



GRANTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS FUND
Summative Evaluation
Summary, Recommendations and Management Response

January 2002

Evaluation Division
Policy Integration and Coordination Section



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. OBJECTIVES OF THE GRANTS & CONTRIBUTIONS FUND	1
3. METHODOLOGY.....	3
4. EVALUATION FINDINGS	3
4.1 Relevance	3
4.2 Program Design.....	4
4.3 Objectives Achievement.....	5
4.4 Cost-effectiveness	6
4.5 Performance Measurement.....	6
4.6 Perceived Duplication between the Fund and other Department of Justice Initiatives	7
5. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	7
5.1 Program Objectives	7
5.2 Resources.....	8
5.3 Performance Measurement.....	9
5.4 Developing Stronger Linkages to Policy.....	10
5.5 Application and Selection Process	10
5.6 Promotion of the Fund.....	11
5.7 Partnership Development	12
5.8 Human Resources.....	13

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1995, the Department of Justice restructured its program of discretionary grants and contributions in response to growing fiscal pressures and calls for improved linkages between the funded projects and departmental priorities. The following changes were made: 25 different funds were consolidated into the single Grants and Contributions Fund; one set of terms and conditions was developed and operationalized for all transfer payments issued under the Fund; six broad objectives were developed to guide the allocation of funds; four funding categories were created;¹ and a framework for identifying priorities and designating resources within the Fund was implemented.²

In order to fulfill a central agency requirement to report on the results of these changes, a summative evaluation of the Grants and Contributions Fund was conducted. The purpose of this evaluation was also to provide feedback and analysis on the continued relevance, success and cost-effectiveness of the Grants and Contributions Fund in the Department of Justice. This evaluation covers the period from 1996 to 2001.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE GRANTS & CONTRIBUTIONS FUND

Perhaps one of the greatest challenges faced during the creation of the Fund was to reduce approximately 130 program objectives from 25 funds into a more manageable set of six. The objectives were broadly defined so as to allow for sufficient flexibility to address departmental priorities:

- To enhance knowledge of and promote development, and inform Canadians and the legal community about public law areas within the federal jurisdiction such as constitutional law, private and public international law, administrative and Crown law, Native law and human rights law.
- To promote access to justice, equality and human rights in Canada by supporting consultations, research, partnerships and the development and dissemination of information as well as the development, testing and implementation of new cost-effective, multi-disciplinary approaches, models and pilot projects regarding the delivery and administration of legal aid services.

¹*Class grants* (provide a maximum of \$10,000 per year); *Annual Grants* (provide core funding for organizations whose goals and objectives are closely linked to the mandate and priorities of the Department); *Annual Contributions* (provide core funding to one designated public legal education and information organization in each province to support justice-related programming); *Contributions* (provide support to individual projects where more accountability and control is deemed necessary).

² The Priority Setting and Strategic Planning Framework was a three-year plan established to help guide the ongoing administration and monitoring of the Fund. This Framework was to be reviewed annually.

- To promote the development and implementation of legislative and socio-legal reforms, and to support the development, testing and implementation of innovative program options, new and multi-disciplinary approaches and models in regard to and initiatives relating to criminal law and the youth justice system, crime prevention through social development and community involvement, and protection of society from violence encompassing such aspects as violence against women and family violence.
- To support judicial education efforts, to promote experimental, innovative and research work in the Canadian justice system, the development, testing and implementation of innovative ideas, approaches and models in providing services, in order to achieve greater efficiencies, effectiveness and cost reductions in the delivery of services and programs related to the justice system such as court reform and family support enforcement, etc.
- To foster the improved responsiveness, fairness, inclusiveness and effectiveness of the justice system with respect to justice and its administration to meet the needs and aspirations of Aboriginal people in the areas of appropriate models for policing, diversion, development of pre-sentencing options, sentencing alternatives, alternatives to incarceration, etc.

Operational Objective

- Funding priorities and activities will support the development and implementation of innovative approaches to governmental/Departmental legal and socio-legal priority substantive areas, considered an investment on the part of the Department, and will support innovation and partnerships. Funding priorities and activities will be identified through the development of a three-year priority and strategic planning framework that will be approved by the Departmental executive committee. The priority and strategic planning framework will be revised on an annual basis and will become an integral part of the terms and conditions of the Departmental Grants and Contributions Fund. The framework will be provided to Treasury Board at the beginning of each fiscal year.

For the purposes of evaluation, the evaluation framework further condensed these six objectives into three broadly defined objectives:

- To serve as a strategic lever for achieving departmental objectives by: 1) enhancing partnerships with professional organizations and individuals whose support is important to that attainment of departmental objectives; and 2) funding projects which support the implementation of departmental policies;
- To stimulate innovation, investment and improvement in the justice system; and

- To support policy and program development by providing new information in accordance with departmental needs.

The Fund has an annual budget of approximately 3.5 million dollars³, approximately half of which is allocated to project contributions. A set amount of funding is provided to both annual grants and annual contributions with a much smaller amount being distributed to class grants. While the Fund's budget was spread across 25 funding priorities in 1996/97, in subsequent years, the same amount of money was directed towards six priority areas.⁴

3. METHODOLOGY

The methodology for the evaluation of the Grants and Contributions Fund consisted of a review of: Fund documentation and performance measurement data; a review of 47 funded project files/reports; 75 key informant interviews; 166 telephone surveys of funded recipients (111), applicants who had have never received funding (33) and project partners (22); and four case studies.

4. EVALUATION FINDINGS

4.1 Relevance

- In general, there continued to be widespread support for the role of grants and contributions in support of the development and implementation of Department of Justice policy and programs. In particular, the respondents viewed discretionary funding to be an economical and powerful alternative to more traditional policy tools. Identified strengths of grants and contributions as policy tools were that they provided: a testing ground for government policies; an alternative to changes in legislation; a means to facilitate citizen engagement; more flexibility, speed and relative ease of use; an economical way of developing partnerships; and a broader approach to policy thereby allowing for a broader range of responses.

³ Of the 3.5 million dollars, approximately \$600,000 is dedicated to Family Violence and \$113,000 to Nunavut.

⁴ The original six priorities were: *Sentencing and Correctional Reform*; *Justice System Design*; *Equality, Diversity and Access to Justice*; *Family Violence*; *Victims of Crime and Youth Justice*. When Youth Justice became a special initiative, *Nunavut* replaced it and for the same reason, *Victims of Crime* was replaced by *Access to Justice in the North*.

4.2 Program Design

- The consolidation of the 25 funds into the Grants and Contributions Fund and the subsequent creation of the four funding types contributed to the flexibility of the Fund and its overall efficiency of administration. This same process also created a number of challenges for the Fund. Most notable among these was the very broad set of funding objectives that lacked clarity both in terms of establishing funding priorities and in terms of explaining the results being sought through the Fund.
- Shortly after the Fund was created, the context within which it was operating changed significantly. Starting with the Child Support Initiative in 1996, the Department launched a number of special initiatives that involved grants and contributions funding. As these initiatives assumed responsibility for issues that had previously been funded through the Grants and Contributions Fund, Programs Branch was able to reduce the scope of the Fund. However, these larger initiatives were more targeted than the Fund and were broadly promoted both inside and outside the Department. An unintended impact of the creation of these new initiatives was that the visibility and role of the more modest Grants and Contributions Fund (both within the Department and beyond) diminished. The evaluation concluded that beyond Programs Branch, few respondents knew very much about the Fund, its objectives, or the types of projects it had funded.
- The level of funding available for the Fund remained relatively stable over the five-year study period until the 2000-01 fiscal year when it dropped by 12 percent. In contrast, the number of applications to the Fund dropped by 45 percent over the five years. Across the four funding types, the proportion of funding allocated to each remained relatively constant with the highest proportion (approximately 55 percent) dedicated to project contributions. The project-funding rate⁵ remained steady at between 50 to 56 percent over the study period.
- The Fund has supported certain organizations and groups of organizations that might not otherwise have received funding due to their lack of specialization. The Fund provided these organizations with the opportunity to develop and test some innovative ideas and programs.
- Among some of the overall strengths of the application and review process were: the speed and punctuality of the funding; the accessibility, cooperative nature and professionalism of Fund staff; and the overall simplicity of the application itself. The respondents also cited the Fund's unique focus, openness to innovation and its capacity to support smaller projects as strengths.
- Applicants to the Fund reported that one of the barriers to accessing funds was the lack of clarity in the application materials regarding the funding requirements. Another barrier was

⁵ Percentage of projects funded divided by the total number of applications for funding.

the broad nature of the Fund's objectives and funding priorities, which made it challenging for them to assess the extent to which the objectives of their projects "fit" with those of the Fund.

- Another weakness of the application and review process was that it was conducted on a project-by-project basis as the projects were submitted. This process favoured the timeliest rather than necessarily the best proposal. When project funding is limited to the extent evidenced in this Fund, it is incumbent upon the Department to ensure that the projects that will provide the most value and that will further the overall objectives of the Fund, receive first consideration for funding.
- To ascertain the extent to which the projects relied on the Fund, applicants were asked the degree to which their failing to receive funding had negatively affected their project. 90 percent responded that not being able to secure support from the Fund had affected their projects to a "moderate" or "large extent" and in turn, had either ceased or delayed their projects. Receiving an endorsement for their project from the Department of Justice was also deemed to be very important.
- The Priority Setting and Strategic Planning Framework was not reported to be flexible enough to respond to emerging issues in the Department of Justice. Developed primarily for the purposes of guiding the proposal review and selection process, Fund management and staff used this framework to ensure that the projects selected for funding fit with and contributed to departmental policies and priorities. The Framework identified the funding priorities and strategic plans for funding operations for three years (1998-2001)⁶ and allowed for these priorities to be reviewed annually.

4.3 Objectives Achievement.

- Partners reported that their involvement with the Grants and Contributions Fund had strengthened existing partnerships/networks, increased the visibility of their organization and their work, and assisted them in establishing new partnerships/networks. These positive findings suggest that partners would be likely to maintain or further enhance their relationship with the Fund and/or the project sponsor. In addition to the benefits cited above, partners also reported playing a significant role in the projects in which they were involved
- The case studies highlighted some significant positive findings with respect to the policy implications of the projects reviewed. The first case study was an annual grant project that resulted in a recommendation to amend the Criminal Code. The second case study was an annual contribution project that improved access to information regarding justice-related policies. The third project was a project contribution whose performance to date had been

⁶ Priority Setting and Strategic Planning Framework, Grants and Contributions Fund, Programs Branch, Policy Sector, Department of Justice Canada, 1998.

promising but it was still too early to measure results. The fourth case study, a project contribution, tested the viability of developing and perhaps instituting, an alternative to the criminal justice system responses to cases involving serious crimes. Initial evaluation results provided by the project partner demonstrated that the pilot project demonstrated some encouraging results and offered some support for the project's potential to contribute to further justice-related programming in the area of sentencing reforms.

- The capacity of the Fund to achieve its overall objectives was constrained by: the overly broad objectives that were unlikely to have an impact in policy development or making the justice system more efficient; the lack of concise and measurable indicators of success; the lack of clear direction from departmental policy areas to ensure that funded projects were directly relevant to existing and emerging policy needs; and the limited awareness of the Fund within the Department which impeded its being used to best strategic advantage.

4.4 Cost-effectiveness

- In terms of leveraging funds, the Grants and Contributions Fund may be considered to be cost-effective. For projects involving partners, the partners have contributed a significant proportion of the total project value (ranging from 49 to 96 percent) over the study period. Even though the number of partnerships dropped significantly over the same time, most notably for annual grants and annual contributions, partners continued⁷ to provide significant levels of support. The reasons behind the drop in partnerships warrant further study. While a broader discussion of cost-effectiveness of the Fund is premature given the lack of information regarding the extent to which its objectives have been achieved, the Fund has encouraged substantial investment into justice-related issues.
- Overall, the evaluation concluded that the level of financial resources currently allocated to the Grants and Contributions Fund was insufficient to meet all of the funding priorities identified, support the ongoing collection, analysis and reporting of results-based information and to provide for projects for which funds have not yet been committed. This evaluation has confirmed the findings of a number of previous studies that have consistently identified many of these issues.

4.5 Performance Measurement

- Although performance measures had been developed by Programs Branch, the information was not collected in a consistent, systematic manner and consequently, there was extremely limited information available on the results of the projects funded. Typical of older programs such as this one, the final project reports tended to focus on the activities that were undertaken over the course of the project rather than on the results achieved. In a review of a sample of 47 randomly selected project files, the evaluation concluded that the project files did not contain the information necessary for tracking and evaluation purposes. Consequently, it was not possible to assess the extent to which the Fund as a whole, had

⁷ These data were provided at the time of application and do not necessarily represent an accurate account of the actual support provided by partners at the end of the project. These data are not collected in the PCS.

contributed to the development and implementation of departmental policies and programs. In contrast, the case studies that were conducted as part of this evaluation did demonstrate that with a concerted investment in measuring performance, results attributable to the Fund could be measured and reported.

- Consistent with the findings in other recent evaluations conducted by the Department,⁸ the existing file tracking system or Project Control System (PCS), currently functions as a project management, rather than as an evaluation or performance measurement tool. The data available through the PCS provided limited, if any, information on project results or lessons learned. The system also did not allow for integration and sharing of funding information across funding programs within the Department.

4.6 Perceived Duplication between the Fund and other Department of Justice Initiatives

- While a number of respondents perceived that there was duplication and overlap between the projects funded under the Grants and Contributions Fund and other Department of Justice special initiatives, this evaluation did not find any evidence of this. Similarly, the recent audit of grants and contributions programs within the Department also did not find any evidence to support this perception.⁹ Funding applicants¹⁰ and funding recipients were asked whether or not they had requested funding from sources other than the Fund. 57 percent of the funding applicants and 65 percent of the funding recipients reported that they had asked and received funding from at least one other source. When asked to identify the other sources of funding, none of the funding applicants and only seven percent of the funding recipients identified other Department of Justice initiatives. Both groups reported that they were most likely to have received additional funds from provincial/territorial governments and other federal departments. This finding does not support the notion that there is duplication between the Fund and the special initiatives in the Department of Justice.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Program Objectives

One of the principal findings of this evaluation was that the objectives of the Fund were not very clear and that this had affected the overall effectiveness of the Fund. These objectives have made it challenging: to identify indicators of success and to measure success; to convey what the

⁸ Evaluation Division, Mid-term Evaluation of the National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention, Department of Justice, January 2001.

⁹ Internal Audit Division *Grants and Contributions Programs*, Department of Justice, 2001.

¹⁰ Funding applicants are defined as those who have applied but who have never received funding from the Grants and Contributions Fund. Funding recipients have received funding on at least one occasion over the study period.

Department is trying to accomplish through the Fund to key stakeholders (particularly those within the Department); and, to demonstrate clear linkages between the Fund projects and broader policy development and implementation issues. In the renewed Fund, which will be subject to the new Treasury Board Transfer Payment Policy, there will be a need to develop results-based, measurable objectives in order to improve: the funding decision-making process (thereby ensuring that the funded projects are more directly relevant to existing and emerging policy needs); the quality of the proposals; and to improve the measurability of project outcomes.

It is recommended that:

Programs Branch develops measurable, results-based objectives for the renewed Fund.

Management Response:

Programs Branch supports the recommendation. In consultation with the Evaluation Division of the Department, the Branch developed new results-based objectives for the renewed Fund. A Results-based Management and Accountability Framework describes in detail how these new objectives will be measured. As well, in an effort to clarify and realign them with the intended purpose of the Fund, the name has been changed to the Justice Partnership and Innovation Fund.

5.2 Resources

The evaluation concluded that there are currently insufficient funds to: support all of the priorities of the Fund; sustain the development and implementation of a performance measurement strategy; evaluate the Fund; and provide for the projects for which funds have not yet been committed. There is a need, in the renewal of the Fund, to reduce the expectations placed upon it and to align the Fund's objectives more closely with the resources available. The objectives of the renewed Fund should be realistic and achievable, which will mean that some difficult choices will have to be made. Otherwise, the credibility of the Fund will be further undermined if the expectations for the Fund are not reconsidered.

It is recommended that:

Programs Branch takes into consideration the level of resources available in the reconsideration of the Fund's objectives.

Programs Branch supports the recommendation. The evaluation concluded that over the life of the Grants and Contributions Fund, the expectations for the Fund have far exceeded its capacity to produce results. In the reconsideration of the Fund's objectives, Programs Branch has focused on two areas, *Access to Justice* and *Emerging Issues*, which do not overlap with any other departmental funding and which have shown to be areas needing further development. With the

implementation of the performance measurement strategy, Programs Branch will be able to monitor the progress of the funded projects and to ensure that priority is given to projects that are producing relevant results. This change in focus from the broad objectives of the former Grants and Contributions Fund, will mean that senior departmental officials and other stakeholders will have to be informed about the changes to ensure that there is a shared understanding about and support for the more modest objectives of the renewed Fund.

5.3 Performance Measurement

Being able to speak conclusively about the relative success of the Fund depends, to a large extent, on the effectiveness of the measures and systems in place to capture information and report on progress. The evaluation has shown that while some performance measures have been developed, they have been implemented inconsistently. There is insufficient information about: how individual projects have worked; the effectiveness of each of the four funding types and the extent to which they have supported the Fund; and more broadly, how the Grants and Contributions Fund is working overall. There is a need to develop a performance measurement strategy that will support the effective management of the Fund. In particular, there is a need for more results information on projects that receive annual funding (both grants and contributions) and for projects that receive substantial amounts of funding. The performance measurement strategy must also be developed in a way that can be supported within the resource levels allocated to the Fund.

It is recommended that:

Programs Branch implements a practical performance measurement system that will provide the comprehensive information needed to manage the renewed Fund effectively and to report on progress on an ongoing basis.

Management Response:

The Programs Branch has already developed a performance measurement framework for the renewed Fund and will collect information on the results-based objectives. The framework will serve as a useful tool to guide the collection of essential data, to report on progress and to identify lessons learned on an annual basis. Management will be able to use this information to guide decisions about future funding and to provide ongoing information to policy issues. In addition, work is underway through the Excellence in Programs Initiative, to implement a new grants and contributions information management system that will facilitate project management information and track the results of projects. The current Project Control System does not have this capacity.

5.4 Developing Stronger Linkages to Policy

There is a need to ensure that projects funded by the renewed Fund are more transparently and consistently aligned with emerging policy issues in the Department. If the renewed Fund is to have any measurable impact on departmental policy, project results and funding decisions need to be communicated to those making policy decisions in the Department. Similarly, those working in policy need to be able to communicate the policy directions and emerging issues of the Department to the Fund administrators on an ongoing basis. This feedback loop does not currently exist.

A possible solution to this situation would be to develop a mechanism (such as an advisory body) that would serve to provide ongoing guidance and advice to managers of the renewed Fund and to provide the forum in which results information could be shared in a timely and ongoing way. This advisory body would serve to: broaden the responsibility for the renewed Fund beyond Programs Branch; encourage the involvement of a broader constituency in the deciding the directions taken by the Fund; facilitate communication about the Fund and the results that have been achieved; and assist with priority setting.

It is recommended that:

Programs Branch explores the feasibility of setting up an advisory body (or comparable mechanism) to provide ongoing policy guidance to the Fund management and to promote the timely sharing of results information to key stakeholders.

Management Response

Programs Branch will establish an advisory group composed of senior departmental officials. The mandate of this group will consist of establishing funding priorities and the group will receive and be expected to share information on the results of the projects. In doing so, the group will better understand the Fund and its role in contributing to policy development. The group will meet on a bi-annual basis to review the priorities, consider the results of projects and provide strategic advice on the Fund.

5.5 Application and Selection Process

In addition to improving the information flow between Fund managers and staff and key stakeholders in the Policy Sector, another way of ensuring that projects are aligned with emerging policy issues is by implementing a more formal application and project selection process. Respondents identified a range of measures that could be considered: establishing

formal proposal review committees; seeking expert advice on projects where committee members lack the substantive expertise; and launching formal calls-for-proposals with submission deadlines to ensure that projects are no longer funded on a “first come, first served” basis. The call-for-proposals was seen to represent a more cost-effective and efficient way to administer the Fund as it would allow comparison of all the applications at the same time.

It is recommended that:

Programs Branch explores and implements more strategic approaches to the application and selection process for the renewed Fund.

Management Response:

Programs Branch proposes to establish two bodies to guide the management of the Fund: an advisory group and review committees. As indicated earlier, the mandate of the advisory group will be strategic in nature. The group will establish the priorities, consider the results of projects and provide advice as needed. The review committees’ mandate will be to assess the merits of project proposals and select those that would best contribute to policy and program development. To ensure that the appropriate structure is in place and the mandate of both bodies are clearly articulated, Programs Branch has developed the following approach: during fiscal year 2002/2003, there will be no major changes to the operation of the renewed Fund. However, during that year, the Branch will set up the advisory group and the review committees and identify their role and membership. The Branch will also develop a communications strategy to effectively communicate to departmental officials and to applicants the purpose, objectives and priorities of the renewed Fund. The Branch will also consider the use of solicited proposals to manage the available resources effectively and to ensure that funded projects contribute to policy and program development.

5.6 Promotion of the Fund

The evaluation concluded that very little was known about the Fund either inside or outside the Department of Justice. Both the lack of clear objectives and the paucity of reporting results have contributed to this low level of awareness about the Fund. In turn, this lack of awareness has lead to a broadly held perception, particularly within the Department, that the Fund is duplicating what other departmental initiatives are already funding. While a recent internal audit and this evaluation have both concluded that there is no factual basis for the perception, it is still very pervasive. There is a need to promote the renewed Fund and what it is trying to accomplish, both within the Department and to key stakeholders.

In the special initiatives, the purpose of discretionary funding is clear even from the title (i.e. crime prevention, family violence). With the Grants and Contributions Fund, there is really no sense from its name what could logically be funded. Again, this leaves many with the impression

that “anything” could be funded. The promotion of the objectives of the renewed Fund would contribute greatly to an improvement in the Fund’s reputation and use within the Department and should yield better quality and more relevant proposals from outside. As well, giving the Fund a name that communicates its focus and priorities may also prove to be an effective way of rapidly improving its visibility within the Department.

It is recommended that:

Programs Branch develops a communication plan to promote the objectives of the renewed Fund both within and outside the Department in order to increase awareness about the Fund, its objectives and to optimize its use and effectiveness.

Management Response:

Programs Branch has identified communication as an important activity of the renewed Fund. In consultation with the Communications Branch of the Department, the Programs Branch will develop a communications strategy to inform the Department as well as other justice stakeholders about the Fund and its purpose. The communications strategy will also promote the new name of the Fund: the Justice Partnership and Innovation Fund. The establishment of an advisory group will also increase awareness about the Fund with a view to ensuring that the Fund remains an effective and efficient tool in meeting the needs of the Department.

5.7 Partnership Development

The evaluation concluded that fostering partnerships had proven to be a successful component of the Grants and Contributions Fund. The renewed Fund should continue to promote the development of partnerships. Ideally, the performance measurement strategy would facilitate the collection of more complete data on partners, the nature of their contribution to a project and the outcomes of these partnerships. From the data currently in the PCS, there is no way of knowing if the promised funds and/or in-kind support materialized as planned or if they did not, the reasons why not. There is also a need to explore ways of encouraging the development of more effective partnerships and to find out why the number of partnerships has dropped off so significantly over the study period.

It is recommended that:

Programs Branch continues to promote the development of partnership under the renewed Fund.

Management Response

Programs Branch will continue to foster partnerships and will explore ways of developing more effective partnerships. While the evaluation notes the limits of the Project Control System in identifying funding partners, a more in-depth review of the actual project and financial files for contribution agreements would have shown all actual revenues, including in-kind, contributed by all partners in the project. Because there is no financial accountability for grants, it is difficult to assess the partnerships developed through the use of this type of funding. Greater effort will be placed on tracking the effectiveness of partnerships (i.e. through a project summary questionnaire that was developed and which is sent to each recipient as a condition of the funding) and maintaining more up-to-date relevant information on who the partners are, the type of partnerships and the extent that they partnered in the projects.

5.8 Human Resources

Programs Branch should review staff competencies and skills to assess the extent to which their present staff complement can support the renewed Fund in terms of: grants administration; performance measurement; analysis and synthesis of findings; disseminating project results; project management; communication and liaison; partnership-building; setting strategic priorities for the Fund; and securing ongoing input from key stakeholders on a broad range of issues from establishing strategic priorities for the Fund to disseminating project results.

It is recommended that:

Programs Branch develop a strategic plan for human resources to ensure that Branch staff have the appropriate competencies, skills and training to meet the diverse requirements required for managing the renewed Fund.

Management Response:

Programs Branch has already moved forward in this area. Staff within the Innovations, Analysis and Integration Directorate of the Branch have already participated in a one-day training session, plus a refresher session on performance measurement. Following the initial training, the Directorate decided to develop a performance measurement framework for each project to assess its merits and to determine the anticipated results. In addition, Programs Branch is leading an Excellence in Programs initiative to consider, among other things, core competencies for program management personnel to ensure that the necessary skill sets for all departmental funding programs are consistent and are met. Programs Branch will continue to ensure that the necessary training remains a high priority.

The Excellence in Programs Initiative was established as a result of a need to improve horizontality, coordination and integration across the various program areas within the Department. The Department increasingly is choosing program solutions to meet its policy objectives. It is also under greater pressure to show results of program spending, strengthen accountability measures and demonstrate due diligence in program management. The Initiative will assist programs within the Department to effectively link among themselves, to streamline the application process, and to maximize program resources. The Initiative will assist in building a more solid understanding of the important role programs play as an instrument of policy and will also ensure that program work reflects broader governmental initiatives.