

**An Evaluation of Three Components of the  
Agenda for Gender Equality (AGE)  
Within  
Status Of Women Canada**

**FINAL REPORT**

**March 31, 2005**

**Presented by  
CS/RESORS Consulting, Ltd.**

## Acknowledgements

The evaluation team would like to thank Suzanne Cooper for her on-going and good-natured management of this evaluation project on behalf of Status of Women Canada.

We also would like to thank all of the participants in the study, from Status of Women itself, from the federal partners, and from the community groups who provided their perspectives on programming.

The evaluation team members are Marylee Stephenson, Ph.D., president of CS/RESORS Consulting, Ltd., and senior research associate, Patricia Bailey, M.A.

AN EVALUATION OF THREE COMPONENTS  
OF THE AGENDA FOR GENDER EQUALITY (AGE)  
WITHIN  
STATUS OF WOMEN CANADA

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	iii
I. CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION.....	1
II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY .....	2
A. Evaluation Research Design .....	3
B. Data Sources, Data Collection Methods, and Data Analysis .....	3
III. FINDINGS ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE AGE AND THE DIRECTORATES.....	5
A. Findings on the AGE Framework.....	5
1. Perspectives of SWC respondents on the AGE .....	5
2. Perspectives of Federal Respondents on AGE .....	5
3. Perspectives of Community Stakeholders on the AGE .....	8
B. Findings on the Gender-Based Analysis Directorate (GBAD): “Accelerating the Implementation of Gender-Based Analysis” .....	9
1. SWC Staff Perspectives on the GBA Directorate .....	10
2. Perspectives of federal respondents on the benefits and challenges of interactions/activities with GBAD .....	11
C. Communications and Consultations Directorate (C&CD), “Engaging Canadians in the Policy Process” .....	12
1. Perspectives of SWC staff on the C&C Directorate .....	13
2. Perspectives of Community Groups on C&C Directorate .....	13
D. Policy and External Relations Directorate (P-ERD), “Meeting Canada’s International and Treaty Obligations” .....	14
1. Perspectives of SWC respondents on the Policy-External Relations Directorate .....	15
2. Perspectives of Federal Respondents on P-ERD.....	16
IV. EVALUATIVE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	17
Appendix A: Interview Guides .....	20

**AN EVALUATION OF THREE COMPONENTS  
OF THE AGENDA FOR GENDER EQUALITY (AGE)  
WITHIN  
STATUS OF WOMEN CANADA**

**Executive Summary**

**CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION**

The Agenda for Gender Equality (AGE) is a multi-faceted strategy that enables the Government of Canada to continue to ensure that gender equality becomes a reality for Canadian women. Under the AGE, SWC received \$20.5 million over 5 years to work toward the following goals:

- Accelerate the implementation of Gender-Based Analysis (GBA)
- Meet international commitments and treaty obligations
- Engage Canadians in the policy process
- Enhance voluntary sector participation in support of achieving gender equality

A fifth component aimed at 'engendering' policies and programs is deemed a shared responsibility between SWC and other government departments.

The lead department supporting the implementation of the federal AGE is Status of Women Canada (SWC). In its overall efforts to support the achievement of three of these AGE goals, the work of three Directorates, each with its own distinctive, but complementary objectives and activities, were the subject of this evaluation. These directorates, their staffing load, and their thematic goal statements are the:

- Gender Based Analysis Directorate (GBAD), "Accelerating the Implementation of GBA" (5 FTEs);
- Communications and Consultations Directorate (C&CD), "Engaging Canadians in the Policy Process" (10 FTEs); and
- Policy and External Relations Directorate (P-ERD), "Meeting Canada's International and Treaty Obligations" (17 FTEs).

The purpose of the evaluation is:

*... to obtain objective, evidence-based information on the relevance and impact of AGE, and to make recommendations, where appropriate, with a focus on identifying gaps in the attainment of certain goals and help determine future direction in terms of priorities*

**EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

This is a *formative* evaluation of the AGE and the three supporting directorates. The evaluation research design follows the standard approach to sound social science research, in that it draws upon the basic methodological principle of "triangulation." This is the drawing together of a number

of diverse data sources to be analysed in such a way as to provide a valid, comprehensive understanding of the subject matter.

A list of respondents from three main data sources were used for as the core data source for the research. These included respondents from:

- SWC management and staff from the 3 directorates: 8 including senior management and line staff;
- Key respondents from among those federal departments that have been engaged in activities to achieve gender equality. Three of these are considered to be central “partners” (Health, Justice, and Human Resources and Skills Development) and the others have interacted significantly with SWC/GBAD over the years; totals: 11 respondents from among ten departments/agencies.
- Key respondents from Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) that have also interacted with SWC about AGE over the years (11).

There was also a review of SWC documents related to AGE and each of the Directorates.

## EVALUATIVE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It seems evident that the AGE and these three Directorates are faced with a number of serious challenges. While this may be daunting, the purpose of an evaluation such as this is to assist programs in addressing these challenges effectively, and it is in this spirit that these conclusions and recommendations are set out.

There is however, a central positive feature of the working environment in which SWC and these Directorates are placed. In the evaluator’s view, there appears to be substantial support for gender mainstreaming of policies and programs across the departments consulted – and they are key departments in the federal context. On the other hand, it is true that the internal units addressing these issues in these departments are very small and the staff tend not to be senior. It also seems that there are very few departments who have legislative or regulatory requirements to work toward and report on their progress on gender equality in all aspects of their work.

Having said this, it seems clear that the effectiveness of the SWC and these Directorates to strengthen gender equality through their actions is decidedly limited. This appears to rest on three closely related challenges. These are listed below, with related recommendations:

### Challenges in the Political Environment

- A need for stronger and clearly articulated support from political and bureaucratic sources at the highest levels;  
**Recommendation: Enhance outreach efforts, working with community and federal partners to substantially increase this support.**
- Along with the above, more financial support for human resources in the SWC;

**Recommendation: Increase efforts, in collaboration with Minister, federal and community partners to make the case for increased budgetary support.**

- A legislative/regulatory framework that compels reporting across the federal spectrum on progress and which can lead to remedial action as called for.  
**Recommendation: Continue efforts with federal and community partners to ensure that this takes place.**

### Challenges in Organizational Operation

- A need for a fully developed, completely documented conceptual framework and operating plan for all aspects of the AGE and its Directorates;  
**Recommendation: Initiate a thorough, professionally-led process to achieve this.**
- A need for stronger, more “pro-active” leadership at the highest levels, supported by a genuine, “working” equivalence of the position with senior-most levels of the federal public service;  
**Recommendation: Based on the evaluative findings, institute a process for further identifying leadership needs and for developing appropriate responses (consultations, training, etc.).**
- A need for more, and more effective and regular, consultations and collaborations with groups seeking equality for women across Canada.  
**Recommendation: Ensure that this is undertaken, and that appropriate follow-up is an integral part of these activities. In this process, develop more cost-effective ways of consulting with smaller groups more frequently (e.g., online forums, forums via videoconference, teleconferences, etc.).**

These conclusions and recommendations flow directly from the findings of the evaluation research. The conclusions can be dispiriting, because they do reflect a situation in need of environmental and operational strengthening. At the same time, it is clear that the need for gender equality remains great and that the importance of the federal government taking a lead in achieving this within its own house cannot be overstated. It is hoped that this evaluation will make a positive contribution to a more rapid, effective, and efficient movement along this very difficult but entirely worthwhile path.

**AN EVALUATION OF THREE COMPONENTS  
OF THE AGENDA FOR GENDER EQUALITY (AGE)  
WITHIN  
STATUS OF WOMEN CANADA**

**I. CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION**

The Agenda for Gender Equality (AGE) is a multi-faceted strategy that enables the Government of Canada to continue to ensure that gender equality becomes a reality for Canadian women. AGE incorporates a gender perspective in the development of its policies, programs and services, to promote public understanding of the benefits of equality and to engage all Canadians in its achievements. The lead department supporting the implementation of the federal AGE is Status of Women Canada (SWC).

Under the AGE, SWC received \$20.5 million over 5 years to work toward the following goals:

- Accelerate the implementation of Gender-Based Analysis (GBA)
- Meet international commitments and treaty obligations
- Engage Canadians in the policy process
- Enhance voluntary sector participation in support of achieving gender equality

A fifth component aimed at ‘engendering’ policies and programs is deemed a shared responsibility between SWC and other government departments.

The AGE builds upon the foundation of *Setting the Stage for the Next Century: The Federal Plan for Gender Equality* (1995). Specifically, the AGE fosters the creation of partnerships between SWC, government departments and various stakeholders to undertake targeted initiatives to address violence against women, improve women’s health and well-being, to increase women’s economic autonomy and to advance women’s human rights.

The implementation of AGE also provides SWC and its partners with a more structured approach to achieving measurable and concrete results that will contribute in a pragmatic way to expanding opportunities for women and will ensure the reflection of the diverse realities of women and men in government responses through the application of gender-based analysis.

In its overall efforts to support the achievement of these AGE goals, the work of three Directorates, each with its own distinctive, but complementary objectives and activities, were the subject of this evaluation. These directorates, their staffing load, and their thematic goal statements are the:

- Gender Based Analysis Directorate (GBAD), “Accelerating the Implementation of GBA” (5 FTEs);
- Communications and Consultations Directorate (C&CD), “Engaging Canadians in the Policy Process” (10 FTEs); and

- Policy and External Relations Directorate (P-ERD), "Meeting Canada's International and Treaty Obligations" (17 FTEs).<sup>1</sup>

While these three components are the focus of this evaluation, their work – and the evaluation research – must be situated in the larger context of the AGE. Thus, as stated in the Request for Proposals, the purpose of the evaluation is:

*... to obtain objective, evidence-based information on the relevance and impact of AGE, and to make recommendations, where appropriate, with a focus on identifying gaps in the attainment of certain goals and help determine future direction in terms of priorities.*

The methodology for achieving this goal is set out below.

## II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This is a *formative* evaluation of the AGE and the three supporting directorates. A formative evaluation, as described in the most authoritative of the resources on program evaluation is as follows:

*Formative evaluation...is limited entirely to a focus on a specific context. Formative evaluation serves the purpose of improving a specific program, policy, group or staff (in a personnel evaluation), or product. Formative evaluations aim at 'forming' the thing being studied. Formative evaluators want to help improve human endeavors.<sup>2</sup>*

In contrast, a *summative evaluation* is defined by the same author as:

*...serv[ing] the purpose of rendering an overall judgement about the effectiveness of a program, policy, or product for the purpose of saying that the idea itself is or is not effective and, therefore, has the potential of being generalizable to other situations.<sup>3</sup>*

Patton continues that the key to differentiating the two types of evaluation is the *purpose of the research*:

*The summative versus formative distinction was originally made...to call attention to different evaluation purposes. Summative evaluations are done for the purpose of making judgements about the basic worth of a program....Summative evaluations tend to focus on outcomes (though not necessarily to the exclusion of evaluating implementation)...<sup>4</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup> . Status of Women Canada, *Report on Plans and Priorities, 2005-2006*.

<sup>2</sup> . Patton, Michael, *Designing Qualitative Studies*, Sage Publications, 1990, pg.156.

<sup>3</sup> . Patton, Michael Q., *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*, 1990, pg. 155.

<sup>4</sup> . Patton, Michael Q., *Practical Evaluation*, Sage Publications, 1982



In that this evaluation is expected to assist SWC in enhancing programming effectiveness, the undertaking is clearly and firmly situated in the formative evaluation mode. This is of particular relevance in the design of the evaluation research methodology, to which we now turn.

## A. Evaluation Research Design

The evaluation research design follows the standard approach to sound social science research, in that it draws upon the basic methodological principle of “triangulation.” This is the drawing together of a number of diverse data sources to be analysed in such a way as to provide a valid, comprehensive understanding of the subject matter. Triangulation, and its value for high-quality applied research, is described in the literature as follows:

*...no single method ever adequately solves the problem of rival causal factors...Because each method reveals different aspects of empirical reality, multiple methods of observations must be employed. This is termed triangulation. I now offer as a final methodological rule the principle that multiple methods should be used in every investigation.*<sup>5</sup>

There are four basic types of triangulation in social science research. They are:

- 1) *data triangulation – the use of a variety of data sources...;*
- 2) *investigator triangulation – the use of several different evaluators or social scientists...; [in our case, a team composed of two evaluators, with diverse but highly complementary skills and experience]*
- 3) *theory triangulation – the use of multiple perspectives to interpret a single set of data; and*
- 4) *methodological triangulation – the use of multiple methods to study a single problem or program, such as interviews, observations, questionnaires, and documents.*<sup>6</sup>

In this evaluation, the primary types of triangulation are data, investigator, and methodological. There is not an emphasis on “theory” as such, but we do look at the data from several perspectives, as a team of two researchers, and as our analysis evolves over time as the results of the analysis accumulate and we are able to return to them at a “meta-analysis” level. From this cumulative, meta-analysis, we can then turn to developing recommendations for future priorities and actions by SWC and its component parts.

## B. Data Sources, Data Collection Methods, and Data Analysis

In support of this formative evaluation, SWC provided the research team with a large amount of documentation on the AGE and the three Directorates.

---

<sup>5</sup> . Denzin, N.K., *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*, 1978, as quoted in Patton, M.Q., *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*, Sage Publications, 1980, p.187.

<sup>6</sup> . *Ibid.*

A list of respondents from three main sources was also provided, as the core data source for the research. These included respondents from:

- SWC management and staff from the 3 directorates: 8 including senior management and line staff
- Key respondents from among those federal departments that have been engaged in activities to achieve gender equality. Three of these are considered to be central “partners” (Health, Justice, and Human Resources and Skills Development) and the others have interacted significantly with SWC/GBAD over the years; totals: 11 respondents from among ten departments/agencies;
- Key respondents from Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) that have also interacted with SWC about AGE over the years (11).

These individuals were interviewed, mostly in-person, over a three-week period. Interviews typically lasted an hour or more. The interviews for the SWC staff and management and for the federal respondents included questions about the AGE overall and each of the Directorates, because they each had familiarity with the full panoply of programming. (Of course, among the federal respondents there are varying degrees of familiarity with all three Directorates, depending on their interactions with these.) The NGO respondents were in a position to respond to questions about the AGE and the Directorate with which they were most associated, (C&C or P-ER) but were not queried about the GBA because this was outside of their area of involvement. A chart listing all respondents (is to be found in Appendix A. The interview guides are in Appendix B).

It can be seen that the methodology for the evaluation relied largely upon qualitative data, whether from interviews or documents. It also focused on the operational processes of the AGE-related Directorates. As a formative evaluation, it is appropriate to concentrate on the *way* a program is implemented. There is less emphasis on *ultimate* outcomes (such as achieving significant change in the “target group”), and greater emphasis on the *processes* of working toward goal achievement. (In fact, in the evaluation literature, the term “process evaluation” is often used interchangeably with “formative evaluation,” but the latter term has achieved more widespread use and is, we believe, more precise in its reference to the continued evolution/formation of a program.)

The primary data analysis technique used is content analysis of the interview and documentary data. This is a two-level process, where the researcher first develops a description of the responses to each of the interview questions or each of the considerations. The next step is to “compare and contrast” the data that addresses each of the questions “asked” of the documentary data (nature of program components, etc.). At the subsequent level the analyst compares and contrasts the themes or trends in the data, both comparing the data *within* a given response category (i.e., staff) and the *across* data categories (i.e., staff versus community respondents versus federal respondents, etc.). This allows for both 1) a description of a program and its processes and impacts, and 2) the development of an understanding of the reasons for program achievements or barriers to achievement. These analytical findings then are reviewed in total so that the evaluator can develop appropriate, realistic recommendations for actions to sustain and/or enhance programming effectiveness and efficiency.

### III. FINDINGS ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE AGE AND THE DIRECTORATES

In our presentation of findings of the evaluation, we will address the AGE framework first and then the three Directorates.

#### A. Findings on the AGE Framework

Within each of the Directorate findings below, the perspectives of each category of respondent will be presented. First will be the perspectives of the SWC respondents, then the federal partners and then the community partners.

##### 1. Perspectives of SWC respondents on the AGE

In this section are described the perspectives from representatives of SWC staff about the AGE overall. This discussion will address, in aggregate:

- The AGE as a means of achieving gender equality goals
- The achievements and challenges of AGE
- Suggestions for meeting the challenges.

In terms of the overall role of the AGE, the respondents indicated that the AGE itself is not a clearly distinct effort, and that it is not set out within a full-fledged, fully documented framework. The AGE initiative is apparently coordinated on a "volunteer" basis within SWC, because there is not a specific budget item allocated to that function. This means that each of the Directorates take on some coordination responsibility, but that there is no central coordinating body, backed up by its own budget. The voluntary coordination of AGE activities was undertaken by GBAD senior staff in order to promote a systematic approach to internal and external relationships in the work with various stakeholders.

Respondents had several suggestions for meeting these challenges to goal achievement. The ways to do so are implicit in the description of the challenges themselves. Respondents would like to see a clearer, documented framework for AGE itself. They would like to see a more substantial budget and the staff to go with it. They see legislative support for compliance to AGE principles and practices as essential to the achievement of these goals for their own operations, and by extension to the federal government as a whole. There was also some comment to the effect that if the AGE function was housed in a special operating agency, this might be a more effective means for the government to support the achievement of its gender equality/mainstreaming goals.

##### 2. Perspectives of Federal Respondents on AGE

In considering the findings from the federal partners, it is important to bear in mind the following statement from SWC's 2005-2006 *Report on Plans and Priorities*.

*While SWC is the coordinating agency for the advancement of gender equality, it is not the sole component of Canada's national machinery. Each federal department is responsible for implementing the government's commitment to*

*gender equality and for having gender-based analysis incorporated within its substantive work and mandate. From Report on Plans and Priorities, 2005-2006, Status of Women Canada.*

Thus, the effectiveness of the relationship between SWC/AGE and federal partners is a key evaluation issue. The respondents from among the federal partners were not in every case *currently* working in the department with which they had had the most interaction with SWC and various Directorates. However, they all had very immediate experience, and it is useful to elicit their views from that experience, even if a respondent had recently moved on to another position. As noted above, there were a total of 11 respondents from seven federal departments/agencies. All are (or recently were) directly involved in their *own* department's GBA activities. The titles and responsibility levels of their positions varied from department to department, but all were engaged in a leading role in those positions dedicated to facilitating gender equality.

These respondents were asked to comment on four key topics about the AGE and any activities undertaken in collaboration with SWC Directorates. The findings are grouped below according to:

- The mandate and role of AGE itself;
- The benefits and challenges of their interactions/activities with any of the SWC's overall AGE efforts and with any of the three Directorates under consideration in this evaluation;
- Suggestions for overcoming challenges in future; and,
- Assessment of cost effectiveness of the SWC/AGE activities.

Each of these will be addressed in turn.

**a. Perspectives of federal respondents on SWC's AGE mandate, role, and operations**

The respondents and their departments have undertaken a wide range of activities and interactions with the SWC's AGE and its Directorates. These have ranged from informal consultations, sitting on various GBA-oriented committees, and using SWC's GBA training and other informational materials. However, the majority of respondents first situated their comments about any of the Directorates within the larger framework of the AGE itself, before they turned to GBA and other Directorate activities.

All of these respondents expressed strong support for the goal of achieving gender equality within government. Many of them are actively engaged in the work their own departments were undertaking to implement policies and programming that fully take into account gender equality issues. Having said this, however, when it comes to their views on the SWC's role in the AGE initiative, the majority of the respondents expressed frustration on several bases. They described a situation that has extended over the years in which there is a need for:

- A documentary "framework" for the AGE, with a *full-fledged* and *written* statement of its goals, objectives, operational framework, and expected working relations with other departments;

- A clear work plan and agenda for what was to be undertaken at SWC and in any collaboration with other departments;
- Full-fledged, substantive and accountable consultation between SWC and a wide ranges of federal partners on the AGE and what the respective roles and responsibilities of each might be;
- Stronger “leadership” within SWC and between SWC and other stakeholders to increase SWC’s effectiveness in advancing the AGE across departments; and,
- An “enforcement” or “accountability” mechanism across government departments for ensuring they do indeed make progress in the implementation of AGE.
  - This, of course, is an issue of wider governmental commitment, rather than that of SWC alone, but the respondents were clear that without such a mechanism the effectiveness of any such policy would be impeded and that this is true for achieving SWC’s own AGE goals. That is, SWC is left without “teeth” to its actions. (A comparison was made with the Official Languages Act, which does have accountability mechanisms, and one department does have internal regulations requiring accountability on progress toward gender equality in its policies, operations, and programming supports.)

Several respondents also pointed out what they see as a flaw in the partnership approach of SWC to implementing the AGE. This was described as:

- A reduction in the potential for promoting AGE because of SWC’s approach of partnering with three main departments (whose commitment in some cases was seen as being somewhat less than that of some other departments), rather than drawing more widely upon others, especially ones that were already demonstrating an active commitment to achieving gender equality in policies and programming.

#### **b. Perspectives of federal respondents on cost-effectiveness of SWC/AGE**

Most of the federal respondents felt that they were insufficiently familiar with the workings and budget of the SWC overall to be able to comment on cost-effectiveness of their efforts. However, there were comments to the effect that the small size of SWC and its relatively modest budget reflected a lack of substantial investment on the part of the government in either SWC or in assisting SWC’s role in facilitating gender mainstreaming across departments. As a result, some respondents felt there may not be enough investment in the SWC’s activities to have an impact across federal departments. There was also concern raised that the time spent interacting with SWC on the AGE overall was not a cost-effective activity for departments which had already embarked on their own gender equality-seeking efforts.

#### **c. Federal respondents’ suggestions for overcoming challenges noted**

The suggestions these respondents had followed logically from the challenges they described. These included a need for:

- More support at the highest political levels for gender mainstreaming;
- More political support for SWC itself and its role in promoting gender mainstreaming;

- Clarifying and strengthening the SWC's mandate for promoting gender mainstreaming and communicating more effectively about the issue and SWC's own role in this promotion;
- More resources to be devoted to SWC for gender mainstreaming, which should be reflected in more staffing resources (It will be remembered that there are just five staff in the GBAD);
- A leadership approach that would make the most of those resources that currently exist, including doing so through more active and effective participation at senior bureaucratic (Deputy Minister) levels; and,
- Training exercises geared to the specific needs and goals of clients. This could mean anything from working with the client in advance to ensure that training includes department-specific examples, to assisting in the development of planning and implementation tools that address client circumstances in particular.

### 3. Perspectives of Community Stakeholders on the AGE

Among the 11 community stakeholders, there was quite a range in the nature of their connection to SWC/AGE-related activities and to the various Directorates. Two of these groups were not involved in GBA activities, but had received funding from the Women's Programme's component of SWC. One of the others had received funding for a conference. The others' interactions with SWC tended to be in their roles as NGOs that sometimes consult informally with the SWC and which sometimes approach SWC in an advocacy role. Because of this diverse experience, the respondents tended to be most able to provide their perspectives on broader issues of the role and effectiveness of SWC in facilitating national and international goals within the AGE/gender mainstreaming.

Having said this, a substantial proportion of respondents were not particularly familiar with the AGE as such, and those that were emphasized that there is a need for clear, comprehensive and accessible documentation on the initiative. The difficulties they see in this gap are manifold. These include the need for:

- Full-fledged documentation of the AGE, so that equality-seeking groups could assess the AGE's progress and to which they could contribute to over time if this fit their own goals and mandate.
- Accountability of the SWC/AGE to Parliament, stakeholder groups, and the public at large.

Those respondents who have some familiarity with the AGE, and with the role of gender-based analysis in achieving gender equality, emphasized the need for a legislative framework that would require reporting on compliance GBA implementation (as in the Immigration Act).

Other challenges identified by respondents included:

- That there is a significant challenge for the SWC is building bridges between federal departments, other governments and outside organizations.

- That SWC should focus on providing their “one-pagers” in plain language. The feeling among some respondents is that a lot of the material that comes out of SWC is “too bureaucratic”.
- SWC overall being decidedly under-funded and under-staffed. (They report good working relationships with staff, but feel that the effectiveness of staff and of SWC as a whole is limited due to those conditions. )

On the issue of cost-effectiveness, many respondents believed that the role of SWC is essential and if some of the structural issues, identified above, were addressed that it could have greater impacts upon its “client group.”

### B. “Accelerating the Implementation of Gender-Based Analysis”

As stated earlier on in the report, the Canadian government has mandated SWC to accelerate its implementation of Gender Based Analysis (GBA) in order to strengthen the government’s policy capacity and design in support of gender equality. SWC fulfils this mandate principally through the GBA directorate. The goals of this directorate are to

- Promote a common understanding of GBA
- Promote the use of common tools and processes
- Demonstrate how to achieve better policy and program outcomes that support gender equality (*Source: AGE Evaluation Framework*)

According to *Status of Women Performance Reports (2002-2003 and 2003-2004)* SWC increased the number of public servants trained in GBA and executed a number of pilot projects in order to fulfil these objectives. Specifically, these activities included:

#### Training

- In September 2003, Status of Women Canada held the first Train the Trainer program where selected federal departments are provided enhanced knowledge and skill to conduct GBA; (*SWC Performance Report 2003-2004*)
- In 2003-2004 over 100 government analysts received GBA training via a number of capacity-building pilot projects (see pilot projects section below). (*SWC Performance Report 2003-2004*)
- International delegations of gender experts from the governments of other countries, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and academics have continued to seek Status of Women Canada’s expertise to create their own gender-based analysis strategies, tools and training programs. Specifically, the Office of the Status of Women for the country of South Africa is using Status of Women Canada materials and expertise to develop their own GBA strategies, tools and training programs, some of which are in progress or recently completed. (*SWC Performance Report 2003-2004*)

- SWC developed a **new evaluation tool** to measure the results on people's work of the application of the GBA knowledge gained through the training.

### Pilot Projects

- In 2003-04, Status of Women Canada conducted a total of five capacity-building pilot projects with federal departments (two sections of Canadian Heritage; DND; Federal Committee on Women in Science and Technology representing 14 departments) and the Saskatchewan government. (*SWC Performance Report 2003-2004*)
- In 2001-02 SWC executed a pilot training project which focused on capacity-building with Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (*SWC Performance Report 2003-2004*)

### Education and promotion

- Status of Women Canada staff gave a number of presentations on GBA to various community groups to help them understand the role GBA can play in promoting gender equality. (*SWC Performance Report 2003-2004*)

### Monitoring

- To assess and monitor progress of the Agenda for Gender Equality, Status of Women Canada conducted a survey among 24 departments on their accomplishments in advancing gender equality over the past four years.

Having given the brief outline of activities for the GBAD, we turn now to the findings from respondents. As with the other sections of this report, we begin with the presentation of the perspectives of SWC staff, then move to that of federal respondents, and then to those from the community-based organizations.

## 1. SWC Staff Perspectives on the GBA Directorate

In the view of the staff respondents, the achievements of the GBAD are difficult to measure. They noted that a results-based, or program outcomes, mode of measurement of achievement has not yet been established. However, the respondents did mention the following process and product achievements.

- *Process:* Extensive networking and informal consultation with other departments which approach them for consultation on their own GBA/gender mainstreaming undertakings.
- *Product:* the creation of tools and methodologies that have been used federally in Canada and internationally to assist others in achieving their own GBA/gender-mainstreaming goals. (see Federal partners section below for related information on these GBAD activities)
  - Training tools include GBA training manuals, an organizational capacity assessment and a performance measurement template (which are designed to "link theory and practice").



There are four main challenges respondents noted to increasing their ability to meet their goals of facilitating GBA/gender mainstreaming nationally and internationally. These are:

- The need for greater political will at senior levels of some federal departments to support the kinds of actions, with sufficient resources, that are required to bring about substantial advances in GBA/gender mainstreaming;
- As part of this challenge, the modest budget and small staff of the SWC and its Directorates limit its effectiveness and reflect the need for stronger commitment to its goals and work;
- A need for greater clarity in the roles and responsibilities of SWC/GBAD and other Directorate staff in promoting and supporting the (insufficiently documented) AGE and GBA; and
- The absence of legislative support that would “enforce” measurable advancement throughout the government toward GBA and gender mainstreaming.

## **2. Perspectives of federal respondents on the benefits and challenges of interactions/activities with GBAD**

Having situated themselves in relation to the AGE overall, the federal respondents then had an opportunity to describe what they see as the benefits and challenges of their interactions/activities with the SWC and the three Directorates included in this evaluation. The results immediately below are the perspectives on the GBA component itself.

For the most part, these federal respondents did not report substantial benefits of the AGE/GBAD interactions for their own achievement of gender equality goals for their departments. The majority of federal respondents have developed their own departmental responses to GBA and its application in their policies and operations. Several of the departments initially had expected leadership and useful tools from SWC for their own GBA-related activities, but they found that the degree of support they needed was not available. Again, the need for clarity of the mandate and role of SWC in facilitating GBA across the federal government was reported as an impediment to their drawing upon SWC for the advancement of GBA within their given departments. The departments therefore developed their approaches independently, for the most part.

In terms of GBAD training materials, several respondents reported that they had found that these materials had to be significantly adapted to their own situation, and hence most found it more efficient and cost-effective to undertake the development of materials themselves. However, there was a minority of respondents who reported that they did indeed adapt the GBAD training materials to specific programs and that these had been a very valuable supplement to their own efforts to promote GBA in their departments.

Some respondents indicated that the people within their department do not understand what GBA is. They feel that those who are more familiar with the GBA portfolio could spend more time creating awareness. The current lack of full understanding was seen as contributing to difficulties for those departments who require specific assistance with the equity programming.

Respondents also reported that they found that there were insufficient staffing resources in the GBAD to meet the needs for various forms of GBA-related support their departments needed. This situation tended to confirm the necessity of their undertaking GBA activities on their own. The respondents in general felt that the staff at GBAD do indeed have the skills and expertise required for their jobs. In fact, respondents identified particular staff members who were very helpful to them in pursuing their mutual goals overall.

Respondents also pointed out that there were other structural or organizational difficulties that they faced in working with SWC to meet internal gender mainstreaming goals. One difficulty was related in part to the fact that the SWC itself does not enjoy full departmental status, and that it is not represented by a senior minister. This situation was seen as having the effect of SWC/GBAD not having the more central role, clout, and accountability requirements that a full-fledged department could. Respondents felt that if there was this support it would be reflected by SWC having truly departmental status, with all of the resources and accountability requirements that would flow from this. Along with this difficulty, respondents again pointed out that they found a lack of leadership at senior and Coordinator levels. Part of this was seen as structural, in that the Coordinator position is an appointed one, and that it does not in practice place the incumbent on a level playing field with Deputy Ministers, though the coordinator designation is seen to be equivalent to the Deputy designation. However, they also felt that whatever the formal designation, the SWC/GBAD would benefit from more pro-active leadership at higher levels.

Another issue arising out of the interviews had to do with the trainers. The training itself was sometimes described as overly generic. In some instances this leads to problems because those departments developing GBA-related case studies were unable to get answers to department-specific situations. It was suggested that if there could be greater collaboration and shared knowledge of the working environment between individuals with GBA experience and those with departmental examples, it could make for a more relevant training exercise. However, they stated that a lack of organizational efficiency and insufficient human resources significantly hampers the ability of SWC/GBAD to achieve its goals for supporting GBA-related activities within the larger federal framework. Some respondents noted that having the insufficient staffing resources is not always restricted to SWC and that specific departments themselves do not always have the necessary resources to implement GBA.

A number of respondents also noted that their interactions with SWC/GBAD often took up considerable time, to somewhat limited effect. That is, they would be invited to consultations or other activities for which they had to prepare briefings for their own ministers, or prepare other documentation or plans. However, they then would sometimes find that the activity might not occur or if it did there would be little or no follow-up on these initial expectations. This tended to reduce their optimism about working closely with SWC staff, even though they may well have been pursuing the same goals overall.

### **C. “Engaging Canadians in the Policy Process”**

A principal objective of AGE is to create a regular, ongoing consultation mechanism to discuss the gender implications of domestic policies, programs and priorities with various stakeholders. The consultations designed to do so are primarily the responsibility of the C&C directorate.

These consultations were meant to promote a more sustained, constructive dialogue with organizations often underrepresented in the policy process (particularly NGOs). They were to be structured as large, conference-style, face-to-face meetings; issue-driven policy roundtables; Minister's dialogues on Accountability Mechanisms and Gender Equality; discussion papers for circulation; teleconferencing; or an Internet-driven discussion (electronic consultation or electronic dialogue).

Informal discussions between SWC staff, individuals and women's organizations, as well as federal, provincial and territorial partners on particular public policy issues were also to take place so as to reinforce the more formal consultations.

## 1. Perspectives of SWC staff on the C&C Directorate

There were two staff respondents who were currently or recently working with the C&C Directorate. Their own role is not focussed entirely upon AGE because they have many other responsibilities as a communications component. They noted that the AGE work with which they were involved tended to be rather piecemeal, in terms of longer-term planning of events or publications or other activities that would eventually become a part of their communications efforts. The respondents flagged the following challenges in their AGE-related work. They described a need for:

- A clear, documented statement of the nature and goals of AGE overall, and where each component of SWC would participate in it (or not)
  - More publications – and these more user-friendly – for communicating about any aspect of AGE and its Directorates;
- Setting of clear priorities in any of the AGE-related activities/investments;
- A clearer internal organizational structure for SWC and its directorates;
- Stronger leadership, to promote both internal effectiveness and more effective links with federal partners; and,
- Increased financial resources within, to support internal operations and externally-oriented activities (conferences, consultations).

## 2. Perspectives of Community Groups on C&C Directorate

Among the eleven community stakeholders which the evaluators were able to interview, there was quite a range of the nature of their connection to SWC/AGE-related activities and to the various Directorates. The list of respondents provided by SWC were involved – to varying degrees – in the following formal consultations organized by SWC:

- 2004 Dialogue on Accountability
- 2001 Roundtable on gender and homelessness
- Consultations on the Beijing +5 UN special session
- Aboriginal Women's Roundtable, a teleconference on the 2000 Budget
- 1999 Consultation on Gender Equality

While many respondents agreed with the importance of conferences, roundtables, and forums they believe that there is a need for SWC to play a more permanent role as a "clearing house" to

promote gender mainstreaming and to inform interest groups in the challenges faced and the successes in the face of these challenges.

Some respondents indicated that SWC should make a more concerted effort to provide information and engage stakeholders. Some respondents indicated that when conferences were being implemented by the SWC, that the mechanics of notification and promotion tended not to happen in a timely fashion, and once the conferences were over, there was an undue time lag before the resulting reports were made available to participants. There was a commitment from SWC to have regular updates, but some respondents felt that these were not happening frequently enough.

Some respondents also indicated that it may be more relevant to focus on supporting small gatherings rather than large gatherings with dozens of organizations in attendance. There is an acknowledgement that a lack of resources could play a significant role in the infrequency of community consultations; nonetheless, respondents see this as a more effective way to achieve their own and SWC's goals for promoting gender equality in their respective realms.

#### D. "Meeting Canada's International and Treaty Obligations"

The Policy and External Relations Directorate (P-ERD) is the largest of the three Directorates under consideration in this report, with 17 staff members. They serve three streams of activity: involving women's groups in the policy process, holding federal/provincial meetings, and carrying out international work related to gender equality. A very experienced staff member noted that they would most appropriately be seen as a "policy shop" dealing with domestic issues and groups, supporting federal/provincial meetings on gender equality, and carrying out international activities and commitments, as appropriate to their level of organization. (This evaluation focused on the international section of the Directorate.)

Part of the overall mandate of the P-ER directorate is to help Canada meet its International and Treaty Obligations by sustaining Canada's status as a global leader on gender equality issues. The Government of Canada mandated AGE resources to be dedicated to address both cyclical pressures in international activities/events and reporting requirements, as well as to meet new international pressures related to trade-based alliances.

These cyclical pressures include: the UN five-year review and appraisal, with the Beijing +10 process in 2004-2005 and the 4 year reporting cycle under CEDAW, and the Commonwealth Ministerial meetings that occur every four years;

SWC also contributed to Canada's preparations for the following international meetings/activities:

- The 2003 World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS).
- Three Executive Committee meetings of the Inter American Commission of Women (CIM).
- The World Trade Organization (WTO)-hosted workshop on the theme *Women and Trade at the WTO*.
- A symposium of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.
- The UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, which focused this year on indigenous women.
- Gender Focal Point Network at APEC.
- Gender-Coordinator at OECD.

(Source: 2003-2004 Performance Reports)

We turn now to the findings from respondents on the P-ER Directorate.

### 1. Perspectives of SWC respondents on the Policy-External Relations Directorate

For this evaluation, the research interviews covered four staff members, most of whom are working in the P-ERD now, and another who had been doing so until recently, when a move was made to another federal department. These staff, who represented a range of the 17 incumbents of positions in this Directorate, expressed a lack of clarity on what the AGE itself is and what their own role in it should be. Their comments focused on:

- Their understanding of and relationship to the AGE overall;
- The challenges of meeting the demands of their work; and
- How these challenges could be better met.

As for their understanding of and relationship to the AGE overall, several of the respondents stated that though they had been with SWC for some time, they still experienced the challenge of living with uncertainties as to:

- What AGE itself really is;
- What their responsibilities are in contributing to AGE; and,
- Who within the organization overall had the lead responsibility for implementing AGE.

When asked what would ameliorate these challenges, respondents suggested what could be seen as “programmatic” actions such as:

- Creation of a full-fledged, publicly available document that fully described the policy approach to the AGE and the role of SWC, including an account of the role of its personnel, and its federal partners in meeting AGE goals;
- Development of gender equality measures (goals, objectives, measurement of current status and changes over time); and,
- Development of a means of effective government-wide monitoring and “enforcement” of gender equality measures.

From an operational level within their own organization, respondents emphasize that they are hampered in their effectiveness by the fact that they are not a “whole ministry.” This means that not only must their own organization work in a collaborative, highly focused manner in a rather ill-defined environment, but that they must work especially hard to try to get “buy-in” on gender-mainstreaming, when there is no formal means to enforce this. They also suggest that a way must be devised to document achievements that have taken place over the last five years. They also felt that there should be better communications internally, to enhance understanding of all staff in the issues addressed and the program efforts that are being undertaken. Better documentation of operations and achievements were recommended, both for communication with the public and to ensure accountability for their gender mainstreaming activities.

Respondents also noted that no matter what their understanding, or lack thereof, of the AGE, they did not have the authority or mandate to query or challenge other departments as to what was being done in these departments to achieve gender equality in their respective organizations. The SWC/P-ER can ask other departments to share information and they can offer assistance – if SWC staff time allows – but there is no mechanism that would cause the departments and SWC to be accountable for whether or not they collaborate, much less accounting for any degree of success in any collaboration that does occur.

From an organizational standpoint, the respondents felt that the job descriptions and responsibilities of staff were ill-defined and that this resulted in confusion and inefficiencies in their achievement of the goals of the organization as a whole. As a part of this ambiguity, there were also comments to the effect that the public does not know the overall mandate of SWC sufficiently well, and that this can result in perceptions that SWC is not achieving its goals, or doing enough of what it should for Canadian women.

Also, from an organizational perspective, respondents thought that the organizational chart of the organization is too “flat”, which can result in inefficiencies and a lack of credibility with other governmental departments which have a more hierarchical, more “professional” approach (or appearance of professionalism) than does SWC and their own Directorate.

Staff also did comment upon the working environment at SWC and in their Directorate. They felt that the staff would benefit from more training in the kinds of skills that would strengthen the quality of their internal working relationships. There were also suggestions that staff would benefit from more language training, more familiarization with how federal government works, and more training in diplomacy and negotiation skills in order to work more effectively internally and with other federal and international partners.

Finally, from a government-wide perspective, P-ER staff emphasized that their work would be facilitated and could be more effective if the federal government established accountability mechanisms for achieving gender equality across the board. They felt that in achieving this, Canada’s impact in the international scene would be enhanced, as it would provide an example of a country which is actively moving toward achieving gender mainstreaming in its governmental mechanisms.

## **2. Perspectives of Federal Respondents on P-ERD**

The general tenor of the perspectives of federal respondents on the activities of SWC on P-ERD, and on the respondents own work with the SWC staff is one of frustration. There have been experiences of a partner department developing an approach to a key gender equality issue and then finding at the last minute, so to speak, there is a lack of congruence with SWC on their perspectives on that issue. The outcome seems to have been divergent representations on an issue, which is seen as reducing the effectiveness of both departments’ involvement in that issue and related activities.

There were also concerns raised by respondents about the internal workings of SWC, in that they find that the challenges that appear to them to exist in the day-to-day “esprit” and operations of SWC seem to impede prompt, coherent decision-making within SWC itself. This makes it more

difficult for other federal partners to know what position SWC will be taking on the relevant issues, and there are resulting inefficiencies in their working together with SWC. The respondents felt that individual staff and management are skilled and dedicated, but noted that internal human resources challenges seem to impede staff effectiveness – at least in the realms that are addressed in the P-ER component.

**Note:** Community respondents did not have experience with P-ERD activities and hence no comments were offered on this program component.

#### IV. EVALUATIVE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This evaluation has focussed on the *processes* utilized by SWC and three of its Directorates, as they work to achieve their goals for the Agenda for Gender Equality. As such, this is a *formative* evaluation and its goal should be to assist the program in maintaining its strengths, in identifying areas needing improvement, and in recommending ways of making positive change. This section will begin with our evaluative conclusions about the effectiveness and efficiency of the AGE and the three Directorates under consideration. The recommendations for program enhancement are integrated into the conclusions.

It seems evident that the AGE and these three Directorates are faced with a number of serious challenges. While this may be daunting, the purpose of an evaluation such as this is to assist programs in addressing these challenges effectively, and it is in this spirit that these conclusions and recommendations are set out.

There is however, a central positive feature of the working environment in which SWC and these Directorates are placed. In the evaluator's view, there appears to be substantial support for gender mainstreaming of policies and programs across the departments consulted – and they are key departments in the federal context. On the other hand, it is true that the internal units addressing these issues in these departments are very small and the staff tend not to be senior. It also seems that there are very few departments who have legislative or regulatory requirements to work toward and report on their progress on gender equality in all aspects of their work.

Having said this, it seems clear that the effectiveness of the SWC and these Directorates to strengthen gender equality through their actions is decidedly limited. This appears to rest on three closely related challenges. These are listed below, with related recommendations:

##### **Challenges in the Political Environment**

- A need for stronger and clearly articulated support from political and bureaucratic sources at the highest levels;  
**Recommendation: Enhance outreach efforts, working with community and federal partners to substantially increase this support.**

- Along with the above, more financial support for human resources in the SWC;  
**Recommendation: Increase efforts, in collaboration with Minister, federal and community partners to make the case for increased budgetary support.**
- A legislative/regulatory framework that compels reporting across the federal spectrum on progress and which can lead to remedial action as called for.  
**Recommendation: Continue efforts with federal and community partners to ensure that this takes place.**

### Challenges in Organizational Operation

- A need for a fully developed, completely documented conceptual framework and operating plan for all aspects of the AGE and its Directorates;  
**Recommendation: Initiate a thorough, professionally-led process to achieve this.**
- A need for stronger, more “pro-active” leadership at the highest levels, supported by a genuine, “working” equivalence of the position with senior-most levels of the federal public service;  
**Recommendation: Based on the evaluative findings, institute a process for further identifying leadership needs and for developing appropriate responses (consultations, training, etc.).**
- A need for more, and more effective and regular, consultations and collaborations with groups seeking equality for women across Canada.  
**Recommendation: Ensure that this is undertaken, and that appropriate follow-up is an integral part of these activities. In this process, develop more cost-effective ways of consulting with smaller groups more frequently (e.g., online forums, forums via videoconference, teleconferences, etc.).**

These conclusions and recommendations flow directly from the findings of the evaluation research. The conclusions can be dispiriting, because they do reflect a situation in need of environmental and operational strengthening. At the same time, it is clear that the need for gender equality remains great and that the importance of the federal government taking a lead in achieving this within its own house cannot be overstated. It is hoped that this evaluation will make a positive contribution to a more rapid, effective, and efficient movement along this very difficult but entirely worthwhile path.



## Appendix A: Interview Guides

### Appendix A: Interview Guides

<b>FEDERAL PARTNERS: FINAL INTERVIEW GUIDE</b>	
Respondent:	Title:
Organization:	Interviewer:
Date: Interviewer answers any questions about interview and project, assures confidentiality, provides name and contact information of Project Authority if requested.	

<b>RESPONDENT BACKGROUND AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGE/GBA (or P/ER or C&amp;C – as appropriate )</b>
---

1. Would you review for me *your own position* and how it relates to AGE based activities, as they are connected to any element of these Directorates: GBA? (or P/ER, or C&C as appropriate –to be adapted for each respondent throughout)
  - Overall AGE:
  - Specific to GBA (use of materials, advice from GBA staff, etc.):
  - Specific to C&C:
  - Specific to P-ER:
  
2. Would you describe for me any *activities* that your department has undertaken as part of the SWC's own partnership work with your department on AGE/GBA/C&C/P-ER
  - Overall AGE:
  - Specific to GBA (use of materials, advice from GBA staff, etc.):
  - Specific to C&C:
  - Specific to P-ER:

3. Would you describe for me the nature of your *interactions* with *management/staff* at SWC, as you have carried out your own AGE/GBA activities? (resource person, activities/informal consultations with staff, etc.)

- Senior Management at SWC overall
- With GBA
- With C&C
- With P-ER
- Combined/any “mix”?

PERSPECTIVES ON GBA (P/ER, C&C)
---------------------------------

4. Thinking of your activities related to GBA/C&C/P-ER, what have been the benefits to your organization of these interactions with management/staff?  
[interviewer, be sure to note clearly to which they are referring]

Management/Staff	Benefits
SWC Management	
GBA Staff	
C&C Staff	
P-ER Staff	

5. Have there been any challenges or difficulties in working with GBA/C&C/P-ER staff that have affected your own department’s ability to achieve its AGE goals?

Overall:

Probe for:

- Availability of SWC/GBA/C&C/P-ER staff/management
- Expertise of SWC/GBA/C&C/P-ER staff/management
- Familiarity of GBA/C&C/P-ER staff/management with respondent’s department’s own mandate, goals, objectives, operations
- Other (as brought forward)

Management/Staff	Challenges
SWC Management	
GBA Staff	
C&C Staff	
P-ER Staff	

6. What suggestions would you have for how these challenges could be avoided/overcome in future?

CHALLENGE	SUGGESTIONS FOR OVERCOMING CHALLENGES		
Overall –SWC-wide			
Directorates	GBA	C&C	P-ER
Availability of SWC/Directorate staff/ Management for each			
Expertise of SWC/Directorate staff/management-			
Familiarity of Directorate's staff/management with respondent's department's <i>own</i> mandate, goals, objectives, operations (or other Directorate's, as appropriate – clearly marked by interviewer)			
Other			
Other			

7. Are there any challenges *within your own department* to achieving your AGE goals and objectives, *irrespective* of your working relationship with SWC/GBA/C&C/P-ER

No

Yes

a. If yes, what are they? And what would need to be done to overcome these challenges?

Challenge in Own Department	Action Needed Action within Own Department

<b>ASSESSMENT OF COST EFFECTIVENESS</b>
---

8. If you were to assess the work of SWC’s AGE (GBA-P/ER, C&C) in terms of its cost effectiveness, how sound an “investment” would you say it is for the federal government?

- Overall response
- Reasons for response

	Assessment of Cost Effectiveness at Program/Directorate Levels
AGE Overall	
GBA D	
C&C D	
P-ER D	

Thinking of any investment of time, human resources, and other expenditures *your department* has made in its supporting partnerships with the AGE/GBA(-P/ER, C&C), how would you assess the cost effectiveness of that investment?

- Overall response
- Reasons for response

	Assessment of Cost Effectiveness for your own Department’s AGE Partnerships I nits own AGE Goal Achievement
Partnering with:	
• AGE Overall	
• GBA D	
• C&C D	
• P-ER D	

**WRAP UP**

9. Looking back over your departments own goals for supporting federal gender equality policies, and given what you have accomplished, what role would you say your partnership with SWC has played in goal achievement?

	Very Great Role
	Moderate Role
	Little Role
	No Role
	Negative Role/impeding goal achievement

- 9a. Would you explain the reasoning behind your choice?
10. Is there anything you would like to add about the AGE/GBE (P/ER, C&C) that you would like us to include in our evaluation?
11. Is there anything you would like to comment on about this evaluation process?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND THOUGHTS!

## FINAL INTERVIEW GUIDE: COMMUNITY-BASED RESPONDENTS

Respondent:	Date: <u>  </u> / <u>  </u> / <u>  </u> D M Y
Organization:	Location:
Position:	Interviewer: _____
Contact information:	
Interviewer explains purpose of project and interview, ensures confidentiality, answers any questions, and gives name of contact Project Authority (Suzanne Cooper, SWC, 613-995-3977)	

### BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENT AND ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED BY SWC FOR AGE

1. Would you give me a brief overview of your organization and what your own role/relationship is to it?

*Our understanding is that your \_\_\_\_\_ [event, etc.] was funded in part or whole through Status of Women Canada's Agenda for Gender Equality initiative. These questions relate to that activity/event:*

*This is a three-part question, so feel free to discuss it in detail. There is a grid here that you may want to look at to help organize your response.*

2. Would you describe for me the type of activity your organization undertook that was supported by the Status of Women Agenda for Gender Equality initiative and what your goals were for this activity and its support and the goals for the nature of the support you asked of the SWC staff/management.

Activity	Goals for Activity	Goals for Role of SWC/AGE staff - how they were to assist
a. Conference: (describe)		
b. Consultations		

c. Use of Materials (whether or not included in above)		
d. Other		

3. In order for us to have a full description of these activities with organizations, we would like to ask you the names of those SWC staff with whom you were most in contact and what their roles were in your activities:

Activity/Materials	SWC staff/directorate	Comments/details/degree of interaction/support

4. Given the goals your group had for these activities, how well do you feel these goals were achieved overall?

a.  Completely  Very well  Not Very Well  Not at all

b. What is the reason for your response?

5. How would you assess the value of the role of the SWC (directorate, as relevant) in your goal achievement [or lack thereof, depending on response to #4]

a. Overall

b. Probe for:

1. Skills of staff in providing guidance/expertise in topic
2. Skills of staff in interacting constructively with the organization and its partners in the planning and implementation of the activity
3. Quality of materials provided (if relevant)

6. Whatever the value of the SWC support, do you have any suggestions for how the SWC's own effectiveness in these activities could be enhanced in future?



## COST EFFECTIVENESS

7. Do you feel that the effort, staff commitment, time, money that your group devoted to this activity/materials was effective from a "cost effectiveness" viewpoint (in other words was it worth their while, from a financial/resource expenditure viewpoint)?
8. Do you feel that the AGE/GBA/etc. programming itself, with its support to groups such as your own is cost effective, if you were taking the viewpoint of the federal government (or taxpayer)?

## WRAP UP:

*So far, we have been talking particularly about the AGE and the three directorates (GBA, C&C, P-ER), but the overall goal of the entire AGE is states as "Engaging Canadians in the Policy Process."*

9. Given this goal, how well would you say Status of Women Canada is succeeding in achieving that goal? I will give you a scale and then ask you to elaborate on the reasons for your choice:

- Very well
- Reasonably well
- Not very well
- Not at all well

9a. Would you explain the reason(s) for your choice?

10. Do you have any other comments about the AGE/GBA/C&C/P-ER Directorates' programming that may not have been covered above?

No  Yes  
If yes, why do you say this?

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND THOUGHTS!**

<b>STAFF: FINAL INTERVIEW GUIDE GBA DIRECTORATE</b>	
<b>Respondent:</b>	<b>Title:</b>
<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Interviewer:</b>
<b>How long in this position:</b>	
<b>How long at SWC:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
Interviewer answers any questions about interview and project, assures confidentiality.	

**Part I:**

**RESPONDENT'S RELATIONSHIP TO AGE – ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:**

1. **Would you tell me your roles and responsibilities related to the implementation of the AGE?**

*Now I would like to ask you a fairly detailed series of questions about the Communications and Consultations Directorate, as a part of the AGE Initiative overall. You will be familiar with these questions because they are the same ones we have used for the evaluation of the GBA Directorate and will use for the Communications and Consultations Directorate and the External Relations Directorate.*

**Part II a: Re GBA DIRECTORATE**

**PERSPECTIVES ON ACHIEVEMENTS AND CHALLENGES TO PROGRAMMING WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF AGE/ AGE-RELATED ACTIVITIES**

2. **In your view, what have been the most notable achievements of the GBA Directorate?**

Overall:

Specific Examples [fill in table below if not already covered in list from #3 below]

3. **What accounts for these achievements? [USE TABLE BELOW FOR RESPONSES]**

a. Overall:

b. Probe for:

- Policy framework (content, goals, "achieveability")
- Degree of receptivity of partners to AGE/GBA goals
- Organizational structure of SWC's relationships with partners
- Human resources available to GBA Directorate
- Expertise of relevant staff at SWC
- Financial resources available (aside from HR, above)
- Quality and number of events/activities sponsored by SWC for AGE
- Publications/documents provided to partners to assist in their own efforts related to AGE overall

- Working relationships with other Directorates:
  - P/ER
  - C & C
  - Other directorates in SWC (as relevant)
- Other
- Other
- Other

ACHIEVEMENT	WHAT ACCOUNTS FOR ACHIEVEMENTS
Policy framework (content, goals, "achieveability")	
Degree of receptivity of partners to AGE/GBA goals	
Organizational structure of SWC's relationships with partners	
Human resources available	
Expertise of relevant staff	
Financial resources	
Quality and number of events/activities sponsored by GBA Directorate	
Publications/documents provided to partners to assist in their own efforts related to AGE overall	
Working relationships with other Directorates:	
• P/ER	
• C&C	
• Other directorates in WC (as relevant)	
• Other Achievements	
• Other Achievements	
• Other	

4. What do you see as the *challenges* that the GBA directorate has faced in achieving its goals and objectives? [use table below for responses]
- a. Overall:
  - b. Probe for:

- Degree of receptivity of partners to AGE/GBA goals
- Organizational structure of SWC’s relationships with partners
- Human resources available to GBA Directorate
- Expertise of relevant staff at SWC
- Financial resources available
- Working relationships with other Directorates:
  - P/ER
  - C & C
- Other directorates in SWC (as relevant)
- Other

5. What do you see as the most effective way to overcome these challenges (for those that have already been achieved, please describe how this was done):

CHALLENGE	MEANS OF OVERCOMING (PAST OR PRESENT OR FOR FUTURE)
Policy framework (content, goals, “achieveability”)	
Degree of receptivity of partners to AGE/GBA goals	
Organizational structure of SWC’s relationships with partners	
Human resources available	
Expertise of relevant staff	
Financial resources	
Quality and number of events/activities sponsored by GBA Directorate	
Publications/documents provided to partners to assist in their own efforts related to AGE overall	
Working relationships with other Directorates: P/ER	
C&C	
Other directorates in SWC (as relevant)	
Other	
Other	
Other	
Other	

**CONCLUSION/WRAP UP**

So far, we have been talking particularly about the AGE and the three directorates (GBA, C&C, P-ER), but the overall goal of the entire AGE is states as “Engaging Canadians in the Policy Process.”

6. Given this goal, how well would you say Status of Women Canada is succeeding in achieving that goal? I will give you a scale and then ask you to elaborate on the reasons for your choice:

- Very well
- Reasonably well
- Not very well
- Not at all well

6a. Would you explain the reason(s) for your choice?

7. Is there anything at all you would like to add about the AGE/GBA/C&C/P-ER?

8. Is there anything you would like to add about the evaluation process?

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND THOUGHTS!**

<b>PART II b. P and ER DIRECTORATE</b>
--

<b>PART II c. C &amp; C DIRECTORATE</b>
---

FOR THESE OTHER DIRECTORATES – THE QUESTIONNAIRE WILL REPEAT THE ABOVE CHARTS, WITH APPROPRIATE “EDITS” TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT DIFFERENCES IN THE PROGRAM DEALT WITH (i.e., Working relationships with other Directorates – the appropriate Directorate will be inserted, particular program activities, etc.)