</u></p> <p>Electronic access to government services (Phase 2) Network of existing and / or new access sites Acquisition and maintenance of computers and peripherals and other goods and services essential to the operation of the access sites or networks Employment opportunities for youth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - work experience in a high-demand sector <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Community ownership and motivation for change 	<p>Sustainability of CAP sites (Phase 2)</p> <p>Business expansion</p> <p>Creating an environment and opportunities for job creation to occur</p> <p>Economic benefit for the community</p> <p>Social benefit for the community / community capacity building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> population integrates Information Technology into its lifestyle
<p>Phase 2</p> <p>Helping to sustain existing CAP sites</p> <p>Setting and implementing service standards at CAP sites</p> <p>Advance pilot activities / promotion (e.g., E-Commerce)</p> <p>Monitoring of sites</p> <p>Preparation of Proposal Guide and publications for national distribution</p> <p>Technical and communication support services</p> <p>Y2K activities</p>	<p>Enhanced Information Highway services to communities and providing a platform for future expanded activities</p> <p>Reprofiling of CAP sites to meet minimum standards of service</p> <p>CAP Web site (electronic tools)</p> <p>Applications to CAP</p> <p>Advanced pilot projects (e.g., E-Commerce)</p> <p>Site inspections</p>			

3.0 Performance Measures

3.1 Definitions

In order to ensure that performance is measured across the spectrum of the performance framework described in the previous section, it is important to ensure that measures cover what we refer to as the Three Rs of performance measurement: resources, reach, results.

Each of these components can be represented by specific measures outlined below. For the most part, specific measures can be taken to represent these components, and for this reason, it is critical to choose measures of appropriate validity, reliability, and balance.

Resource measures may include:

- human resource measures;
- physical / technical / information / process resource measures; and,
- financial resource measures.

Reach measures may include.

- user segments / categories measures;
- achievement of critical mass measures; and,
- co-deliverers.

Results measures may include:

- influence / value-added measures;
- client service measures; and,
- fairness measures.

**3.2 CAP
Performance
Measures**

The key performance measures for CAP are provided below for each performance area.

Resources	Reach	Results
\$ from CAP funding	Profile of co-deliverers and some clients.	Client / CAP site coordinators / community representatives perceptions / opinions
In-kind contributions	# of clients undergoing skills development	Client satisfaction
\$ from other sources	Community penetration (% of community using site)	Public / client awareness
# of volunteers / paid staff	Community penetration (% of community using site)	Business activity generated
# of volunteer / paid staff hours	Community penetration (% of community using site)	Home / business use of the Internet by clients
# of skills development sessions by type	Community penetration (% of community using site)	# of clients who have created new web sites
	Community penetration (% of community using site)	# of, impacts of and CAP's influence on networks / new access sites created by location
	Community penetration (% of community using site)	Status of CAP sites
	Community penetration (% of community using site)	Inventory and profile of equipment at sites
	Community penetration (% of community using site)	# and scope / magnitude of agreements with OGDs
	Community penetration (% of community using site)	Increased flow of information / accessible to more people
	Community penetration (% of community using site)	# of partners actively involved
	Community penetration (% of community using site)	# of positions offered to youth

4.0 Performance Information Sources / Methods and Gaps

Preliminary information sources and gaps were identified for the performance measures mentioned in the previous section. Interviews were conducted with CAP managers, staff, coordinators, and representatives of provincial committees, and it was determined that a standard method to collect performance information did not exist. A wide discrepancy currently exists in the type of information collected.

4.1 Internal Sources of Information

The key internal sources for CAP performance information are the milestone reports essentially aimed at gathering tombstone information plus some information on visitors and courses offered. . In some cases, the information currently collected through these reports appears to be complete and reliable. In other cases, information is currently collected through the reports, but interviewees indicated that this information was not provided consistently. Based on the experience of CAP to date, the milestone reports are currently being revisited and adjusted to more realistically reflect what volunteer-based CAP sites are able to gather and report on performance information.

Information which appears to complete and reliable includes:

- \$ from CAP funding;
- in-kind contributions;
- \$ from other sources;
- # of visitors
- # of skills development sessions by type;
- # of clients undergoing skills development by type and in total;
- # of partners by type;

Information which is not consistently provided includes:

- some of the client profile characteristics; and,
- inventory and profile of equipment at sites.

Additional information requirements include:

- # of volunteers / paid staff;
- # of volunteer / paid staff hours; and,

- some profile characteristics.

There are a few important points which should be made regarding the milestone reports:

- First, CAP coordinators indicated that completing the current milestone reports was a very time consuming task, particularly given the fact that it is completed by volunteers. The information requirements are currently too burdensome, therefore new elements should only be added if absolutely necessary;
- Second, CAP coordinators cannot comment on the usefulness of these reports since the information is not fed back to them once collected. Even when specific requests for feedback are made, the information does not appear to be available;
- Third, several interviewees questioned the usefulness of these reports;
- Fourth, since CAP sites are promoting the use of information technologies, an effort should be made to convince sites to report electronically, but so far, this has proven to be a difficult task; and,
- Fifth, when there is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with a province, the milestone reports are provided to the provincial coordinator / committee rather than directly to IC / CAP management. There is some indication for concern regarding the completeness of the information provided by the provincial partners to CAP. Detailed milestone report information is not always provided, but rather simply a summary report. In cases where there is no MOU, there is also concern that the information provided in the milestone reports is not made available by CAP to the province. The province must therefore collect its own information and add burden on the CAP site coordinators, most of whom are volunteers who do not have that much time to provide this type of information.

Nonetheless, many CAP coordinators have commented that the current milestone reporting format is easier than an earlier reporting format used at the beginning of the program in 1995.

4.2 External Sources of Information

The key external sources for CAP performance information are visitors/clients, CAP site coordinators and other stakeholders. Many of the results presented in the performance framework which refer to the impact on clients, their opinions about services and their satisfaction with those services, will have to be measured through on-off targeted surveys and other feedback mechanisms.

The interviews demonstrated that only a few CAP sites have some of these client feedback mechanisms in place and thus the need for targeted, one-off surveys.

Overall, the interviewees believed that this feedback information would be very valuable and should be gathered where possible.

5.0 Proposed Approaches to On-Going Data Collection

This section proposes an approach for on-going data collection which will ensure that CAP management, site coordinators, and provincial committees have the required performance information for day-to-day management and that the client information that should feed into the evaluation issues of Section 6.0 is collected where feasible.

5.1 Overview of Approach

The activities of CAP sites can be grouped into three categories:

- Skills Development: this includes introductory courses to the CAP site and its services as well as advanced Internet skills development in HTML and other formats;
- Access to the Internet: this includes on-site access to the Internet as well as e-mail accounts; and,
- Awareness Building: this includes public information sessions.

5.2 Skills Development

Skills development helps users develop the skills or knowledge to help themselves. The relationship between CAP sites and users is of medium intensity. For these activities, the measurement strategy should be as follows:

- Measurement information on the resources for the activity:* This includes budgeted and actual resources for the activity.
- Measurement of the usefulness and impacts resulting from skills development sessions:* The usefulness and impacts of the course should be measured approximately one to three months after the session. If more time has elapsed, it is again highly likely that respondents will not know what specific course they are evaluating. This should be a telephone survey to ensure that the respondent remembers the course (i.e., the interviewer can prompt until sure that the respondent remembers). It can be administered to a sample of those who attended the session.

5.3 Internet Access

Internet access creates value for the user. The users will be affected if they choose to take some action (e.g., create a web site) based on the fact that they now have access to the Internet and if they have the skills and knowledge to do so.

The performance measurement strategy should be based on the following principles:

- Budgeted and actual resources should be tracked.
- Basic information on the clients served should be maintained in order to be able to report reliable information on how many and who was reached.
- The client survey should ensure the following:
 - Contact should take place fairly soon after access;
 - The interview must be brief; and
 - Only a sample of clients should be surveyed.

5.4 Awareness Building

Measurement for awareness building activities should be tailored to the individual activities of each CAP site or province. Nonetheless, some overall principles should apply:

- Measurement should take place soon after the activity; and,
- It should simply measure awareness of the activity, and possibly content recall, as well as, intention to use the information conveyed in the message.

CAP could also:

- Track budgeted and actual resources for each activity; and,
- Obtain basic information on the number of people reached by the activities.

5.5 Cost to Implement

While it is difficult to truly assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the current reporting system, some suggestions seem worthy of mention even if they could prove difficult to implement:

- Electronic submission of the milestone reports.* This would provide sites with the capacity to systemize their ability to collect the information required in the reports and to simply transmit them to CAP management.
- Access by the sites to the database information from the milestone reports.* The sites and provincial partners would be

able to use this information for decision-making purposes if it was available.

The costs to implement such suggestions are impossible to forecast within the scope of this study.

For the surveys, costs will depend on who administers, analyzes and reports on the various surveys. However, for planning purposes, it can be assumed that:

- For any telephone survey following a skills development session, the costs will include sampling, interviewing, coding, data entry, analysis and reporting. It should therefore be limited to approximately \$40 per completed questionnaire, unless the sample size is so small that economies of scale cannot be achieved in which case the costs would be higher, or if the sample size is very large in which case the costs would be lower;
- For awareness building, since measurement would depend on the activity, cost estimates cannot be provided.

Regardless of which survey is involved, it will be more cost-effective to centralize surveying activities for all CAP sites. This is due to the fact that economies of scale are achieved with larger sample sizes.

By centralizing these activities, the following benefits should also be noted:

- It is more likely to be done in a disciplined fashion — if each CAP site is trying to do its own survey, this is less likely to occur;
- External parties are more likely to find the results more credible and reliable — groups reviewing the performance measurement process, such as the Auditor General, are less likely to believe that the “best” clients were selected for the survey if the sampling and administration of the survey takes place centrally; and,
- It is more likely that the appropriately trained people to administer the surveys can be found — CAP sites are unlikely to have the resources to have personnel with the skills for

conducting telephone interviews, statistical analysis and for interpreting the results confidently.

PART II — EVALUATION

6.0 Evaluation Issues

The general evaluation categories prescribed by Treasury Board were used to group a number of specific evaluation questions related to CAP. Any or all of these questions may be considered in a future evaluation, along with other issues which arise in the interim, depending on management concerns and priorities at that time.

6.1 Relevance

<i>Issue #1</i>	<p>Is there a need for a program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> To assist the establishment and sustainability of public sites and networks of sites for Canadians to access and use the Information Highway? <input type="checkbox"/> To support services offered through the public sites and networks that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - better inform citizens through the exchange of ideas and information? - create greater public awareness of the benefits and opportunities of using information technologies and services? - help individuals to more effectively use the services available through Information Highway technologies? - create opportunity for economic and social benefits for the community by using information technologies? <input type="checkbox"/> To facilitate access by Canadians to online government programs and services?
<i>Indicators</i>	<p>Degree of use of services by location</p> <p>Extent to which the services of the program match the needs of its target clients</p> <p>Availability of other comparable services / uniqueness of CAP sites in the communities</p>
<i>Sources</i>	<p>Milestone reports</p> <p>CAP site coordinators</p>

Community leaders / experts
 Evaluation client impact surveys
 Literature

6.2 Success

<i>Issue #2</i>	To what extent is the program reaching its intended audience?
<i>Indicators</i>	Profile of clients (previous awareness, use, access to Internet, location)
<i>Sources</i>	Milestone reports Evaluation client impact surveys
<i>Issue #3</i>	To what extent has the program achieved its goals and objectives?
<i>Indicators</i>	Extent to which the program is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> assisting in the establishment and sustainability of public sites and networks of sites for Canadians to access and use the Information Highway; <input type="checkbox"/> supporting services offered through the public sites and networks that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - better inform citizens through the exchange of ideas and information; - create greater public awareness of the benefits and opportunities of using information technologies and services; - help individuals to more effectively use the services available through Information Highway technologies; - create opportunity for economic and social benefits for the community by using information technologies; and, <input type="checkbox"/> facilitating access by Canadians to online government programs and services.
<i>Sources</i>	CAP coordinators Community leaders / experts

Evaluation client impact surveys

Issue #4 What are the impacts and benefits of having access to CAP sites and services for:

business users?

home users?

Indicators Reported impacts and benefits of using CAP sites and their services

Sources Milestone reports

Evaluation client impact survey

Issue #5 How successful are the sites which are receiving / have received CAP funding?

Indicators Are CAP sites operational?

To what extent are they reaching the community (penetration)?

Are clients satisfied with their services?

Sources Site visits

On-going client survey results

6.3 Cost- Effectiveness and Alternatives:

Issue #6 Are results being achieved in the most cost-effective manner?

Indicators How do the costs and results achieved by CAP compare to the costs and results achieved by other comparable programs?

Sources Program files

Other programs

Issue #7 Is the program unique?

Indicators To what extent does CAP complement, duplicate or work at cross purposes with other federal, provincial and local government programs?

Are there similar services already provided by the private sector or non-government organizations?

Sources Other programs

Evaluation client impact surveys (use and assessment of comparable programs)

7.0 Proposed Approach to Data Collection for an Evaluation

This section proposes a number of approaches for addressing the evaluation issues presented in Section 6.0.

7.1 Approaches

In order to address the issues presented in Section 6.0, the following approaches to data collection, over and above the on-going collection process, are proposed:

- Review of milestone reports and other program files.
- Review of literature, including literature on other programs.
- A survey of a sample of clients at the time of the program's evaluation will provide input on the actual performance of CAP as it relates to addressing client needs, and the incidence of various impacts occurring.
- Targetted, one-off surveys aimed at particular issues.
- Interviews with community leaders / experts. These will provide information on the current and future needs of the various communities and CAP.
- Interviews with CAP site coordinators.
- Interviews with representatives of other programs.
- Site visits. While these may be undertaken in the context of on-going performance measurement, it may be necessary to undertake some site visits at the time of the evaluation.

**7.2 Link
Between
Issues and
Proposed
Approaches**

The table presented below summarizes the link between the evaluation issues and proposed approaches.

	Milestone reports / program files	Literature		Eval. client surveys	Interviews	Site visits
<i>Is there a need for a program like CAP?</i>	X	X		X	X	
<i>To what extent is the program reaching its intended audience?</i>	X			X		
<i>To what extent has the program achieved its goals and objectives?</i>	X			X	X	
<i>What are the impacts and benefits of having access to CAP sites?</i>	X			X		
<i>How successful are the sites which are receiving / have received CAP funding?</i>	X					X
<i>Are results being achieved in the most cost-effective manner?</i>	X	X			X	
<i>Is the program unique?</i>		X		X	X	

8.0 Options for Future Evaluation

8.1 Option 1:

As outlined in the Executive Summary, the options outlined here were developed at the time the framework was completed in November 1998. This option was based on the assumption, at the time, that the establishment of an on-going performance measurement system made sense for CAP sites. Experience since November 1998, however, has indicated that very few of the volunteer-operated CAP sites have the capacity to efficiently operate such a system. Therefore, Option 1 (outlined below) is no longer valid.

Based on the assumption that an ongoing performance measurement system would be put in place it meant that:

- All on-going data requirements would be available through the milestone reports, based on the recommended changes / additions.
- On-going data collection through surveys would be in place to measure service satisfaction and short-term outcomes.
- Some sites would have been visited. In such cases, we would simply review the findings from these visits.

This information would be analyzed in detail at the time of the evaluation of CAP. Therefore, original data collection would only be required for:

- Review of literature.
- A survey of clients to measure longer-term impacts.
- Interviews with community leaders / experts.
- Interviews with CAP site coordinators.
- Interviews with representatives of other programs.
- Site visits. Additional site visits may be required to probe more deeply into some issues.

The table presented below provides an overview of the each approach and the cost of these approaches under the proposed option.

	Description	Size	Length	Cost
<i>Review of milestone reports</i>	At the time of evaluation, the information required to address the evaluation issues is obtained by the evaluation team and analyzed.	NA	NA	\$4,000
<i>Review of literature</i>	A review of the appropriate literature required to address the evaluation issue is undertaken at the time of the evaluation	NA	NA	\$5,000
<i>On-going survey of clients</i>	At the time of evaluation, the results from all surveys completed through on-going monitoring are analyzed to address the relevant evaluation issues	depends	NA	\$8,000
<i>Survey of clients</i>	At the time of evaluation, a more detailed survey of a sample of clients across CAP sites and across services is administered by telephone to probe into longer term impacts.	250 clients	15 minutes/ interviews	\$10,000
<i>Interviews</i>	At the time of evaluation, interviews with some community leaders or experts, some CAP site coordinators, and representatives of other programs are completed, by telephone, to address specific evaluation issues.	30	30 minutes/ interview	\$6,000
<i>Site visits</i>	At the time of evaluation, site visits undertaken by CAP staff will be supplemented by visits to other sites by the evaluators.	10 sites	1 day/site	\$10,000
Total evaluation cost under Option 1				\$43,000

The following are the pros and cons of Option 1:

- Pros**
- Program management will have up-to-date impact indicators from CAP sites;
 - CAP will be seen as using the technology it is promoting;
 - Although CAP is to sunset in 2001/02, the electronic submission tools will likely continue to be useful in the future as the program evolves;
 - There is a possibility to cost-share the development costs of developing electronic submission tools with other programs and OGDs; and
 - Possibility of providing feedback to CAP site coordinators.
- Cons**
- There will be a significant amount of resources and coordination needed to operationalize the electronic submission of these user surveys.

8.2 Option 2: Minimum

Option 2 (as outlined below) remains valid. This option assumes that while some on-going performance information is collected, this information is limited to the information currently collected through the milestone reports. Therefore, minimal client profile information is available, while outcomes information is not available. Under this option, more interviews are completed. These interviews are longer in length because they probe more deeply into some of the issues.

Because the amount of on-going data which is available to the evaluators is limited, more initial data collection is required. The client surveys must include larger samples and be longer in length because, at the time of the evaluation, little or no client results information is available.

The table presented below summarizes the proposed approaches and costs.

	Description	Size	Length	Cost
<i>Review of milestone reports</i>	At the time of evaluation, the information required to address the evaluation issues is obtained by the evaluation team and analyzed.	NA	NA	\$4,000
<i>Review of literature</i>	A review of the appropriate literature required to address the evaluation issue is undertaken at the time of the evaluation	NA	NA	\$5,000
<i>On-going survey of clients</i>	Not done	NA	NA	\$0
<i>Survey of clients</i>	At the time of evaluation, a more detailed survey of a sample of clients across CAP sites and across services is administered by telephone to probe into short-term outcomes and longer term impacts.	500 clients	20 minutes/ interviews	\$25,000
<i>Interviews</i>	At the time of evaluation, interviews with some community leaders or experts, some CAP site coordinators, and representatives of other programs are completed, by telephone, to address specific evaluation issues.	50	½ to 1 hour/ interview	\$15,000
<i>Site visits</i>	At the time of evaluation, site visits undertaken by CAP staff will be supplemented by visits to other sites by the evaluators.	20 sites	1 day/site	\$20,000
Total evaluation cost under Option 2				\$82,000

The following are the pros and cons of Option 2:

- Pros
- Less resources and coordination needed as compared to Option 1.

-
- Cons
- Minimal interim data on CAP impact indicators; and
 - Less likely to be comprehensive or consistent in the quality of data that CAP sites provide

NOTE:

Minor editorial changes were made to this report in order to prepare the document for posting to the Internet (including removal of standard Appendices such as list of interviewees and questionnaires). Readers wishing to receive a copy of the original version of this report should contact the Audit and Evaluation Branch at Industry Canada.