



**FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE
“INTERDEPARTMENTAL PARTNERSHIP WITH
OFFICIAL LANGUAGE COMMUNITIES” (IPOLC)
COMPONENT OF THE PROMOTION OF OFFICIAL
LANGUAGES PROGRAM**

Prepared for

Canadian Heritage

Participating Staff

Mira Svoboda, Senior Research Consultant
ARC Applied Research Consultants
Suite 2010A, 112 Kent Street
Place de Ville, Tower B
Ottawa, ON
K1P 5P2
(613) 230-4136

Date

October 22, 2003
N0593

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|--|-----------|
| Executive Summary | i |
| I INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| A. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND | 1 |
| B. OBJECTIVES OF IPOLC | 1 |
| C. RATIONALE FOR IPOLC | 2 |
| D. POSITIONING OF THE INITIATIVE | 3 |
| E. ANTICIPATED RESULTS FOR IPOLC | 4 |
| F. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION | 5 |
| G. METHODOLOGY | 7 |
| II RELEVANCE OF THE DESIGN OF THE INITIATIVE | 9 |
| A. PERCEIVED STRENGTHS OF IPOLC | 9 |
| B. PERCEIVED WEAKNESSES OF IPOLC | 10 |
| C. ADEQUACY OF RESOURCES | 13 |
| D. CONCLUSIONS | 13 |
| III RELEVANCE OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INITIATIVE | 15 |
| A. VARIATIONS IN IMPLEMENTATION | 15 |
| B. TRENDS IN THE NUMBER OF REQUESTS | 16 |
| C. DELAYS IN IMPLEMENTATION | 16 |
| D. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES | 16 |
| E. PERCEIVED ADEQUACY OF PROMOTIONAL TOOLS AND ACTIVITIES | 17 |
| F. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS TO PARTNER DEPARTMENTS | 18 |
| G. CONCLUSIONS | 18 |
| IV PROBABILITY OF PRODUCING RESULTS | 21 |
| A. ACHIEVEMENT OF RESULTS IN MOUs | 21 |
| B. ACHIEVEMENT OF SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM IPOLC RESULTS | 21 |
| C. INTERVIEWEES SUGGESTIONS FOR OTHER MEANS TO OBTAIN RESULTS | 22 |
| D. UNINTENDED IMPACTS | 23 |
| E. WILLINGNESS TO CONTINUE INVOLVEMENT WITH IPOLC | 24 |
| F. CONCLUSIONS | 25 |
| V PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND REPORTING | 27 |
| A. MONITORING AND REPORTING SYSTEMS IN PLACE | 27 |

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|----|
| B. | FIT WITH OAG PRINCIPLES..... | 28 |
| C. | CONCLUSIONS | 30 |
| VI | RECOMMENDATIONS | 31 |

APPENDICES

| | |
|------------|---|
| Appendix A | List of Interviewees and Interview Protocols |
| Appendix B | Reporting Documents on Activities Under the IPOLC |
| Appendix C | Fact Sheet, IPOLC Guidelines and Frequently Asked Questions |
| Appendix D | Summary of Results and Objectives in MOUs |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. OBJECTIVES OF THE INTERDEPARTMENTAL PARTNERSHIP WITH THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE

The Citizenship and Heritage sector of the Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH) aims to help Canadians to recognize and celebrate their common identity and to enable them to increase their contribution to Canadian society. The Official Languages Support Programs Branch (OLSPB) of PCH, which is part of this sector, is mandated to promote the recognition, learning and use of the two official languages in Canadian society, and to encourage the development of Francophone and Anglophone communities in minority situations in Canada in accordance with sections 41 and 42 of the *Official Languages Act*. In fulfilling its mandate, the OLSPB oversees two main programs: the Official Languages in Education Program and the Promotion of Official Languages Program. IPOLC falls within the Promotion of Official Languages Program.

IPOLC was implemented in June 2000. The objectives of the initiative¹ are to:

- Support activities that contribute to the overall development of the official language minority communities, with a view to the sustainable development and enhanced vitality of the communities.
- Promote access to the programs and services offered by federal organizations, make them better known, and enable the federal government to determine the needs and realities of official language minority communities more effectively. This will enable them to be taken into account when reviewing existing programs and services or in developing new programs and services.
- Have a “lasting change” effect on the organizational culture of the federal and community partners. In this context, “lasting change” is defined as any factor that helps to facilitate the integration of official language minority communities into the regular clientele of federal organizations.
- Function as a financial lever in promoting the creation of sustainable partnerships and new methods of cooperation by effecting long-term change in the organizational culture of the federal and community partners.

¹ As stated in the Program’s Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework, March 2001

B. POSITIONING OF THE INITIATIVE

Within the Department of Canadian Heritage, four strategic objectives have been adopted to guide the Department's policies and actions. The objectives of IPOLC support one of these four objectives, specifically:

- *Active Citizenship and Civic Participation*: Promote understanding of the rights and responsibilities attached to shared citizenship and foster opportunities to participate in Canada's civic life.

To date, of the 29 targeted departments and agencies, 14 have signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) with the Department of Canadian Heritage. One agency has signed two separate MOUs with the Department of Canadian Heritage, one for Francophones and one for Anglophones. Funding available through the initiative is approximately \$5.5 million annually since 1999-2000, allowing for funding that complements other federal contributions designed to promote the development of official language minority communities. However there was some delay in implementing the initiative and the first projects were only approved in January 2001. Therefore, the evaluation has focused on IPOLC funded activities and projects for the period of January 2001 to January 2003. As of January 2003, IPOLC staff reports that a total of 60 federal programs and initiatives have funded projects through IPOLC.

C. ANTICIPATED RESULTS FOR IPOLC

The anticipated short-term results for IPOLC² are:

- Officers in Canadian Heritage regional offices, national and regional coordinators in federal institutions, federal Official Languages Champions and the Federal Council of Senior Federal Officials in the Regions are informed about IPOLC and capable of promoting it.
- Official language minority communities are informed about the IPOLC initiative and are receiving funding through Canadian Heritage federal partners.
- By working in collaboration with official language minority communities on developing activities that can be funded by the IPOLC, federal institutions become more knowledgeable of the needs and realities of the communities.
- The cooperation between Canadian Heritage and the federal institutions encourages the establishment of sustainable partnerships and new modes of cooperation.
- Federal institutions achieve the target results indicated in the Memoranda of

² As stated in the Program's Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework, March 2001

Understanding (MOUs).

- Structuring impacts on the organizational culture of the federal partners and communities begin to emerge.

The anticipated long-term results for IPOLC are:

- Changing the organizational culture of federal institutions so that they acquire the habit of doing business with official language communities.
- Adapting federal programs and service delivery models to make them more responsive to the realities of official language communities.
- A more coordinated approach among federal, provincial/territorial, regional and municipal governments and community associations.
- Recognition of the influence of official language communities in the action plans of federal institutions, and in the development of new programs and initiatives or when existing programs are renewed or reviewed.

Finally, for the community organizations, the implementation of IPOLC should contribute to:

- Greater knowledge by official language minority communities of government programs and services.
- A change in the culture of community associations so that they are better equipped to benefit from federal programs.
- Sustainable development of the communities.

D. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THIS EVALUATION

The Evaluation of IPOLC is a formative evaluation. As such, its focus is on the design and implementation of the initiative as well as short-term outcomes that are likely to have been achieved since implementation. As is common with formative evaluations, this one served to verify the initiative's degree of progress towards achieving the target results and to identify the corrections that may be necessary to maximize the likelihood of its success.

E. METHODOLOGY

This evaluation incorporates information gathered through key informant interviews, document reviews, and program data. Key informant interviews are the primary source

of data for this evaluation. A total of 31 interviews were conducted with 41 individuals. Prior to each interview, interviewees were reminded that their comments would be treated as strictly confidential.

F. EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS

1. Relevance of the Design of the Initiative

This evaluation found evidence that the design of the initiative has facilitated cooperation between official language minority communities and federal departments and agencies. In fact there were concrete examples of this found. This cooperation between official language minority communities has been found to be particularly important in terms of educating both sides. The communities have become more aware of what federal programs are available to them and federal departments and agencies have increased their awareness of the needs and realities of official language minority communities.

The criteria for the initiative were intentionally designed to be flexible so as to allow an easy fit between IPOLC criteria and those of partner departments and agencies. IPOLC assesses requests based on the following criteria:

- The activity must address a community priority.
- The activity must fall within other departments' mandates.
- The activity must have a long-term or structuring effect.
- The activity must not have been planned to be funded by the other department without IPOLC.
- If the activity is a new component to an existing activity, the added value of the new component must be clear.

The approval or rejection of a request for funding is thus primarily determined by the criteria of the partner department or agency. In general this has worked well, however community organizations and some section 41 coordinators appear to misconstrue the determining criteria for funding as belonging to the Department of Canadian Heritage.

This is perhaps the result of the perception that the Department of Canadian Heritage is solely responsible for programming to official language minority communities. In fact, the Department of Canadian Heritage receives requests that have been assessed and

approved for funding by the partner department or agency based on their criteria.

The majority of the regional Department of Canadian Heritage staff indicated that the initiative was too centralized. They felt ill equipped to fully market the initiative to communities and regional section 41 coordinators. However, the funding envelope available for the initiative is relatively small and cannot be reasonably split into regional funding envelopes, as is the case with larger programs, thus precluding devolution of responsibility for the programs to the regions.

This evaluation found evidence that some partner departments and agencies were not meeting their reporting obligations as stipulated in their MOUs with the Department of Canadian Heritage. The program, because of its interdepartmental nature, requires the signature of at least two Deputy Ministers for each funding submission. This requirement results, on occasion in delays in community organizations receiving their funding. This is the inevitable by-product of interdepartmental initiatives such as IPOLC, which should be managed with the same level of diligence as any other program or initiative. Similarly, the timing of interdepartmental funding transfers, January and September, was found to slow the funding process. However, this is outside the influence of the Department of Canadian Heritage.

2. Relevance of the Implementation of the Initiative

There are significant variations in the effectiveness of the implementation of IPOLC. Official language communities vary greatly in terms of size, concentration, cohesiveness and the level of ability to access the necessary resources to develop project proposals. Large and active communities, such as those found in Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick, are more likely to present projects for funding to IPOLC. These are also regions where key IPOLC partners had established contact with the communities. However, it should be noted that the mandate of IPOLC is to foster new working relationships between official language minority communities, not to reinforce existing relationships.

The limited information available to IPOLC staff about the number of requests made to partner departments and agencies for IPOLC funding, including the number of requests rejected, limits their ability to assess the adequacy of the IPOLC funding envelope.

This evaluation found that some community organizations, particularly at the national level and those representing community organizations at the regional level, would like to play a greater role in the program development. Regional Department of Canadian Heritage staff also feel they should have a larger role to play in the marketing and management of IPOLC.

In general, the relationship between all partners, Department of Canadian Heritage,

federal departments and agencies and community organizations, was found to be positive. In particular, community organizations are grateful for the additional funding available to them through IPOLC and the increased interest in the needs of their community expressed by IPOLC partner departments and agencies.

This evaluation found some evidence that there was a lack of promotional tools and activities, specifically those directed at community organizations and regional staff in partner departments and agencies. However, it was noted by Department of Canadian Heritage staff, community organizations and section 41 coordinators that there are risks associated with active marketing of a relatively small, initiative such as IPOLC. Creating more demand for funding from community organizations would likely result in a larger proportion of requests for funding being rejected. On the other hand, a larger number of applications might result in the approval of better projects.

3. Probability of Producing Results

There is some indication that the expected results of the MOUs are being achieved, albeit slowly. However, there is general agreement that these results are difficult to measure because they are of a qualitative nature.

Despite the agreement that projects funded through IPOLC support the objectives of the MOUs, some PCH staff expressed concern that funding was not necessarily strategic, in that projects funded were not always engendering long-term change in the relationship between official language minority communities and federal departments and agencies.

IPOLC is a new initiative, however, there are indications that there has been progress in the attainment of the short-term results of IPOLC. In fact, the main achievement appears to be the change in the mindset of federal departments and agencies with respect to official language communities. As a result of IPOLC, there are closer ties between federal departments and agencies and official language minority communities. A number of section 41 coordinators reported that their department or agency had received positive press as a result of their involvement under IPOLC in the official language communities.

There has been little progress in reaching the long-term results of IPOLC, which is understandable in light of the relatively brief period covered by this evaluation. It is very early in the lifecycle of the initiative.

Some federal departments and agencies have continued to fund projects in official language communities without the involvement of IPOLC. Again, this is an indication that progress towards the long-term results of IPOLC is being made. However, some partner departments and agencies indicated that they had been involved in official language minority communities prior to IPOLC and that IPOLC has changed little in

their dealings with official language communities. As a result, one must question whether the signing of an MOU with these departments and agencies was a strategic use of IPOLC funds.

A number of federal departments and agencies that IPOLC staff did not expect to be interested in IPOLC have expressed interest and signed MOUs. The number of MOUs exceeds the number anticipated by PCH managers. This may have led to an unintended negative impact since the \$5.5 million in funding available annually will have to be shared by a larger number of partner departments and agencies. This could be prevented if IPOLC does not renew existing MOUs, many of which are with relatively large departments and agencies. This would give other departments and agencies the opportunity to participate in IPOLC.

There are some indications that IPOLC is creating a dependency on matching funding available through IPOLC on the part of some federal departments and agencies. There are also indications that a similar dependency is occurring in official language minority communities.

4. Performance Measurement and Reporting

The OAG has suggested a number of guidelines for assessing collaborative arrangements. Our assessment is based on chapter 5 – *Collaborative Arrangements: Issues for the Federal Government* (April 1999) and chapter 23 *Involving Others in Governing: Accountability at Risk* (November 1999). This evaluation has found that IPOLC meets these guidelines.

The Office of the Auditor General of Canada notes that effective accountability is more complex in a collaborative arrangement such as IPOLC. This is borne out in IPOLC, where there remains some lack of clarity and understanding, as well as willingness on the part of partner departments and agencies, with regard to the reporting of results. Reporting by partner departments and agencies is inconsistent, with some departments reporting regularly and others late or not at all. The Department of Canadian Heritage is dependent on how much it can report by whether partner departments and agencies submit information in a timely and consistent manner.

G. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations in this section flow directly from the data and analysis in the

preceding chapters.

1. The Department of Canadian Heritage should continue to administer IPOLC centrally. However, IPOLC management should provide more training to and work closely with regional PCH staff and, where appropriate, regional staff of other departments and agencies to ensure that they can act as ambassadors for and promoters of the IPOLC in their contacts with the official language communities.
2. As intended by the IPOLC criteria, the Department of Canadian Heritage should be more strategic in the MOUs it signs. IPOLC should be focussed on federal departments and agencies that have had little involvement in the official language communities historically and with which the communities are interested in working rather than on departments and agencies that have been actively involved for some time.
3. The Department of Canadian Heritage should ensure appropriate accountability reporting by funding recipients, in keeping with the terms and conditions in MOUs. This reporting will improve the systematic collection of performance information for this initiative and ensure that the information needed for good reporting is provided on a timely basis. This should be combined with clarification of the reporting requirements in each MOU signed so that they are more clearly understood by all partners, particularly section 41 coordinators who are new to the role.
4. Partner departments should be encouraged to provide information to PCH on the number of requests received from official language communities and brief details of the requests. This will allow IPOLC staff to better track demand for the program by community organizations. In the future, consideration should be given to including this requirement in the MOUs.
5. The Department of Canadian Heritage should encourage federal departments and agencies to communicate their programs to official language minority communities, particularly those that apply directly to official language minority communities.

H. MANAGEMENT RESPONSE AND ACTION PLAN

Management Response to Recommendation #1

- Canadian Heritage accepts this recommendation. Canadian Heritage will consider

different means to provide more training to and work closely with its regional personnel and the regional personnel of partner departments. As a first step, Canadian Heritage intends to use the new training module it has developed for PCH staff and official-languages coordinators to better equip them to play their role as ambassadors or promoters of IPOLC. This training module provides an overview of the context and support mechanisms in the federal government to assist the official-language communities and includes a section on the IPOLC. To this end, PCH will determine the most effective occasions for offering these training sessions in the different regions of the country.

- PCH will also set up an IPOLC consultative process, which would include regional representatives of Canadian Heritage. This will enable PCH to work more closely with its regional staff and receive regional input on the general direction that the IPOLC initiative is taking and therefore optimize sectoral and regional impacts. Canadian Heritage will also consult with the regional offices to consider how the Federal Councils could be brought to support the initiative in each region. Furthermore, teleconferences between headquarters and the regional offices will be resumed on a regular basis.
- **Timeline:** Implementation over the next year, starting Autumn 2003

Management Response to Recommendation #2

- Canadian Heritage accepts this recommendation partially. The first four MOUs were signed with departments and agencies that were already relatively active with the communities in some areas, and were therefore ready to conclude IPOLC agreements. The subsequent eleven MOU's were signed with federal organizations that had been previously less active with the communities. Canadian Heritage is currently working on establishing relations with other departments to enlarge the array of programs that have a sustainable relationship with the communities.
- However, there could be projects that we may want to support by a Department that previously signed a MOU if that Department is developing a new area of service. At the end of each MOU, an analysis will be done to determine the usefulness or relevance of renewing the agreement with the partnering department. This will take into account such elements as the nature and number of programs involved, the regions served by these agreements and the need for such programs in a given region.
- **Timeline:** Ongoing and as each MOU comes to an end

Management Response to Recommendation #3

- Canadian Heritage accepts this recommendation. The Department intends to

integrate, in its regular IPOLC management process, a letter to the partnering departments, signed by a senior official of PCH, to request the reports required under the MOUs. PCH will also take the opportunity of the regular meetings held with departmental coordinators and line officers to explain the reporting requirements of the MOUs and emphasize the importance of these reports for PCH's own accountability requirements. The existing clause of the MOUs on reporting requirements will be strengthened and made more specific in new or renewed MOUs.

- **Timeline:** Implementation over the next year, starting Autumn 2003

Management Response to Recommendation #4

- Canadian Heritage accepts this recommendation. Canadian Heritage will encourage coordinators to gather information on requests received within their department from official-language communities, whether they are accepted or rejected for funding under the IPOLC, and to provide this information to Canadian Heritage on an annual basis. PCH will consider the possibility of including a clause requesting that information as new MOUs are developed.
- **Timeline:** Implementation over the next year, starting Autumn 2003

Management Response to Recommendation #5

- Canadian Heritage accepts this recommendation. The Department will work with the coordinators and their communication advisors to discuss the use of minority media in federal government communications in order to encourage departments to meet with community groups and to use community media to communicate information on their programs and services. Moreover, PCH will encourage departments to use the 41-42 Bulletin, which has a subscription of 3500, including community associations, to communicate information about their new programs or services.
- **Timeline:** Autumn 2003

I INTRODUCTION

A. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The first *Official Languages Act* came into effect in 1969. Its objective was to protect the language rights of Canadians in their relations with federal institutions and to define the institutions' obligations. The *Act* was amended in 1988 to include, among other things, Part VII, which includes section 41, the provision stating that the federal government is committed to enhancing the vitality of the Anglophone and Francophone minorities in Canada, to supporting and assisting their development, and to fostering full recognition and use of both English and French in our society. This commitment now includes not only access to services for the linguistic minority communities, but also ensures that federal institutions will actively contribute to the development and growth of these communities.

Under section 42 of the *Official Languages Act*, the Department of Canadian Heritage is required to encourage and promote a coordinated approach to the implementation of section 41 of the *Official Languages Act* by federal departments and agencies. The Department of Canadian Heritage is, accordingly, responsible for coordinating the federal government's commitment to helping linguistic minority communities by supporting various groups that work within those communities and by facilitating contributions by other federal departments and agencies to their development.

Although there has been some progress towards achieving the objectives of the *Official Languages Act*, many, including the Commissioner of Official Languages, feel that measures taken by federal departments and agencies have not produced the desired results, particularly in terms of the necessary changes in federal institutions.

B. OBJECTIVES OF IPOLC

The Citizenship and Heritage sector of the Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH) aims to help Canadians to recognize and celebrate their common identity and to enable them to increase their contribution to Canadian society. The Official Languages Support Programs Branch (OLSPB) of PCH, which is part of this sector, is mandated to promote the recognition, learning and use of the two official languages in Canadian society, and to encourage the development of Francophone and Anglophone communities in minority situations in Canada in accordance with sections 41 and 42 of the *Official Languages Act*. In fulfilling its mandate, the OLSPB oversees two main programs: the

Official Languages in Education Program and the Promotion of Official Languages Program. IPOLC falls within the Promotion of Official Languages Program.

IPOLC was implemented in June 2000. The objectives of the initiative³ are to:

- Support activities that contribute to the overall development of the official language minority communities, with a view to the sustainable development and enhanced vitality of the communities.
- Promote access to the programs and services offered by federal organizations, make them better known, and enable the federal government to determine the needs and realities of official language minority communities more effectively. This will enable them to be taken into account when reviewing existing programs and services or in developing new programs and services.
- Have a “lasting change” effect on the organizational culture of the federal and community partners. In this context, “lasting change” is defined as any factor that helps to facilitate the integration of official language minority communities into the regular clientele of federal organizations.
- Function as a financial lever in promoting the creation of sustainable partnerships and new methods of cooperation by effecting long-term change in the organizational culture of the federal and community partners.

C. RATIONALE FOR IPOLC

In his report *Official Language Minority Communities: Promoting a Government Objective*, Donald Savoie (2000) noted that there were few signs the federal government had been able to encourage and promote a coordinated approach to the implementation by federal institutions of the commitments set out in the *Official Languages Act*. In addition, the Commissioner for Official Languages decried the relative lack of progress of federal departments and agencies in meeting their obligations with respect to the *Official Languages Act*, year after year. In her 1999-2000 Annual Report to Parliament, the Commissioner of Official Languages noted the poor performance of the federal government in implementing the *Official Languages Act*. In her report, she called on the federal government to develop and adopt a comprehensive plan to better implement the *Act*. IPOLC provides direction for increased coordination and participation among federal departments and agencies within official language minority communities and so play a role in assisting federal departments and agencies in meeting their obligations with respect to the *Act*.

³ As stated in the Program’s Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework, March 2001

D. POSITIONING OF THE INITIATIVE

Within the Department of Canadian Heritage, four strategic objectives have been adopted to guide the Department's policies and actions. The objectives of IPOLC support one of these four objectives, specifically:

- *Active Citizenship and Civic Participation*: Promote understanding of the rights and responsibilities attached to shared citizenship and foster opportunities to participate in Canada's civic life.

To date, of the 29 targeted departments and agencies, 14 have signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) with the Department of Canadian Heritage. One agency has signed two separate MOUs with the Department of Canadian Heritage, one for the Francophones and one for the Anglophones. Funding available through the initiative is approximately \$5.5 million annually since 1999-2000, allowing for funding that complements other federal contributions designed to promote the development of official language minority communities. However there was some delay in implementing the initiative and the first projects were only approved in January 2001. Therefore, the evaluation has focused on IPOLC funded activities and projects for the period of January 2001 to January 2003. As of January 2003, IPOLC staff reports that a total of 60 federal programs and initiatives have funded projects through IPOLC. Departments and Agencies that have signed MOUs with the Department of Canadian Heritage include:

- The Canada Council for the Arts (2)
- Industry Canada
- Telefilm Canada
- Health Canada
- CBC-Radio Canada
- Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
- Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
- Fisheries and Oceans Canada
- Canada Economic Development – Quebec
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada
- Western Economic Diversification Canada
- National Film Board
- Human Resources Development Canada
- Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Federal departments and agencies work directly with representatives of the minority language communities to develop projects that meet the terms and conditions of their existing grants and contributions programs. Once the projects are defined, the federal partners develop their plans and negotiate funding with the Interdepartmental Coordination Directorate within the Department of Canadian Heritage. This is usually done through the section 41 coordinator of the relevant federal department or agency. Funding provided by the Department of Canadian Heritage serves to leverage additional funding from other departments or agencies that would not otherwise be willing or able to fully finance projects presented by official language minority communities.

Only projects or activities with the explicit support and involvement of federal partners other than the Department of Canadian Heritage as well as the official language communities are eligible for funding under IPOLC. All activities that correspond to the priorities of the official language communities are eligible for funding. In most communities, priorities target activities related to economic development, human resources development, culture, new technologies, and health and social services.

E. ANTICIPATED RESULTS FOR IPOLC

The anticipated short-term results for IPOLC⁴ are:

- Officers in Canadian Heritage regional offices, national and regional coordinators in federal institutions, federal Official Languages Champions and the Federal Council of Senior Federal Officials in the Regions are informed about IPOLC and capable of promoting it.
- Official language minority communities are informed about the IPOLC initiative and are receiving funding through Canadian Heritage federal partners.
- By working in collaboration with official language minority communities on developing activities that can be funded by the IPOLC, federal institutions become more knowledgeable of the needs and realities of the communities.
- The cooperation between Canadian Heritage and the federal institutions encourages the establishment of sustainable partnerships and new modes of cooperation.
- Federal institutions achieve the target results indicated in the Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs).
- Structuring impacts on the organizational culture of the federal partners and communities begin to emerge.

⁴ As stated in the Program's Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework, March 2001

The anticipated long-term results for IPOLC are:

- Changing the organizational culture of federal institutions so that they acquire the habit of doing business with official language communities.
- Adapting federal programs and service delivery models to make them more responsive to the realities of official language communities.
- A more coordinated approach among federal, provincial/territorial, regional and municipal governments and community associations.
- Recognition of the influence of official language communities in the action plans of federal institutions, and in the development of new programs and initiatives or when existing programs are renewed or reviewed.

Finally, for the community organizations, the implementation of IPOLC should contribute to:

- Greater knowledge by official language minority communities of government programs and services.
- A change in the culture of community associations so that they are better equipped to benefit from federal programs.
- Sustainable development of the communities.

F. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation of IPOLC is a formative evaluation. As such, its focus is on the design and implementation of the initiative as well as short-term outcomes that are likely to have been achieved since implementation. As is common with formative evaluations, this one served to verify the initiative’s degree of progress towards achieving the target results and to identify the corrections that may be necessary to maximize the likelihood of its success. Evaluation issues and questions addressed included:

| A. Relevance and Design of the Initiative |
|--|
| 1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the design of IPOLC? In other words, if we were to do it again, what would we do differently? (e.g. objectives of the initiative, expected results, eligibility criteria, authority structure, channels of communication, mode of implementation by federal organizations and community associations)? |
| 2. Are there any elements related to the design of the IPOLC initiative that are detrimental to its success? If so, what are they? |
| 3. Has Canadian Heritage been able to allocate the internal resources required to make IPOLC a success? |

| |
|---|
| B. Relevance of the Implementation of the Initiative |
| 4. Is IPOLC being implemented as planned? If not, why not? |
| 5. Has implementation of IPOLC been delayed by internal or external problems or obstacles? If so, what are they, and have they been resolved? |
| 6. To what extent has implementation of the initiative with the OLMCs, federal institutions and officers in the regional offices been effective in achieving the target results? Are there any alternatives? |
| 7. Are the roles and responsibilities well defined? Appropriately shared? |
| 8. Do the tools/services developed to promote the initiative explain the initiative and the eligibility criteria clearly? |
| 9. Has the initiative been adequately promoted to the partners, OLMCs and regional offices? |
| 10. Are the stakeholders (federal institutions, community associations, personnel, managers of the initiative, regional offices) satisfied with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The administrative procedures leading to funding recommendations? • The time frames for decision-making? • The amounts allocated per project and the related conditions? |
| 11. What are the administrative costs of the initiative? |
| 12. What is the trend in terms of number of inquiries, number of bids received and number of projects funded? |
| C. Probability of the Initiative Producing Results |
| 13. To what extent has there been demonstrable achievement of the results stipulated in the MOUs? |
| 14. To what extent has progress been made in achievement of the short-term and long-term results of the initiative? |
| 15. To what extent are the IPOLC partners prepared to repeat the experience (i.e. sign another MOU when the current MOU expires)? If not willing to repeat the experience – why? |
| 16. Have the initiative’s funds been completely spent for the purposes planned? If not, why? What were the funds spent on instead? |
| 17. Are there any signs that the initiative or the projects it funds might have unintended positive and/or negative effects? If so, what are they? |
| D. Performance Measurement and Reporting |
| 18. What monitoring and control mechanisms have been put in place for ongoing, effective performance measurement? Is performance information collected systematically? |
| 19. Do the existing MOUs comply with the principles of good governance described in chapters 5 (April 1999) and 23 (November 1999) of the Office of the Auditor General of Canada? Do the federal institutions render an account of the results obtained? If they do not, what measures have to be taken to correct the situation? If they do, is the feedback helpful? |

G. METHODOLOGY

This evaluation incorporates information gathered through key informant interviews, document reviews, and program data. Key informant interviews are the primary source of data for this evaluation. A total of 31 interviews were conducted with 41 individuals. Prior to each interview, interviewees were reminded that their comments would be treated as strictly confidential. The breakdown by category of interviewee is as follows:

- Official Language Minority Community organization representatives that have had project funded through IPOLC (13 individuals).
- Section 41 Coordinators from partner departments and agencies (19 individuals).
- Canadian Heritage staff from the regions and National Headquarters (9 individuals).

Key documents reviewed as part of this evaluation include:

- MOUs signed to date.
- Annual reports submitted to IPOLC by partner departments and agencies.
- *Official Language Minority Communities: Promoting a Government Objective*, Donald Savoie, 2000.
- Reports of the Auditor General of Canada, chapter 5 – *Collaborative Arrangements: Issues for the Federal Government* (April 1999) and chapter 23 – *Involving Others in Governing: Accountability at Risk* (November 1999).

II RELEVANCE OF THE DESIGN OF THE INITIATIVE

This section addresses evaluation questions related to the design of IPOLC. The focus is on identifying the strengths and weaknesses as well as possible solutions to the perceived weaknesses, as proposed by interviewees. The evaluation questions addressed here will serve to assist management at the Department of Canadian Heritage in identifying any problems in the design of IPOLC that may hinder its success. Identifying any weaknesses in the design of a program allows for program managers to remedy such weaknesses early in the program's life cycle and increase the likelihood that the program will be successful in meeting its long-term objectives.

A. PERCEIVED STRENGTHS OF IPOLC

Interviewees generally agreed that one of the principal strengths of IPOLC was that it facilitated official language communities and federal departments and agencies working together. Some section 41 coordinators commented that their department or agency had previously had little awareness of the needs or existence of official language minority communities and that IPOLC was instrumental in bridging that gap. In some cases, it was the official language minority community itself that approached federal departments or agencies with specific needs or projects, reflecting the development priorities of the community. This was particularly true in Quebec, where the community developed a set of development priorities and then approached the specific federal departments and agencies that could provide assistance in meeting these development priorities. In fact, Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) was one of the departments that the Anglophone community in Quebec approached with specific needs. The DFO is an operational department that does not have programs or project funding. However, IPOLC allowed the section 41 coordinator at DFO to leverage funding within the department to implement a number of projects in Quebec. In this sense, IPOLC has clearly served to help bridge the gap between official language communities and federal departments and agencies and has facilitated the involvement of federal departments and agencies, in the official language minority communities.

There was some disagreement on whether the funding criteria were too flexible or not sufficiently flexible. The Department of Canadian Heritage, after receiving project proposals approved by partner departments and agencies, assesses requests for IPOLC funding based on the following criteria:

- The activity must address a community priority.
- The activity must fall within the other departments' mandates.

- The activity must have a long-term or structuring effect.
- The activity must not have been planned to be funded by the other department without IPOLC.
- If the activity is a new component to an existing activity, the added value of the new component must be clear.

Notably, it is the program or funding criteria of partner departments and agencies that determine whether the request for funding is submitted to IPOLC. Community organizations first submit their funding request to the partner department, where the request is assessed for eligibility for funding based on the partner department's internal criteria. If the proposed project is deemed eligible for funding by the partner department, the request is then sent on to IPOLC. PCH staff involved in designing IPOLC noted that the funding criteria were designed to be as flexible as possible so that other departments' programs easily fit within IPOLC. Some section 41 coordinators commented that this was one of the strengths of IPOLC – allowing an easy fit for projects that meet their department's criteria and those of IPOLC.

Where interviewees stood on this debate was determined by whether they represented the community or a federal department or agency. Of those that believe that the criteria for IPOLC are not flexible enough, the vast majority represented official language minority communities who believe that the initiative's criteria prevent good projects from being funded. Those who feel the funding criteria are too flexible and need to be tightened are generally section 41 coordinators. This group feels that the flexibility of the funding criteria allows for a grey area that opens the door to decisions that appear politically motivated or lacking in objectivity. However, we note that requests for funding are sent to IPOLC for assessment against IPOLC funding criteria only *after* the project has been approved for funding by the partner department or agency. So it is difficult to see how funding decisions made by IPOLC could be seen to be politically motivated since IPOLC partner departments and agencies at the first instance, make funding decisions.

B. PERCEIVED WEAKNESSES OF IPOLC

The most frequently mentioned comment about IPOLC's design was the centralized nature of the management of the initiative. Regional PCH staff and community organizations felt excluded from the process, and complained that IPOLC staff at the Department of Canadian Heritage does not communicate sufficient details about the initiative to them. Some interviewees suggested that management of the initiative should be decentralized and each region be allocated a funding envelope.

Some section 41 coordinators noted that the management of the initiative is centralized

in their departments as well, either because they do not have a presence in the regions or because regional staff is too busy with other responsibilities to administer IPOLC. For example, the management of IPOLC at Human Resources Development Canada is centralized in the National Capital Region. These departments, with a centralized management structure, as well as others, have generally not decentralized the management of IPOLC because it represents a relatively small amount of money and it is not cost effective to set up a regionalized management structure.

IPOLC is designed to be managed more centrally than most Department of Canadian Heritage programs, because the amount of funding available is relatively small and so not easily split into regional envelopes. Decentralizing the management and funding of IPOLC could result in increased management costs related to IPOLC. In particular, additional staff in the regions might be required to manage the initiative.

There are inherent difficulties in attempting to split annual funding of \$5.5 million into regional envelopes, while ensuring that funding is spent on eligible projects. This would raise questions about how to split the funding – on a per capita basis, based on historical demand? In fact, the option of regional envelopes was suggested early in the development of IPOLC and rejected because of the difficulties associated with attempting to split a relatively small amount of funding amongst the five operational regions in the Department of Canadian Heritage.

The most frequent suggestion for overcoming problems associated with the centralized nature of IPOLC management was that management should be expanded to include more input and participation by regional staff and communities. Some community representatives would like to be consulted more on how funds are spent in the communities. Interviewees also noted that there is a need for increased communication between PCH national headquarters and regional staff and communities.

A number of interviewees from partner departments and agencies (section 41 coordinators) and official language minority communities believe that the reporting requirements of IPOLC are onerous, a situation they blame on PCH. Due diligence, however, requires reporting on results and accountability for funds spent, regardless of department. There appears to be a misperception on the part of official language community organizations that it is only the Department of Canadian Heritage that requires reports on projects funded through IPOLC. If partner departments and agencies are exercising due diligence, then they should be requiring reports from community organizations similar to those requested by the PCH.

Managers at PCH feel they are simply requesting copies of reports that partner departments and agencies should be requiring of community organizations for own reporting obligations. In addition, some section 41 coordinators commented that there is a lack of clear direction from the Department of Canadian Heritage on the accountability requirements. A review of the Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) found that the reporting requirements are clearly noted in all MOUs. As well, templates are provided to all departments and agencies for project descriptions, interim and final reports (Appendix B).

A number of interviewees suggested changes that they feel would simplify management of the initiative. Suggestions included delegating signing authority for project funding to a level lower than Deputy Minister or equivalent, and simplifying the management and reporting requirements to the extent possible. We note that changes in signing authority are up to individual departments and not within the powers of PCH to change.

Some section 41 coordinators noted that it is sometimes difficult to meld their department's procedures with those of the Department of Canadian Heritage, making the management of IPOLC more difficult in some departments and agencies than others. This is a challenge specific to interdepartmental programs or initiatives noted by the Office of the Auditor General. Based on a review of the MOUs signed between partner departments and agencies and the Department of Canadian Heritage, the recommendations of the Auditor General with respect to mitigating the difficulties of two or more departments working together have been incorporated into the MOUs. The MOUs signed to date are briefly analyzed against the recommendations of the Auditor General in chapter V of this report.

Another reason why the management of IPOLC may be seen as particularly time consuming or onerous is the need to have funding for the projects approved by a Deputy Minister or equivalent at the partner department as well as at the Department of Canadian Heritage. It is not unusual for departments to require ministerial approval for spending on projects. IPOLC is an interdepartmental initiative and so requires the approval of the Deputy Minister or equivalent of each department or agency involved. The greater the number of signatures involved, the slower the process is likely to be. In our view, there is little to be done about the delays associated with multiple approvals, the inevitable by-product of interdepartmental initiatives such as IPOLC, which should be managed with the same level of diligence as similar programs or initiatives. We note that we did not find evidence that funding delays in IPOLC are greater than those of other funding programs.

Section 41 coordinators expressed frustration over the timing of funding transfers. The Department of Canadian Heritage is able to transfer funds to partner departments and agencies in January and September of each fiscal year. This is part of a federal government-wide funding transfer process and so is impossible for PCH to modify. However, we note that partner departments and agencies are able to provide funding for projects to community organizations prior to the January/September funding transfers through cash management once projects are approved. This should be done to prevent delays in project implementation.

Some interviewees feel that there is a lack of communication tools to explain IPOLC to partners and community organizations. The suggested solution to this perceived limitation is to improve existing communication tools. In fact, IPOLC staff is planning a series of presentations in cities across Canada in the coming months and this activity should respond to this concern.

C. ADEQUACY OF RESOURCES

The Department of Canadian Heritage staff interviewed, as part of the evaluation generally feel that an adequate level of internal resources has been allocated to the initiative. IPOLC staff at national headquarters can call upon staff from other programs to assist them if necessary. Regional staff is involved in a number of Department of Canadian Heritage programs as well as IPOLC.

D. CONCLUSIONS

Interviewees identified the principal strength in the design of IPOLC as its ability to facilitate official language communities working with federal departments and agencies. This is precisely the rationale for IPOLC – what it is intended to do. In some communities, IPOLC has enabled the community to identify its needs to federal departments and agencies.

The identified weaknesses of IPOLC that may prevent the initiative's success include:

- The initiative's design does not facilitate participation and communication to the regions within PCH and partner departments.
- The requirement for Deputy Ministers or equivalent from all departments or agencies to sign the Funding Agreement of an IPOLC project is believed to result in delays in funds reaching community organizations.
- There have been difficulties with some departments and agencies meeting their MOU-stipulated reporting requirements in a timely manner.

The Department of Canadian Heritage is not in a position to change the signing authority in partner departments and agencies; this is up to individual Deputy Ministers or equivalent to decide. Further, the transfer of funding from one department to another is also not within the power of the Department of Canadian Heritage to change. However, individual departments may decide to advance funding to community organizations in advance of the funding transfers so as not to delay the implementation of projects. Again, this is a decision for individual partner departments and agencies to make.

Section 41 coordinators and community organizations need to be reminded more frequently of the reporting requirements and the eligibility criteria for IPOLC. Despite the fact that every MOU stipulates the frequency of reporting, many section 41 coordinators were confused as to what was expected by PCH in terms of reporting and with what frequency.

III RELEVANCE OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INITIATIVE

This section addresses evaluation questions related to the implementation of IPOLC, including the roles and responsibilities of partners as well as the adequacy of promotional tools and activities.

A. VARIATIONS IN IMPLEMENTATION

Interviewees reported that there are variations in the effectiveness of implementation of IPOLC in the regions. It was felt that implementation has been particularly successful in the Ontario, Quebec and Atlantic Regions. Program data on the number of projects funded, by region, supports this view. To date, a total of 185 activities and projects have been funded under IPOLC. Official language communities vary greatly in terms of size, concentration, cohesiveness and level of ability to access the necessary resources to develop project proposals. Large and active communities, such as those found in Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick, are more likely to present projects for funding to IPOLC. As well, the lion's share of projects funded related to economic development and human resources development. Interviewees generally believe that difficulties in implementation are the result of poor communications and the centralized management of the initiative. Others blame the lack of successful implementation on the lack of inclusion and communication with regional PCH staff or the communities themselves.

It was noted by some interviewees that implementation worked well in those regions where key federal departments already had established contact with the communities. For example, there were a number of projects implemented in the economic development and human resources development sectors largely because of the historical involvement of Human Resources Development Canada, Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Canada Economic Development for Quebec regions and Western Economic Development Canada in the official language minority communities. However, it should be noted that this goes against the spirit of IPOLC, in that it is intended to foster new relationships.

Some regional PCH staff feel that some of their federal partners in the regions have been unable to adequately foster or build relationships with these communities because the individuals did not speak the minority official language. Although it is outside of the powers of the Department of Canadian Heritage to change this, departments and agencies should ensure that those who are intended to serve the interests of the official language minority communities, section 41 coordinators, are able to communicate in the official language of the minority community.

B. TRENDS IN THE NUMBER OF REQUESTS

Departments do not provide information on the number of proposals received to PCH. As noted elsewhere in this report, official language minority community organizations submit requests for funding directly to partner departments and agencies. If the IPOLC partner department approves the request for funding based on that department or agency's criteria, the request is then forwarded to IPOLC for assessment based on IPOLC criteria.

Because of the lack of information on the number of requests received versus the number of requests accepted and rejected, the Department of Canadian Heritage cannot adequately gauge the level of demand, the overall quality of requests or the regions from which most requests come.

C. DELAYS IN IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation of IPOLC was delayed for approximately 18 months after it was initially announced in 1999. The new Deputy Minister of PCH wanted to be certain that the design for IPOLC was workable. The initial design for IPOLC called for communities to make two separate applications for funding, one to the Department of Canadian Heritage and another to the partner department or agency. The Deputy Minister pointed out that this was unlikely to be workable and suggested a funding transfer instead. This alternative approach was felt to be more effective in that it eliminated the need for duplicate applications and put full responsibility for managing the funding process on the partner departments and agencies.

Some section 41 coordinators reported that their departments and agencies experienced difficulties in finding projects that could be funded through IPOLC, which hindered the implementation of the initiative. Some departments and agencies actively sought out projects or assisted communities in developing projects that could be funded through IPOLC. Some communities approached federal departments and agencies with specific needs or projects.

D. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Community representatives interviewed generally feel that the communities' role is insufficient in that communities are not consulted on IPOLC or similar initiatives that impact them. However, projects are submitted by community groups. Nevertheless, the majority of community representatives reported that the relationship between their community and the federal departments and agencies with whom they had worked was generally positive. Community representatives in the Atlantic region appeared to be

much less satisfied with their relationship with federal departments and agencies. Community representatives generally feel that they should have a bigger role in the program development. According to PCH staff, community organizations, particularly at the national level, were consulted as part of the process of designing IPOLC. The risk with an expanded role for communities at the regional level is that an additional level of management and consultation, and its accompanied financial costs, will result in funds being shifted from grassroots community organizations to representative organizations in the regions.

The majority of PCH staff feel that the Department's relationship with partner departments and agencies is positive. Regional PCH staff tended to express some frustration over the lack of involvement of other departments and agencies that are not yet participating to IPOLC, the lack of information from PCH national headquarters, and the centralized nature of the management of the initiative. Regional Canadian Heritage staff also noted that partner departments and agencies do not always do a good job of ensuring that knowledge is transferred to new employees. This was echoed by a small number of section 41 coordinators interviewed, who recognized that their department or agency does not always do a good job of transferring knowledge about IPOLC to in-coming section 41 coordinators.

E. PERCEIVED ADEQUACY OF PROMOTIONAL TOOLS AND ACTIVITIES

There appears to be an understanding of IPOLC's criteria, although no interviewees from federal departments and agencies were able to list the criteria for funding. Section 41 coordinators from partner departments and agencies interviewed noted that the challenge for them was to match their department's funding criteria with that of IPOLC. Each project funded through IPOLC is subject to two sets of funding criteria. Project proposals are assessed first by the partner department or agency against the department's funding criteria. If the project proposal meets the funding criteria of the partner department or agency, it is then sent to IPOLC for consideration. Section 41 coordinators generally assess whether the project is likely to fit within IPOLC's criteria before officially sending the project to IPOLC.

Community organizations indicated that there was a lack of information available to them about IPOLC and the funding criteria, even though these are all on PCH Web site, which includes Fact sheets, IPOLC Guidelines and Frequently Asked Questions (Appendix C). In many cases, the community organizations representatives interviewed were not clear about what the eligibility criteria were, even the organizations that had received funding through IPOLC. We should note that the organization representatives we interviewed might not have been the same person who prepared the project proposal.

Regional PCH staff was in agreement that IPOLC has not been adequately promoted to partners and official language minority communities. Department of Canadian Heritage national headquarters staff as well as some regional staff, and community organizations, noted that one must keep in mind IPOLC is relatively small in terms of the amount of funding available (\$5.5 million per year) and that promotional activities should correspond to this and be appropriately strategic.

Section 41 coordinators were split on whether PCH promotional activities for IPOLC were sufficient. Some noted that partner departments and agencies also have an important role to play in promoting IPOLC to the communities.

There was general agreement on the part of all categories of interviewees that more work needs to be done in the regions to communicate with partner departments and agencies and communities. It was agreed that regional PCH staff is in the best position to do this effectively and strategically, since they are most familiar with the communities.

F. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS TO PARTNER DEPARTMENTS

Some partner departments and agencies report that the level of effort required to administer each funding agreement with IPOLC sometimes exceeds, in terms of dollar value, the amount of funding provided to the community organization for their project. Other than the opinions of section 41 coordinators, there is no way to verify or refute this claim. Section 41 coordinators indicated that they continue to seek IPOLC funding because of the positive benefits to the communities. The administrative requirements for IPOLC relate to the Department of Canadian Heritage as well as the partner departments and agencies.

Almost unanimously, partner departments and community organizations expressed appreciation for the funding provided through IPOLC. Community organizations were pleased to have received funding for their projects even though in some cases the amount of funding received fell short of needs or expectations. In addition, community organizations expressed appreciation over the involvement of federal departments and agencies in their communities.

G. CONCLUSIONS

There are significant variations in the effectiveness of the implementation of IPOLC across regions and departments, as reported by interviewees. This is also evidenced in the number of IPOLC projects funded by region, with the Quebec, Ontario and Atlantic regions having received the largest number of projects. However, these are also the

regions with the largest populations of official language minority communities as well as the most developed communities in terms of their ability to develop project proposals.

The limited information available to IPOLC staff about the number of requests made to partner departments for IPOLC funding, including the number of requests rejected, limits the ability of IPOLC staff to assess the adequacy of the IPOLC funding envelope.

The majority of the Department of Canadian Heritage staff indicated that the initiative was too centralized. As a result, regional PCH staff feel ill equipped to provide sufficient advice and information to community organizations in their regions. Implementation of IPOLC could be improved through increased communication with regional staff. Regional staff would then be in a better position to network and provide details on the initiative to community organizations and partner departments and agencies. However, some regional staff are already closely involved with regional departments and agencies under IPOLC.

Communities are generally very happy with the initiative, largely because it represents an additional source of funding to the community and because it indicates an interest on the part of federal departments and agencies in becoming more involved in the communities.

IV PROBABILITY OF PRODUCING RESULTS

This section provides an assessment of the results achieved to date by IPOLC as well as the likelihood of IPOLC achieving its objectives and attaining the results described in the 15 MOUs signed to date.

A. ACHIEVEMENT OF RESULTS IN MOUs

In general, all categories of interviewees believe that activities are being carried out as stipulated in the MOUs and are logically linked to meeting the MOUs' objectives. Appendix D summarizes the results sought for each of the 15 MOUs reviewed as part of this evaluation. Some interviewees noted that the objectives in the MOUs are long-term and some, but not much, progress has been made in achieving these, since many departments have only recently signed MOUs and begun funding projects through IPOLC. Notably, some section 41 coordinators remarked that their departments had been working towards the objectives in the MOU all along. Thus one must question whether the decision to sign an MOU with these departments was strategic on the part of PCH.

Despite agreeing that the projects funded through IPOLC support the objectives of the MOUs, some PCH staff expressed concerns that funding wasn't necessarily strategic, in that projects funded were not always engendering long-term change in the relationship between official language minority communities and federal departments and agencies. Some interviewees questioned whether federal departments and agencies would continue their involvement with official language communities after the MOUs expire.

Interviewees, for the most part, feel that the expected results of the MOUs are being achieved, albeit slowly. However, most agree that the results are difficult to measure because they are of a qualitative nature.

B. ACHIEVEMENT OF SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM IPOLC RESULTS

All categories of interviewees feel that there has been progress made in the achievement of short-term results for IPOLC. However, few were able to cite concrete examples or data to support this view. Regional PCH staff feel that the implementation of IPOLC in the regions has not been effective enough to achieve the objectives of the initiative. They feel that more inclusion of regional staff is needed so that they are better able to

serve as a bridge between official language minority communities and federal departments and agencies.

In fact, the main achievement of IPOLC to date, according to interviewees, is that it has served to change the mindset of many federal departments and agencies relative to official language minorities. As a result, there are closer ties between official language minorities and federal departments and agencies. In fact, a number of section 41 coordinators commented on the positive press received by their departments and agencies as a result of projects implemented under IPOLC in the official language minority communities.

Overall, interviewees feel little progress has been made towards the achievement of most of the long-term objectives of the initiative, which is understandable in light of the relatively brief period covered by this evaluation. However, section 41 coordinators interviewed were somewhat more positive than other categories of interviewees. Section 41 coordinators often noted that their department had been working towards these objectives before IPOLC.

There is a general sense that some departments and agencies are more involved in and knowledgeable about official language minority communities than before IPOLC, and that communities and federal departments and agencies are working more closely. Some feel there is the beginning of cultural change within some federal departments in their recognition of the value of official language minority communities. This is in fact one of the long-term objectives of IPOLC.

C. INTERVIEWEES SUGGESTIONS FOR OTHER MEANS TO OBTAIN RESULTS

Interviewees were asked whether they believed that the expected results for IPOLC could better be achieved through other means. The majority feels that IPOLC is the best vehicle for achieving the expected results.

A number of interviewees suggested that the initiative should be linked to regional official language sub-committees of the Federal Council of senior federal officials. Each region has a section 41 and 42 committee that includes representatives from federal departments and agencies. According to interviewees there is currently no collaboration between these regional committees and IPOLC. These interviewees feel that a more coordinated approach is necessary.

Some interviewees suggested that an initiative such as IPOLC should not be required. Departments and agencies are required to meet their obligations under section 41 of the *Official Languages Act* and should be forced to do so. It should be noted that IPOLC is

not intended to absolve federal departments and agencies of their obligations, but rather to encourage them to meet their obligations to official language minority communities.

D. UNINTENDED IMPACTS

A number of positive and negative unanticipated impacts were identified. On the positive side, there is evidence that federal departments and agencies are implementing projects with communities without the involvement of IPOLC. Some interviewees indicated that their department or agency has worked with the official language minority community on subsequent projects without the involvement of IPOLC. Again, this is an indication that some progress towards the long-term objectives of IPOLC is being made. However, some partner departments and agencies indicated that they had been involved in official language minority communities prior to IPOLC and that IPOLC has changed little in their dealings with official language communities. As a result, one must question whether the signing of an MOU with these departments and agencies was a strategic use of IPOLC funds.

According to staff and managers at PCH, the number of MOUs signed exceeds the number they anticipated. We note that this may lead to an unintended impact in that the \$5.5 million in funding available annually through IPOLC will have to be shared amongst 15 partner departments and agencies. This could be minimized if IPOLC signs MOUs with federal departments and agencies that have had little involvement with official language communities.

Section 41 coordinators indicated that, in some cases, their department had benefited from positive public relations as a result of their involvement in IPOLC and funding projects in the official language minority communities. This may provide additional encouragement to departments and agencies to continue their involvement with official language minority communities after their MOU with IPOLC expires. However, some section 41 coordinators believe that their departments and agencies have suffered negative publicity because of the administrative burden of IPOLC. As noted elsewhere in this report, there are no indications that IPOLC requires more in terms of administration or paperwork than other programs that provide funding. Some additional administration may be required due to the interdepartmental nature of IPOLC, but this should not impact community organizations that are required to submit reports to the IPOLC partner department who then forwards the reports to IPOLC staff at PCH. Some departments and agencies require quarterly reports from community organizations however; PCH does not require this for IPOLC.

IPOLC staff have found that they have become much more familiar with the federal programs and initiatives of the federal departments and agencies.

On the negative side, some believe that IPOLC is creating a dependency on matching funding available through IPOLC on the part of some departments and agencies. The Department of Canadian Heritage has indicated that IPOLC is not a permanent initiative and it provides complementary funding to other federal contributions to federal departments and agencies in meeting their obligations under the *Official Languages Act*. However, some partner departments and agencies continue to see IPOLC as permanent. Some also believe that similar expectations are being raised on the part of official language communities, who also tend to see the initiative as permanent. As noted in the Donald Savoie (2000) report, the federal funding is limited yet the needs of official language minority communities are unlimited.

The Department of Canadian Heritage staff, particularly those at national headquarters, are slowly realizing that it may be more difficult to change the culture of some federal departments and agencies than they had anticipated. These staff note that in the case of some departments and agencies, the existing culture of ignoring obligations with regard to official language minority communities is so ingrained that it will take much longer than the three-year period of most MOUs. This is also evidenced in reports of the Commissioner for Official Languages, who continues to find evidence that federal departments and agencies are not meeting their obligations with respect to official language minority communities.

E. WILLINGNESS TO CONTINUE INVOLVEMENT WITH IPOLC

All representatives of official language minority communities interviewed would be willing to implement another project through IPOLC. Most are enthusiastic about their involvement with IPOLC. Community representatives appreciate the additional source of funding presented by IPOLC. They also approve of the efforts of federal departments and agencies to get involved in official language communities.

The majority of section 41 coordinators indicated that their departments and agencies would be willing to sign another MOU. This is despite the expressed view that the amount of money available through IPOLC is very small relative to the amount of work involved in managing the initiative. Many indicated that they continue to seek funding through IPOLC, despite the level effort required, because it benefits the official language minority community. In fact, some feel that the three-year period for their MOU is insufficient and would like to see at least one more MOU signed by the Department of Canadian Heritage and their department or agency.

F. CONCLUSIONS

There is general agreement among interviewees that after two years of operation, progress has been made towards the short-term results of the initiative, particularly with respect to increased awareness on the part of federal departments and agencies of official language minority communities and their needs. However, interviewees feel it is too soon to expect much progress with respect to the long-term results. An indication of the long-term results being met will be the extent to which federal departments and agencies continue their work in official language minority communities after their MOUs have expired.

There is a general agreement that these results are difficult to measure because they are of a qualitative nature. For example, cultural change in partner department and agencies is somewhat difficult to quantify. There is a need to have more quantitative evidence that goes beyond the number of MOUs signed and the number of projects funded.

Some departments and agencies report that they were involved in official language minority communities prior to IPOLC and that IPOLC has changed little in their relationship with the communities. As a result, one must question whether the signing of an MOU with these departments and agencies was a strategic use of IPOLC funds.

Overall, satisfaction with IPOLC is very high despite some of the problems identified by interviewees. The vast majority of community organizations interviewed are willing to undertake another project funded through IPOLC. Similarly, most departments and agencies interviewed expressed interest in renewing their MOUs once they expire. This is despite what some feel to be the onerous administrative requirements of IPOLC.

V PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND REPORTING

Federal departments and agencies are required to monitor and report on programs. This chapter provides an assessment of the performance measurement and reporting on IPOLC by PCH and partner departments and agencies.

A. MONITORING AND REPORTING SYSTEMS IN PLACE

In general, official language minority community organizations submit a final report and evaluation of the project funded through IPOLC to the partner department or agency. In some cases, at the request of the partnering department or agency, reports must be sent at fixed points in the year (quarterly). Reports are intended to fulfill the requirements of the partner department or agency, not those of the Department of Canadian Heritage. The Department of Canadian Heritage requires reports and every MOU clearly states that “the (partner department or agency) agrees to provide Canadian Heritage an annual summary of activities undertaken and short-term results obtained.” IPOLC staff report tremendous difficulties in obtaining these reports from a number of partner departments and agencies. Reports are often received late or not at all. In some cases, partner departments and agencies report on results more frequently than what is required in the MOU.

The Department of Canadian Heritage is thus entirely dependent on partner departments and agencies for meeting its own reporting requirements. Without the necessary reports, PCH cannot always conduct its own monitoring and performance measurement for IPOLC.

Some section 41 coordinators reported that their department or agency does not spend significant resources on measuring or monitoring performance for IPOLC, because IPOLC represents a very small amount of money and extensive reporting cannot be justified from a resource perspective. However, this should not prevent departments and agencies from meeting their obligations in their MOUs and providing the required reports to PCH in a timely manner. There appears to be a misunderstanding about the level of complexity of reporting required where some section 41 coordinators interpret the reports to be much more complex than required by IPOLC. Section 41 coordinators report that projects are assessed on their own and results are not aggregated. There are generally different performance indicators for each project.

Although, each department is required to evaluate its performance with respect to sections 41 and 42, internal reporting on IPOLC on the part of partner departments and agencies is minimal. Most partner departments and agencies mention IPOLC in their

Annual Performance Reports or in reports related to section 41 and 42, however, this is usually limited to a paragraph. This is not surprising since IPOLC funding represents a very small proportion, less than 1%, of total departmental spending for partner departments and agencies.

B. FIT WITH OAG PRINCIPLES

The Office of the Auditor General of Canada notes that effective accountability is more complex in a collaborative arrangement such as IPOLC. This is borne out in IPOLC, where there remains some lack of clarity and understanding, as well as willingness on the part of partner departments and agencies, with regard to the reporting of results in spite of the reporting templates provided by IPOLC staff. Based on comments from interviewees, much of these problems, stem from a lack of understanding of what is expected. There is also the concern that reporting requirements exceed the perceived value of IPOLC funding received by the partner departments and agencies. As noted elsewhere in this report, this is false: all departments should be in a position to account for funding provided to organizations. Partner departments and agencies are providing at least 50% of project funding and so they should require reports from funded organizations. If not, they are not acting with due diligence with respect to funding.

The OAG has suggested a number of guidelines for assessing collaborative arrangements. Our assessment is based on chapter 5 – *Collaborative Arrangements: Issues for the Federal Government* (April 1999) and chapter 23 *Involving Others in Governing: Accountability at Risk* (November 1999). The results of our brief analysis, much of which has been addressed in previous sections of this report, are summarized in Exhibit V-1.

Exhibit V-1 Summary of Analysis Results

| 1. Serving the Public | |
|---|---|
| Are the objectives being met? | In general, interviewees believe the short-term objectives of IPOLC and the MOUs are being met. However, due to the largely qualitative nature of the expected results, there is a lack of quantitative evidence to support this at this time. |
| Is the collaborative arrangement the best way to do it? | Results from this study strongly indicate that, given the current level of involvement of federal departments and agencies in official language communities, a collaborative arrangement such as IPOLC is likely the best means to increase the level of compliance of <i>some</i> federal departments and agencies with respect to the <i>Official Languages Act</i> . |
| Is serving the public interest being given appropriate emphasis? | IPOLC is serving the public interest. |
| Are public service values being | There are indications that public service values are being maintained. |

| | |
|--|---|
| maintained? | |
| 2. Effective Accountability Arrangements | |
| Are the objectives, the expected level of performance and results and the operating conditions agreed to and clear? | The MOUs contain provisions on the reporting requirements. However, there is still confusion as to what was expected by PCH in terms of reporting and with what frequency. There is some clarification required of the operating conditions in particular with respect to the reporting requirements so that they are more clearly understood by partners. |
| Are the authorities, roles and responsibilities of each partner clear? | The roles of regional staff, both within the Department of Canadian Heritage and partner departments and agencies, needs to be better communicated |
| Are the expectations for each partner balanced with its capacities? | There is no indication that partners cannot meet their obligations. However, there is some indication that management of IPOLC in partner departments and agencies requires additional resources. In fact, the lack of resources devoted to managing departmental obligations with respect to official language communities may be seen as an indication of a general lack of commitment of federal departments and agencies to meeting their obligations with respect to the <i>Official Languages Act</i> . It should not be the responsibility of the Department of Canadian Heritage to provide the resources required, since it is required that partner departments and agencies meet their obligations with respect to official language minority communities. |
| Can performance be measured and credibly reported to Parliament and the public? | There are indications that partner departments and agencies are not reporting on results in a consistent and timely manner. Consequently, IPOLC staff cannot always adequately monitor its own performance for IPOLC. MOUs should be more explicit about the reporting requirements. |
| Has adequate provision been made for review, program evaluation and audit? | The Department of Canadian Heritage has prepared a Results and Management Accountability Framework (RMAF) for the initiative. The Department has also conducted this formative evaluation of IPOLC after two years of operation. |
| 3. Greater Transparency | |
| Have the information needs of those affected been recognized? | The MOUs recognize the information needs of the partners. IPOLC provides information on results to the official language minority communities; as well, information on the initiative and results is available on the Department of Canadian Heritage web-site. |
| Is appropriate and sufficient information being disclosed to Parliament and the public? | Even though reporting on final results on the part of federal partners is not consistent and timely, the Department of Canadian Heritage is able to report on the nature of the projects, their funding, their numbers, the programs involved and the community partners. |

C. CONCLUSIONS

In general, reporting by partner departments and agencies is inconsistent, with some departments reporting regularly and others late or not at all. The Department of Canadian Heritage is dependent on how much it can report by whether partner departments and agencies submit information in a timely and consistent manner.

VI RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations in this section flow directly from the data and analysis in the preceding chapters.

1. The Department of Canadian Heritage should continue to administer IPOLC centrally. However, IPOLC management should provide more training to and work closely with regional PCH staff and, where appropriate, regional staff of other departments and agencies to ensure that they can act as ambassadors for and promoters of the IPOLC in their contacts with the official language communities.

Management Response:

- Canadian Heritage accepts this recommendation. Canadian Heritage will consider different means to provide more training to and work closely with its regional personnel and the regional personnel of partner departments. As a first step, Canadian Heritage intends to use the new training module it has developed for PCH staff and official-languages coordinators to better equip them to play their role as ambassadors or promoters of IPOLC. This training module provides an overview of the context and support mechanisms in the federal government to assist the official-language communities and includes a section on the IPOLC. To this end, PCH will determine the most effective occasions for offering these training sessions in the different regions of the country.
 - PCH will also set up an IPOLC consultative process, which would include regional representatives of Canadian Heritage. This will enable PCH to work more closely with its regional staff and receive regional input on the general direction that the IPOLC initiative is taking and therefore optimize sectoral and regional impacts. Canadian Heritage will also consult with the regional offices to consider how the Federal Councils could be brought to support the initiative in each region. Furthermore, teleconferences between headquarters and the regional offices will be resumed on a regular basis.
 - **Timeline:** Implementation over the next year, starting Autumn 2003.
2. As intended by the IPOLC criteria, the Department of Canadian Heritage should be more strategic in the MOUs it signs. IPOLC should be focussed on federal departments and agencies that have had little involvement with official language communities historically and with which the communities are interested in working rather than on departments and agencies that have been actively involved for some time.

Management Response:

- Canadian Heritage accepts this recommendation partially. The first four MOUs were signed with departments and agencies that were already relatively active with the communities in some areas, and were therefore ready to conclude IPOLC agreements. The subsequent eleven MOU's were signed with federal organizations that had been previously less active with the communities. Canadian Heritage is currently working on establishing relations with other departments to enlarge the array of programs that have a sustainable relationship with the communities.
 - However, there could be projects that we may want to support by a Department that previously signed a MOU if that Department is developing a new area of service. At the end of each MOU, an analysis will be done to determine the usefulness or relevance of renewing the agreement with the partnering department. This will take into account such elements as the nature and number of programs involved, the regions served by these agreements and the need for such programs in a given region.
 - **Timeline:** Ongoing and as each MOU comes to an end
3. The Department of Canadian Heritage should ensure appropriate accountability reporting by funding recipients, in keeping with the terms and conditions in MOUs. This reporting will improve the systematic collection of performance information for this initiative and ensure that the information needed for good reporting is provided on a timely basis. This should be combined with clarification of the reporting requirements in each MOU signed so that they are better understood by all partners, particularly section 41 coordinators who are new to the role.

Management Response:

- Canadian Heritage accepts this recommendation. The Department intends to integrate, in its regular IPOLC management process, a letter to the partnering departments, signed by a senior official of PCH, to request the reports required under the MOUs. PCH will also take the opportunity of the regular meetings held with departmental coordinators and line officers to explain the reporting requirements of the MOUs and emphasize the importance of these reports for PCH's own accountability requirements. The existing clause of the MOUs on reporting requirements will be strengthened and made more specific in new or renewed MOUs.
- **Timeline:** Implementation over the next year, starting Autumn 2003

4. Partner departments should be encouraged to provide information to PCH on the number of requests received from official-language communities and brief details of the requests. This will allow IPOLC staff to better track demand for the program by community organizations. In the future, consideration should be given to including this requirement in the MOUs.

Management Response:

- Canadian Heritage accepts this recommendation. Canadian Heritage will encourage coordinators to gather information on requests received within their department from official-language communities, whether they are accepted or rejected for funding under the IPOLC, and to provide this information to Canadian Heritage on an annual basis. PCH will consider the possibility of including a clause requesting that information as new MOUs are developed.
- **Timeline:** Implementation over the next year, starting Autumn 2003

5. The Department of Canadian Heritage should encourage federal departments and agencies to communicate their programs to official language minority communities, particularly those that apply directly to official language minority communities.

Management Response:

- Canadian Heritage accepts this recommendation. The Department will work with the coordinators and their communication advisors to discuss the use of minority media in federal government communications in order to encourage departments to meet with community groups and to use community media to communicate information on their programs and services. Moreover, PCH will encourage departments to use the 41-42 Bulletin, which has a subscription of 3500, including community associations, to communicate information about their new programs or services.
- **Timeline:** Autumn 2003

Appendix A

List of Interviewees and Interview Protocols

Program Staff

Hilaire Lemoine
Director General – Official Languages Support Programs

Pierre Goulet
A/Director, Interdepartmental Coordination

Nicky Norris
Senior Analyst, IPOLC

Beverly Caplan
Senior Advisor, Official Languages

Sylvie Bergeron
Program Manager, Canadian Identity

Hélène Cormier
Director - Policy

Sheila MacDonald
Manager, Policy Research and Governmental Initiative

Lucie LeBouthillier
Manager, Canadian Identity

Diane Leclercq
A/Operations Manager

Diane Dorge
Program Officer, Official Languages

Mirande Alexandre
Coordinator, Grants & Contribution

Section 41 Coordinators

Canada Council for the Arts

Katherine Berg
André Courchène

CBC/Radio Canada

Hélène Gendron

Citizen and Immigration Canada

Lyne Deschênes
Micheline Doiron

Economic Development Agency for the Region of Quebec
Yves Lavoie

Telefilm Canada
Anne Chantal Roy
Ginette Pépin
Jean-Daniel Eigenmann

Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA)
Kurt Inder

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
Brian Murphy

Human Resources Development Canada
Rachel Bourassa

Western Economic Diversification Canada
Anastasia Lim

Industry Canada
Dominique Veilleux
Diane Morneau

Health Canada
Jacques Cloutier
Lucie Potvin
Liette Gartner

Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Sylvie Buendia-Riva

*Interview Protocol for Key Informants –
OLMC Associations/Representatives*

Name: _____

Title: _____

Affiliation: _____

Interview Date: _____

Phone/email: _____

Introduction

ARC Applied Research Consultants have been contracted by the Department of Canadian Heritage to conduct a formative evaluation of the Interdepartmental Partnership with Official Language Communities (IPOLC) component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program. The evaluation will focus on the adequacy of the initiative’s design and implementation and whether progress is being made toward the achievement of its objectives. Adjustments to the initiative may be made based on the results of the evaluation.

As part of this evaluation, ARC Applied Research Consultants are conducting interviews with Canadian Heritage staff as well as a sample of program managers and section 41 coordinators in federal departments and agencies and with Official Language Minority Community associations/representatives receiving funding through the initiative.

The anticipated short-term results for IPOLC are:

- Officers in Canadian Heritage regional offices, national and regional coordinators in federal institutions, federal Official Languages Champions and the Federal Council of Senior Federal Officials in the Regions are informed about the IPOLC and capable of promoting it.
- Official language minority communities are informed about the IPOLC initiative and are receiving funding through Canadian Heritage federal partners.
- By working in collaboration with the Official Language Minority Communities on developing activities that can be funded by the IPOLC, federal institutions become more knowledgeable of the needs and realities of the communities.
- The cooperation between Canadian Heritage and the federal institutions encourages the establishment of sustainable partnerships and new modes of cooperation.
- Federal institutions achieve the target results indicated in the Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs).
- Structuring impacts on the organizational culture of the federal partners and communities begin to emerge.

The anticipated long-term results for IPOLC are:

- IPOLC should contribute to:
 - Changing the organizational culture of federal institutions so that they acquire the habit of doing business with official language communities.
 - Adapting federal programs and service delivery models to make them more responsive to the realities of official language communities.
 - A more coordinated approach between federal, provincial/territorial, regional and municipal governments and community associations.
 - Recognition of the influence of official language communities in the action plans of federal institutions and in the development of new programs and initiatives or when existing programs are renewed or reviewed.
- Over the longer term for the community associations, implementation of IPOLC should contribute to:
 - Greater knowledge by official language minority communities of government programs and services.
 - A change in the culture of community associations so that they are better equipped to benefit from federal programs.
 - Sustainable development of the communities.

All responses provided by key informants during the interviews will be treated as strictly confidential by ARC Applied Research Consultants. Results will be reported in aggregate form. Interviews are anticipated to take approximately 45 to 60 minutes. All interviews will be conducted in the official language of choice of the interviewee.

Should you have any questions or concerns about this evaluation or the interview, please feel free to contact either of the individuals below:

Ms. Mira Svoboda (Project Manager)
ARC Applied Research Consultants
(613) 230-4136
MSvoboda@nfcgroup.com

Martin Dompierre (Senior Evaluation Manager)
Department of Canadian Heritage
(819) 956-9917
martin_dompierre@pch.gc.ca

Interview Questions

1. Please describe your involvement with IPOLC (role, responsibility, position, length of time, etc.)
2. *(Note the expected short-term and long-term results listed above.)*

From your community's or organization's perspectives, has any progress been made in the achievement of the short-term results in your community or organization as a result of IPOLC? All? Some? Which ones? How can these be measured?

Has any progress been made towards the long-term results of the initiative? Which ones? How can these be measured?

Are there other means (other than IPOLC) through which these short and long-term results could be better achieved? If yes, what are these means?

3. Based on your experience, what are some of the strengths and weaknesses of IPOLC in terms of the objectives, the expected results, eligibility criteria, authority structure, channels of communication, or mode of implementation by partners?
4. In your view, are the roles and responsibilities, as described in the attached general presentation document, well defined? Are they appropriately shared between project partners? If not, what changes do you feel are needed and why?
5. How would you describe the relationship between your community or organization and the federal institutions concerned by IPOLC?
6. In your view, do the tools and services developed by the Department of Canadian Heritage explain the initiative clearly? Can you describe the eligibility criteria used in assessing eligibility for funding? Are the eligibility criteria clear/understandable?

If not, how do you feel they should be changed?

7. In your view, has IPOLC been adequately promoted by the Department of Canadian Heritage to official language communities, Canadian Heritage regional offices and partner departments and agencies? What promotional activities have been implemented? What more should be done?
8. On a scale of one-to-five (where 1 is "completely satisfied", 3 is "neutral" and 5 is "completely dissatisfied"), please rate your satisfaction with the following:
 - The time frames for decision-making. If dissatisfied, please explain.
 - The amounts allocated per project. If dissatisfied, please explain.

9. In your view, are any changes required to ensure that IPOLC's objectives are met? If

yes, what changes are required?

10. From your community's or organization's perspective, has there been any demonstrable results attributable to IPOLC funding (as opposed to funding from other departments or sources)? If yes, what results have been achieved? If not, why do you think results have not been achieved?
11. Would your community or organization be willing to implement another project through IPOLC? If so, why? If not, why not?
12. To the best of your knowledge, were the funds provided through IPOLC completely spent for the intended purposes? If not, why? What were the funds spent on instead?
13. Has the funding provided for your project(s) been sufficient to meet the objectives of the project? If not, how would additional funding increase the effectiveness of your project in meeting its objectives and the objectives of IPOLC?
14. In your view, have any of the project(s) funded through IPOLC had any unintended positive impacts? Any negative unintended impacts? If yes, what were they?
15. How does your community or organization measure and report on results of projects funded through IPOLC to the federal institutions providing funding? Do you feel these mechanisms are effective?
16. Overall, what do you consider to be the main achievements of the initiative since 2000?
17. In your opinion, what changes, other than increased funding, could improve the initiative's overall effectiveness?
18. Do you have any final comments?

Thank you for your participation.

*Interview Protocol for Key Informants –
PCH Staff (NCR and Regions)*

Name: _____

Title: _____

Affiliation: _____

Interview Date: _____

Phone/email: _____

INTRODUCTION

ARC Applied Research Consultants have been contracted by the Department of Canadian Heritage to conduct a formative evaluation of the Interdepartmental Partnership with Official Language Communities (IPOLC) component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program. The evaluation will focus on the adequacy of the initiative’s design and implementation and whether progress is being made toward the achievement of its objectives. Adjustments to the initiative may be made based on the results of the evaluation.

As part of this evaluation, ARC Applied Research Consultants are conducting interviews with Canadian Heritage staff as well as a sample of program managers and section 41 coordinators in federal departments and agencies and with Official Language Minority Community associations/representatives receiving funding through the initiative.

Please find attached a brief summary of the questions we would like to address during our interview with you as well as a general presentation on IPOLC prepared by the Department of Canadian Heritage. We also provide the short-term and long-term anticipated results for IPOLC below. ***We recommend that you consult the general MOU model prior to the interview and have it in front of you during the interview.*** This will allow you to review some of the details of the initiative prior to the interview.

The anticipated short-term results for IPOLC are:

- Officers in Canadian Heritage regional offices, national and regional coordinators in federal institutions, federal Official Languages Champions and the Federal Council of Senior Federal Officials in the Regions are informed about the IPOLC and capable of promoting it.
- Official language minority communities are informed about the IPOLC initiative and are receiving funding through Canadian Heritage federal partners.
- By working in collaboration with the Official Language Minority Communities on developing activities that can be funded by the IPOLC, federal institutions become more knowledgeable of the needs and realities of the communities.
- The cooperation between Canadian Heritage and the federal institutions encourages the establishment of sustainable partnerships and new modes of cooperation.
- Federal institutions achieve the target results indicated in the Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs).
- Structuring impacts on the organizational culture of the federal partners and communities begin to emerge.

The anticipated long-term results for IPOLC are:

- IPOLC should contribute to:
 - Changing the organizational culture of federal institutions so that they acquire the habit of doing business with official language communities.
 - Adapting federal programs and service delivery models to make them more responsive to the realities of official language communities.
 - A more coordinated approach between federal, provincial/territorial, regional and municipal governments and community associations.
 - Recognition of the influence of official language communities in the action plans of federal institutions and in the development of new programs and initiatives or when existing programs are renewed or reviewed.
- Over the longer term for the community associations, implementation of IPOLC should contribute to:
 - Greater knowledge by official language minority communities of government programs and services.
 - A change in the culture of community associations so that they are better equipped to benefit from federal programs.
 - Sustainable development of the communities.

All responses provided by key informants during the interviews will be treated as strictly confidential by ARC Applied Research Consultants. Results will be reported in aggregate form. Interviews are anticipated to take approximately 45 to 60 minutes. All interviews will be conducted in the official language of choice of the interviewee.

Should you have any questions or concerns about this evaluation or the interview, please feel free to contact either of the individuals below:

Ms. Mira Svoboda (Project Manager)
ARC Applied Research Consultants
(613) 230-4136
MSvoboda@nfcogroup.com

Martin Dompierre (Senior Evaluation Manager)
Department of Canadian Heritage
(819) 956-9917
martin_dompierre@pch.gc.ca

Interview Questions

1. Please describe your involvement with IPOLC (role, responsibility, position, length of time, etc.)
2. *(Please refer to general presentation on IPOLC sent to you)* In your view, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the design of IPOLC in terms of the objectives? The expected results? The eligibility criteria? The authority structure? The channels of communication? The approach to implementation of IPOLC by PCH partners?

If no weaknesses identified then continue to Question 5.

3. *If weaknesses identified:* Do you feel that these weaknesses are detrimental to the success of IPOLC? If so, why/how?
4. *If any weaknesses identified* – Do you have any suggestions for changing the design of the initiative to overcome these weaknesses? What would be the impact(s) of the changes you suggest?
5. In your view, has PCH allocated sufficient internal resources to ensure that IPOLC is able to meet its objectives? *(staff, financial resources, etc)* If not, how would additional funding increase the effectiveness of the initiative?
6. In your view, has IPOLC been implemented successfully in all regions? In some regions? Which regions?
7. Has implementation of IPOLC been delayed by internal or external problems or obstacles? If yes, what are these problems or obstacles? Did they occur in all regions? If not, in which regions did these delays occur? How were these problems resolved?
8. *(Refer to short and long-term results listed above.)* In your view, has there been progress made in the achievement of these short and long-term results? Which ones? All? Some? How can these be measured?

In your view, has the implementation of IPOLC in the regional offices been effective in achieving the short and long-term results? Are there other means through which these results could be better achieved? If yes, what are these alternatives?

9. In your view, are the roles and responsibilities, as described in the attached general presentation on IPOLC, well defined? Are they appropriately shared between project partners? If not, what changes do you feel are needed and why?
10. How would you describe the relationship between the Department of Canadian Heritage and the federal partners involved in IPOLC? In your view, does the Department provide sufficient information and support to federal partners to deliver the initiative? Do the MOUs provide clear information on the Department's reporting and accountability requirements?

11. Is the delivery of the initiative through other federal departments effective? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this delivery mechanism?
12. In your view, has IPOLC been adequately promoted to official language communities, Canadian Heritage regional offices and partner departments and agencies? What promotional activities have been implemented? What more should be done?
13. On a scale of one-to-five (where 1 is “completely satisfied”, 3 is “neutral” and 5 is “completely dissatisfied”), please rate your satisfaction with the following:
 - The administrative procedures leading to funding recommendations. If dissatisfied, please explain.
 - The time frames for decision-making. If dissatisfied, please explain.
14. Based on your experience, with what aspects of the initiative are partner departments and agencies satisfied or dissatisfied?
15. **Note: This question is to be asked only of those familiar with the program budget and administration.** What are the costs associated with administering the initiative?
16. Do you believe that the projects funded through IPOLC support the objectives of the MOUs? If not, what changes are required?
17. Overall, has there been any demonstrable achievement of the results listed in the MOUs you are familiar with? If yes, what results have been achieved? If not, why do you think results have not been achieved?
18. In your view, has IPOLC had any unintended positive impacts? Any negative unintended impacts? If yes, what were they?
19. What strategy has been put in place for performance measurement? In your view is this strategy effective at collecting the necessary information? If not, what needs to be done to improve this?

Is performance information collected systematically? Who is responsible for collecting this information? Who is this information shared with? How is it being used?
20. To the best of your knowledge, were the funds provided through IPOLC completely spent for the intended purposes? If not, why? What were the funds spent on instead?
21. To your Knowledge, does your department report on the results obtained through IPOLC? If yes, where is this reporting done? Do other federal departments involved in IPOLC report on results as well?

If no, what measures do you feel should be taken to ensure that reporting on results is done?

If yes, do you feel the results reported on provide useful feedback on the projects funded?

22. Overall, what do you consider to be the main achievements of the initiative since 2000?
23. In your opinion, what changes could improve the initiative's overall effectiveness?
24. Do you have any final comments?

Thank you for your participation!

Program Managers, and section 41 Coordinators

Name: _____

Title: _____

Affiliation: _____

Interview Date: _____

Phone/email: _____

INTRODUCTION

ARC Applied Research Consultants have been contracted by the Department of Canadian Heritage to conduct a formative evaluation of the Interdepartmental Partnership with Official Language Communities (IPOLC) component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program. The evaluation will focus on the adequacy of the initiative's design and implementation and whether progress is being made toward the achievement of its objectives. Adjustments to the initiative may be made based on the results of the evaluation.

As part of this evaluation, ARC Applied Research Consultants are conducting interviews with Canadian Heritage staff as well as a sample of program managers and section 41 coordinators in federal departments and agencies and with Official Language Minority Community associations/representatives receiving funding through the initiative.

Please find attached a brief summary of the questions we would like to address during our interview with you as well as a general presentation on IPOLC prepared by the Department of Canadian Heritage. We also provide the short-term and long-term anticipated results for IPOLC below. ***We recommend that you consult the MOU prior to the interview and have it in front of you during the interview.*** This will allow you to review some of the details of the initiative prior to the interview.

The anticipated short-term results for IPOLC are:

- Officers in Canadian Heritage regional offices, national and regional coordinators in federal institutions, federal Official Languages Champions and the Federal Council of Senior Federal Officials in the Regions are informed about the IPOLC and capable of promoting it.
- Official language minority communities are informed about the IPOLC initiative and are receiving funding through Canadian Heritage federal partners.
- By working in collaboration with the Official Language Minority Communities on developing activities that can be funded by the IPOLC, federal institutions become more knowledgeable of the needs and realities of the communities.
- The cooperation between Canadian Heritage and the federal institutions encourages the establishment of sustainable partnerships and new modes of cooperation.
- Federal institutions achieve the target results indicated in the Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs).
- Structuring impacts on the organizational culture of the federal partners and communities begin to emerge.

The anticipated long-term results for IPOLC are:

- IPOLC should contribute to:
 - Changing the organizational culture of federal institutions so that they acquire the habit of doing business with official language communities.
 - Adapting federal programs and service delivery models to make them more responsive to the realities of official language communities.
 - A more coordinated approach between federal, provincial/territorial, regional and municipal governments and community associations.
 - Recognition of the influence of official language communities in the action plans of federal institutions and in the development of new programs and initiatives or when existing programs are renewed or reviewed.
- Over the longer term for the community associations, implementation of IPOLC should contribute to:
 - Greater knowledge by official language minority communities of government programs and services.
 - A change in the culture of community associations so that they are better equipped to benefit from federal programs.
 - Sustainable development of the communities.

All responses provided by key informants during the interviews will be treated as strictly confidential by ARC Applied Research Consultants. Results will be reported in aggregate form. Interviews are anticipated to take approximately 45 to 60 minutes. All interviews will be conducted in the official language of choice of the interviewee.

Should you have any questions or concerns about this evaluation or the interview, please feel free to contact either of the individuals below:

Ms. Mira Svoboda (Project Manager)
ARC Applied Research Consultants
(613) 230-4136
MSvoboda@nfcgroup.com

Martin Dompierre (Senior Evaluation Manager)
Department of Canadian Heritage
(819) 956-9917
martin_dompierre@pch.gc.ca

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Please describe your involvement with IPOLC (roles, responsibilities, position, length of time, etc.)
2. *(Please refer to the general presentation on IPOLC sent to you)* In your view, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the design of IPOLC in terms of the objectives? The expected results? The eligibility criteria? The authority structure? The channels of communication? The approach to implementation of IPOLC by the Department of Canadian Heritage?

If no weaknesses identified then continue to Question 5.

3. *If weaknesses identified:* Do you feel that these weaknesses are detrimental to the success of IPOLC? If so, why/how?
4. *If any weaknesses identified* – Do you have any suggestions for changing the design of the initiative to overcome these weaknesses? What would be the impact(s) of the changes you suggest?
5. In your view, has IPOLC been implemented successfully in all regions? In some regions? Which regions?
6. Has implementation of IPOLC been delayed by internal or external problems or obstacles? If yes, what are these problems or obstacles? Did they occur in all regions? If not, which regions did these delays occur? How were these problems resolved?

(Note the expected short-term and long-term results listed above.)

7. In your view, has there been progress made in the achievement of the short-term results as a result of IPOLC? Which ones? All? Some? How can these be measured?

What about long-term results? In your view has there been any progress made? Which ones? How can these be measured?

Are there other means (other than IPOLC) through which these short and long-term results could be better achieved? If yes, what are these alternatives?

8. How would you describe the relationship between your Department/Agency and the Department of Canadian Heritage? Does the Department provide the information and support that the federal institutions need to deliver the initiative? Does the MOU provide clear information on the Department reporting and accountability requirements?

9. Is the delivery of the initiative in its current form effective? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this delivery mechanism?
10. Based on your experience, with what aspects of the initiative are official language communities particularly satisfied or dissatisfied?
11. In your view, are the roles and responsibilities, as described in the attached general presentation on IPOLC, well defined? Are they appropriately shared between project partners? If not, what changes do you feel are needed and why?
12. In your view, do the tools and services developed by the Department of Canadian Heritage explain the initiative clearly? Can you describe the eligibility criteria used in assessing eligibility for funding? Are the eligibility criteria clear/understandable?

If not, how do you feel they should be changed?
13. In your view, has IPOLC been adequately promoted by the Department of Canadian Heritage to official language communities, Canadian Heritage regional offices and partner departments and agencies? What promotional activities have been implemented? What more should be done?
14. On a scale of one-to-five (where 1 is “completely satisfied”, 3 is “neutral” and 5 is “completely dissatisfied”), please rate your satisfaction with the following:
 - The administrative procedures leading to funding recommendations. If dissatisfied, please explain.
 - The time frames for decision-making. If dissatisfied, please explain.
 - The amounts allocated per project and the related coordination. If dissatisfied, please explain.
15. (*Interviewers should provide the appropriate MOU to interviewee.*) Do you believe that the activities are carried out as described in the MOU with the Department of Canadian Heritage? Are any changes required to ensure that the initiative’s objectives are met? If yes, what changes are required?
16. (*Interviewers should provide appropriate MOU to interviewee*) In your view, has there been any demonstrable achievement of the results listed in the memoranda of understanding? If yes, what results have been achieved? If not, why do you think results have not been achieved?

17. Do you feel it would be worthwhile for your department to sign another MOU when the current MOU expires? If so, why? If not, why not?
18. To the best of your knowledge, were the funds provided through IPOLC completely spent for the intended purposes? If not, why? What were the funds spent on instead?
19. Has the funding been sufficient to support the overall goal of the initiative? If not, how would additional funding increase the effectiveness of the initiative?
20. In your view, have any of the project(s) funded through IPOLC had any unintended positive impacts? Any negative unintended impacts? If yes, what were they? Why did they occur?
21. What strategy has been put in place in your Department to assess IPOLC's performance measurement? In your view is this strategy effective at collecting the necessary information? If not, what needs to be done to improve this?

Is performance information collected systematically in your department? Who is responsible for collecting this information? Who is this information shared with?
22. To your Knowledge, does your department report internally on the results obtained through IPOLC? If yes, how is this reporting done?
If no, what measures do you feel should be taken to ensure that reporting on results is done?
If yes, what measures or feedback do you feel is the most useful?
23. Overall, what do you consider to be the main achievements of the initiative since 2000?
24. In your opinion, what changes could improve the initiative's overall effectiveness?
25. Do you have any final comments?

Thank you for your participation!

Appendix B

Report Documents on Activities Under the IPOLC

Description of activities

TITLE:

DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES:

EXPECTED RESULTS:

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

COMMUNITY SPONSOR (Name and address/include letter(s) of support from the community-not the sponsor:

FEDERAL PARTNERS:

IS THIS A NEW COMMUNITY PARTNER:

FEDERAL PROGRAM SUPPORTING THE INITIATIVE):

PROVINCE:

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT:

FUNDING PER PARTNER, FEDERAL OR OTHER, PER YEAR:

DURATION:

FEDERAL CONTACT (Name, program and phone number):

PROPOSAL INITIATED BY COMMUNITY OR BY FEDERAL PARTNER?

Interim report on activities under the IPOLC

Financial year :

1. Title of the activity:

Please attach one-page description:

2. Community sponsor:

3. Federal partners:

4. Federal program:

5. Annual allocated funds:

Federal Department(s) - IPOLC:

- Year 1
- Year 2
- Year 3

6. Outcomes and services resulting from the activity in the first/second year:

Date :

Agent de programme/Program Officer:

Titre/title :

Commentaires/PCH Comments :

Final report on the activities under the IPOLC

Exercices financiers:

1. Title of the activity:

Please attach one-page description:

2. Community sponsor:

3. Community partner(s):

4. Federal partner(s):

5. Federal program:

6. Outcomes and services resulting from the activity:

7. Reach: community partners and beneficiaries:

- Community partners (other than the sponsor)
- Beneficiaries (ex. Membres of the community associations/the community at large)

8. Expected results:

9. Short and medium term results observed:

- Accomplishments of the activity and immediate impact on the community
- Innovative aspects (ex. New partners, new ways of doing business)

10. Long term results (anticipated):

11. Impacts on the federal organizations and on the communities:

- Measures taken to reinforce or put in place a lasting effect to ensure that the federal organization will be better able to take into account the situation of the official language minority communities in the review of policy, programs and existing services or in putting in place new policies, services and programs.
- Lasting partnerships between the communities and the federal organizations
- Sectoral impacts

12. Follow-up suggestions to optimize the impacts of the activity:

Date:
Program Officer:
Titre:
PCH Comments:

Appendix C

Fact Sheet, IPOLC Guidelines and Frequently Asked Questions

Fact Sheet

What is the Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities (IPOLC)?

The IPOLC is a Department of Canadian Heritage initiative launched in June 2000, to create and strengthen lasting cooperative relationships between the official-language minority communities and the federal institutions. The IPOLC initiative has a budget of \$5.5 million a year which provides funding to complement the contributions of other federal institutions. Thus, over a five-year period, some 55 million dollars in federal funding will be allocated to activities developed in cooperation with official-language minority communities. To date, IPOLC's outcomes demonstrate that the amount from the other federal organizations will probably be considerably higher than foreseen, and that the initiative will attract funding from other organizations and other levels of government.

How does the IPOLC work?

Official-language minority community associations approach federal organizations to develop proposals for activities under each federal organization's mandate. Once the proposals for activities are developed, the federal organization negotiates a memorandum of understanding with Canadian Heritage, setting out the federal organization's aims and objectives for working with the community associations; that is to say to support the communities' development. Only initiatives with explicit support and involvement of departments other than Canadian Heritage and community associations are eligible for funding under the IPOLC.

Results to date

By the end of fiscal year 2002-03, 15 agreements had been signed with 14 federal organizations. They are the Canada Council for the Arts (one for the Francophones and one for the Anglophones), Health Canada, Industry Canada, Telefilm Canada, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Agriculture and Agri-food Canada, Western Economic Diversification, the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Human Resources Development Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, the National Film Board, and Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

What activities are eligible?

All activities that fall under the priorities of the official-language minority communities are eligible. These may include, among others, activities in the areas of health and social services, agriculture and rural development, justice, arts and culture, economic development and tourism, human resources development and new technologies.

Where can I find further information?

Consult the [Frequently Asked Questions](#) (hyperlink) and the [General Guidelines](#) (hyperlink) on this site.

IPOLC Guidelines

INTRODUCTION

About the Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities

The mandate of the Department of Canadian Heritage is to strengthen and celebrate Canada. The Department works to preserve and promote those characteristics that define Canadians and, more specifically, seeks to foster the recognition, learning and use of English and French in Canadian society as a whole and, in particular, to enhance the vitality of the official-language minority communities throughout Canada as outlined in Sections 41 and 42 of the *Official Languages Act*.

The mission of the Citizenship and Heritage Sector is to create a greater sense of connection among Canadians through, for instance, the promotion of intercultural understanding and responsible citizenship, broad engagement in the preservation of our heritage, and deeper understanding of the evolving Canadian legacy.

The mandate of the Official Languages Support Programs Branch is, among other things, to enhance the vitality of Francophone and English-speaking minority communities (English-speaking minority communities in Quebec and Francophone and Acadian communities in all other Canadian regions). The Department is also aware of the importance of advancing its mission by encouraging initiatives that have repercussions in a larger framework than the present, initiatives that weave links between Canadians from different regions of the country, and between Francophone and English-speaking minority communities. It seeks to encourage activities that may have a multiplier effect by establishing best practices or models able to inspire other initiatives in other regions of the country by involving other Canadian clientele. It is within this mandate that the Department has created the **Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities (IPOLC)**.

This initiative of \$5.5M per year over a period of 5 years is meant to create new working relationships between the official-language minority communities and the federal government and to ensure that the programs, policies and services of these organizations take into account the needs and realities of the official-language communities in order to support their development. To this end, it offers complementary funding to the contributions of other federal organizations.

This initiative is also designed to help the associations that represent the official-language minority communities to improve their knowledge of the programs and services of the federal government and make better use of them.

1 OBJECTIVES

The following are the IPOLC's objectives.

- 1.1** To support activities that promotes sustainable development of the communities and increases the dynamism of the two minority official-language communities thus contributing to their overall development.
- 1.2** To facilitate access to the programs and services offered by federal organizations, make them more visible, and enable the federal government to better comprehend and take into account the needs and circumstances of official-language communities, when reviewing existing programs and services or developing new ones.
- 1.3** To create a lasting change⁵ on the organizational culture of the federal and community partners.
- 1.4** To provide financial leverage to facilitate the establishment of sustainable partnerships and new methods of cooperation.

2 WHY THIS GUIDE?

The purpose of this guide is to tell you about the IPOLC, to help you decide if the proposed activity meets the IPOLC criteria, and to explain the process for obtaining funding.

3 TO WHOM DOES THE COMMUNITY APPLICANT APPLY?

The community applicant applies to the federal organization with the appropriate mandate, in accordance with the nature of the underlying need and the activity proposed to address this need. If necessary, a representative from Canadian Heritage may assist the community organization in identifying the appropriate federal organization.

4 WHAT ARE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA?

- 4.1** The activity must be consistent with the federal partner's departmental mandate and program criteria.
- 4.2** The activity must be consistent with strategic priorities and directions for community development.
- 4.3** The activity must be consistent with IPOLC objectives.
- 4.4** The IPOLC financial contribution must not provide replacement funds for current or

⁵ Lasting change means an element that contributes to facilitating the inclusion of the OLC's in the regular clientele of the federal organizations.

planned contributions by federal organizations for official-language minority community development.

- 4.5 The IPOLC financial contribution must not support the creation or operation of a new or existing departmental entity.
- 4.6 The activity must contribute to the creation of lasting partnerships between federal organizations and the communities or the reinforcement of existing ones.
- 4.7 The activities must be consistent either with the official-language communities' areas of intervention or with their sectoral development plans. The activities could be in the following sectors, among others:
 - arts, culture and heritage;
 - economic development and tourism;
 - human resources development;
 - new technologies;
 - health and social services.

5 PROCESS

The community and federal partners will follow the process outlined below in developing activities to submit for funding under the IPOLC.

- 5.1 The community association contacts the appropriate federal organization to open discussions and develop activities jointly. The regional offices of PCH will continue to work with the community associations to identify their priorities and activities to develop with the federal partner for submission for IPOLC funding.
- 5.2 The federal institution through its provincial offices, when appropriate, consults the official-language minority community associations to determine their needs as they relate to that federal institution's mandate.
- 5.3 Once the needs and potential activities have been identified, the federal partner develops the planned activities with the community associations. These activities may emanate either from the communities or from the federal departments, in which case they must be recognized as priorities by the communities.
- 5.4 The federal partner analyses the proposed activities and decides which ones it will approve for funding. The approved activities will constitute a proposal that will be the basis for negotiating an agreement with Canadian Heritage for funding under the IPOLC.
- 5.5 The federal partner signs a memorandum of understanding with Canadian Heritage for the implementation of the Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities.

- 5.6 The federal partner receives funding from the IPOLC under the terms of the memorandum of understanding with Canadian Heritage and redistributes these funds to the community associations.
- 5.7 The community partner receives payments according to the procedures established with the federal partner under the agreement with that institution.

6 WHAT MUST THE PARTNERING DEPARTMENT'S APPLICATION TO IPOLC CONTAIN?

The following information is required for each activity to be funded under IPOLC

- 6.1 Title of the activity.
- 6.2 A short but clear description of the activity.
- 6.3 Expected results of the activity.
- 6.4 Performance indicators.
- 6.5 Name and address of community sponsor.
- 6.6 Name(s) of community partner(s) and letters of support from other community associations.
- 6.7 The name of the program of the federal partner supporting the initiative.
- 6.8 The province and community the activity will affect.
- 6.9 The total cost of the activity and the contributions from each partner, including any in-kind contributions, as well as the contributions from third parties.
- 6.10 The duration of the activity.

7 FUNDING METHOD

- 7.1 IPOLC funding is conditional on obtaining funds from at least one other federal partner.
- 7.2 Financial aid is provided to the applicant community organization according to the terms and conditions of the federal partner's program supporting the initiatives. This financial aid includes the funds from PCH transferred to the federal partner.
- 7.3 Initiatives and funding may be approved on a multi-year basis while IPOLC funding will be disbursed upon receipt and approval by Canadian Heritage of an annual submission or submissions for appropriate activities under the IPOLC, in accordance with the results obtained to date and subject to approval by Parliament of funds and to

the maintenance of current and forecasted budgetary levels of the Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities (IPOLC).

8 ACCESS TO INFORMATION

All activities are subject to access to information requests under the Access to Information Act and the Privacy Act.

9 MENTIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The federal partner and the community organization undertake to acknowledge the financial support from Canadian Heritage and all participating departments in any advertising documents, promotional activities and programs of events.

10 FOR MORE INFORMATION

For more information on the administration of the IPOLC, please contact the National Secretariat of the IPOLC at Canadian Heritage at:

Interdepartmental Coordination Directorate
Official Languages Support Programs
Department of Canadian Heritage
7th floor, 15 Eddy Street
HULL, QC
K1A 0M5
Telephone: (819) 994-3577
Fax: (819) 953-3942

or the nearest office of Canadian Heritage. Information is also on the Canadian Heritage Web site at: http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/lo-ol/ci-ic/piclo-ipolc/index_e.cfm

Frequently Asked Questions

1 What is the Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities?

The IPOLC is a Canadian Heritage initiative of \$5.5 million a year to provide complementary funding to other federal contributions to encourage the establishment of long-term working relationships between federal government organizations and the official-language minority communities (Francophones outside Quebec, and Anglophones in Quebec).

2 How does it work?

Official-language minority community associations approach federal organizations to develop proposals for activities under each federal organization's mandate. Once the proposals for activities are developed, the federal organization negotiates a memorandum of understanding with Canadian Heritage, setting out the federal organization's aims and objectives for working with the community associations; that is to say to support the communities' development. Only initiatives with explicit support and involvement of departments other than Canadian Heritage and community associations are eligible for funding under the IPOLC. Only initiatives with explicit support and involvement of departments other than Canadian Heritage and of community associations are eligible for funding under the IPOLC.

3 Which departments were targeted first?

The first group included Health Canada, Agriculture and Agri-food Canada, Justice Canada, Industry Canada, Western Economic Diversification, the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, FedNor, the Canada Council for the Arts and Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

4 Which departments have already signed agreements with Canadian Heritage?

They are the Canada Council for the Arts, Health Canada, Industry Canada, Telefilm Canada, CBC/Radio-Canada, Agriculture and Agri-food Canada, Western Economic Diversification, the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Human Resources Development Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, the National Film Board, and Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

5 Would an organization which receives funds from Canadian Heritage, that they use to promote the development of an industry in Canada, be considered as a valid partner for the IPOLC if they were approached by an official-language

association with a proposal?

No. Canadian Heritage wants to encourage partnerships between community associations and federal organizations other than PCH. Therefore, another federal partner would be required before the activity would be eligible.

6 Who can apply for funding under the IPOLC?

Representatives of the official-language minority communities who have joined with one or more federal partners, excluding Canadian Heritage, to undertake a priority initiative for the community.

7 I am a representative of an official-language minority community association. How do I apply?

Contact the appropriate federal organization. If necessary, a Canadian Heritage officer can help you identify the federal organization with the appropriate mandate for your activity.

Develop the planned activity with the federal organization; the latter will sign an agreement under the IPOLC with Canadian Heritage if it has not already done so.

You will receive payments according to the procedures established with your federal partner under that federal institution's agreement.

8 What activities are eligible?

All activities that fall under the priorities of the official-language minority communities are eligible. These may include, among others, activities in the areas of health and social services, agriculture and rural development, justice, arts and culture, economic development and tourism, human resources development and new technologies.

9 How do I know if the activity I am planning conforms to the criteria and regulations of the IPOLC?

The most important points to consider are the program criteria of the participating federal departments and organizations and the community priorities.

The Guidelines document developed by Canadian Heritage sets out the eligibility criteria and process for applying for funding under the IPOLC. Ineligible activities are described in this document. The Guidelines may be consulted on the Internet at the following address: http://www.pch.gc.ca/offlangoff/ci-ic/piclo-ipolc/index_e.cfm.

10 Is there a form for submitting a request?

Since the official-language communities will submit their request directly to the other federal

partner, that partner's request form will be used for the submission.

11 You mention eligible activities that have a lasting effect. What is a lasting effect and is a lasting effect still an important factor?

Yes, it is important that an activity have a lasting effect on federal-community working relations. Lasting change is the long-term relationship that will be established between a federal institution and the official-language minority communities and reinforces the commitment of the federal partner regarding the implementation of section 41 of the Official Languages Act.

12 Must the proposed projects be part of the global development plans of the communities?

The projects must be part of the communities' priorities; should a global development plan exists, we would expect to see the need for the proposed project reflected in it.

13 Are existing activities funded by programs in other federal organizations eligible for complementary funding under IPOLC?

PCH does not wish to simply add funds to already planned spending for the official-languages minority communities. Nevertheless, if, for example, a department were to add additional funds to what is already planned under an existing program and add a new component, its activities could be eligible for IPOLC funding.

On the other hand, if PCH feels that a department should have added more funds to an initiative for the communities at the start, PCH still has the right to decide on the extent of IPOLC funding and perhaps offer less than 50% of the total contribution.

14 Can the IPOLC funding be used for setting up or operate a new program or a new component of an existing program?

The IPOLC cannot fund the setting up nor the operating costs of a new branch, program, program component, ad hoc or standing committee, nor the hiring of staff.

15 It is important for the federal institutions to know the support level from Canadian Heritage before drawing up a list of activities. What will it be?

Support from the IPOLC may include up to 100% of the amount given by the federal partner, that is to say, 50% of the total federal contribution. It is possible, however, that we will negotiate lower funding with the federal organization if an activity seems a bit weak or not a strong priority for the community.

16 May a community organization that has been working with federal departments

for a number of years make a request for an existing and already funded project?

No. Since the IPOLC was developed to bring about partnerships, especially where there were none formerly, it will not add funds to projects or activities that are already planned or in effect, and even less, already funded.

17 If a project is partially funded by Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC)'s support fund and/or the Official Languages Support Programs Branch of Canadian Heritage, is it eligible for funding under the IPOLC?

No. HRDC's support fund is \$24 millions over two years whereas the IPOLC has only \$5.5 million a year for all the departments; therefore, HRDC should not need to come to the IPOLC to supplement its support fund. If necessary, the HRDC project could be eligible for co-funding from other Canadian Heritage programs. Other HRDC programs are eligible for IPOLC funding under the agreement between HRDC and the IPOLC. As for the other programs of the OLSPB, Canadian Heritage is already in partnership with official-language minority communities, so will not transfer money from one of its envelopes to another. Canadian Heritage has other programs that do not rely on IPOLC funding.

18 Will IPOLC funding be a grant or a contribution?

That depends on the funding regulations of the federal partner's programs.

19 Which of the federal partners makes the payments?

To avoid complicating the process, Canadian Heritage will transfer funds to the federal partner who will then make payments to the community associations involved.

20 How can the needs of the communities in the regions be met without regional envelopes?

On the one hand, funding to the different regions of the country will not be restricted by pre-established envelopes. On the other hand, Canadian Heritage will be vigilant in ensuring that the needs of the official-language minority communities in the regions are addressed by the plans of the federal partners.

21 Do the federal institutions process requests one at a time and will there be a central point within the federal institution to receive/respond to requests to fund?

The federal institutions decide upon the most appropriate internal structure for themselves. As for the activities, the Department will come to the IPOLC with a list in order to proceed to signing a memorandum of understanding. The first year the list could include two or three large activities, and the subsequent years more. A new annex to the memorandum of understanding will be drawn up each year listing the activities and their funding, but Canadian Heritage does not want to deal with them on a piecemeal basis.

22 Can a group receive contributions from more than one federal organization for

the same activity? For example: if a group receives one contribution of \$100 000 from one department and \$50 000 from another department, would PCH be able to offer them \$150 000?

Yes. The Department encourages activities that include two or more federal organizations other than Canadian Heritage. The IPOLC can provide complementary funds for the combined contributions from the other federal partners providing their having signed a memorandum of understanding with Canadian Heritage. Non-federal partners are also desirable, but Canadian Heritage offers complementary funding to contributions of federal partners only.

23 Are there any instances in which the federal partner will not disburse the federal funding to the beneficiary organizations?

Yes, in some cases. For example, the federal partner could ask a third party to do work on behalf of the community association which does not have the capacity or human resources.

24 In the approval of annual funding, do you take into account that certain projects will not be able to show conclusive results after one year and that some decisions will have to be made without a complete portrait?

Yes. The Department understands that some results will not be totally measurable after one year, but it will expect to receive an interim activity report, before continuing with funding for the subsequent year(s).

25 What is the role of the regional offices of Canadian Heritage in relation to the communities?

The regional offices of Canadian Heritage will continue to work with the community associations to identify their priorities and the activities to develop together with other federal partners under the IPOLC. If needed, the regional offices will help the communities and the federal organizations to identify the appropriate partner.

26 What is the role of the regional offices of Canadian Heritage in relation to the other federal departments?

Federal organizations work through their regional offices to develop plans that include all parts of the country, Canadian Heritage officials in the regions provide liaison between the other federal departments and the community associations, help identify the community needs, and put the appropriate federal and community partners in touch with each other.

27 If a group wishes to consult directly with a federal department can they do so?

Community associations are encouraged to make initial contact with the departments; this is the first step to producing a structuring effect, that of developing a working relationship, which the IPOLC encourages.

28 Does the memorandum of understanding have a clause that will bind the federal organizations to continue their partnership with the communities in the long term? We wonder about what will happen after the IPOLC.

The second generation of memoranda of understanding mentions this objective specifically.

29 Once the communities and the federal organizations have agreed on what they wish to do under the IPOLC, must the activities proposed be approved by Canadian Heritage?

Yes. Once the federal partner has decided which activities it wishes to support, it will come to Canadian Heritage to negotiate funding from the IPOLC. The activities will be briefly described in the annual submission.

30 Must the memorandum of understanding be multi-year?

The memorandum of understanding will be multi-year, but the activities, even those approved to take place over more than one year, must have their funding approved annually, subject to approval by Parliament of the funds available and, also, providing that the activities are proceeding as planned.

31 What is the role of the regional offices in negotiating the memoranda of understanding with the federal organizations?

The regional offices are included in this process. In some cases they play a key role in the negotiation and subsequent management of the memorandum of understanding.

32 When a request is submitted to the IPOLC, is a copy sent to the region?

The community representatives submit their requests to the federal partner for approval under that department's program(s). Then the partnering federal organization comes to Canadian Heritage with its list of conditionally approved activities. The Interdepartmental Coordination Directorate of Canadian Heritage examines the proposal and forwards a copy to the representatives of the regional offices of Canadian Heritage for their input. Once consensus is reached, the proposals are submitted for final approval and funding.

33 Must the federal partner wait until the supplementary estimates twice a year before having the approval of IPOLC funding for its proposed activities?

No. Approval will be given as soon as possible to allow the activity to proceed expeditiously. However, the actual transfer of funds from Canadian Heritage will take place after the supplementary estimates in the fall or the winter.

34 Must every federal partner involved in an IPOLC-funded activity with the official-language minority communities have signed a memorandum of understanding with Canadian Heritage?

No. The lead department will have signed a memorandum of understanding with Canadian Heritage comprising a list of activities to support its strategy. This does not prevent another federal organization from also contributing to the activity; its contribution, however, will not receive complementary funding under the IPOLC.

Appendix D

Summary of Results and Objectives in MOUs

Health Canada

Objectives of the Memorandum of Understanding

To improve and strengthen official-language minority communities' access to primary and basic health care in the following sectors in particular:

- Development and dissemination of strategic information such as knowledge of health needs of the official-language minority communities; this may include, among others, developing information tools to provide support to isolated official-language communities;
- Use of technology; this may include, among others, the use of technology to access health services at a distance; to form networks of health professionals in the official-language minority communities; to create diagnostic tools;
- Support of networking/consultation; this may include, among others, sensitizing the official-language minority associations to the existence of Health Canada programs and to the possibilities of creating working partnerships with Health Canada;
- Support to the workforce (training and recruitment); this may include, among others, encouragement for official-language minorities to train in, and practice medicine in, their first official language;
- The need for permanent structures; this may include virtual structures as well as associations or networks.

During the fiscal year 2000-2001, Health Canada will target the activities related to the support of remote communities.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada

Objectives of the Memorandum of Understanding

Recognizing the federal and bilingual character of Canada, Citizenship and Immigration's objective are to:

- contribute to Canada's economic growth;
- contribute to social and cultural enrichment;
- encourage participation of newcomers in Canadian society;
- foster pride in being a Canadian and awareness of the rights and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship.

Human Resources Development Canada

Objectives of the Memorandum of Understanding:

The objectives of Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC) are to:

- enable HRDC to support activities which contribute to the overall development of the communities, promote sustainable development and foster the vitality of both official-language minority communities;
- promote access to the services and programs offered by HRDC, increase awareness of those services and programs, and help HRDC gain a better understanding of the needs and realities of the official-language minority communities;
- serve as financial leverage in order to help build sustainable partnerships and new ways of working together.

Industry Canada

Objectives of the Memorandum of Understanding

The objectives of Industry Canada under the IPOLC MOU are to:

- encourage the development of information and communications technology skills among minority official-language communities;
- contribute to the development of Canada-wide networks accessible to the official-language minority communities to facilitate the integration of Information and Communications Technology (ICT), develop joint projects and enhance computer skills;
- foster partnerships and closer ties between Francophone communities and develop French language applications, services and content for the Internet.

Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Objectives of the Memorandum of Understanding

The objectives of Fisheries and Oceans Canada under the IPOLC MOU are to:

- improve and maintain visibility and communications of the federal government in isolated regions;
- analyze and reorganize fisheries resource allocations in order to improve employment possibilities in fishing communities;

- improve training possibilities and create service centres in aqua cultures;
- improve employment opportunities in fishing communities.

Foreign Affairs and International Trade Objectives of the Memorandum of Understanding

The Public Diplomacy Program, which will be the principal contractor of the agreement, in co-operation with its departmental partners from the International Cultural Relations Bureau and the Francophonie Affairs Division, assumes the mandate to :

- stimulate the creation of regional, community and institutional partnerships for the affirmation, outreach and development of official-language minority groups (Francophones outside Quebec and Anglophones in Quebec) through the establishment of co-operative relationships and exchanges with other countries;
- promote the presence, primarily in regions of France, Belgium and Switzerland, of French-Canadian artists outside Quebec, who work as professionals, have gained some recognition and have asserted themselves in Canada;
- benefit Canada's Francophonie by supporting the reinforcement of its institutions through international Francophone cooperation.

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada Objectives of the Memorandum of Understanding

To contribute to the development of the official-language minority communities by:

- developing an enhanced communications capability between government organizations, including research centres, and official-language minority communities and among official-language communities themselves;
- developing an innovative delivery system for farm management services to ensure access to quality advisory services at a distance;
- providing working tools for farmers in their own language in minority situations;
- assisting rural communities to identify and develop strategies to pursue unique business opportunities;
- providing technical assistance and training for the formation of other business models;
- assisting rural communities to develop and promote community capacity building and community development.

Economic Development Agency Canada Objectives of the Memorandum of Understanding

The objectives of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec (CED) are to:

- focus on two main areas of activity, enterprise development and improving the environment for economic development of the regions of Quebec;
- contribute directly to the attainment of the federal government's economic priorities, particularly with respect to innovation, competitiveness, local development and sustainable development.

Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency Objectives of the Memorandum of Understanding

The objectives of Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency under the IPOLC MOU are to:

- assist the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA), within the sphere of its jurisdiction, to address the needs of the official-language minority community, to the extent that those needs correspond with the Agency's institutional mandate. As a complement to the measures currently taken by ACOA to implement section 41 of the Official Languages Act, the means agreed to under this MOU will enable the Agency to enhance even further its assistance towards the economic development of the official-languages minority community and facilitate the process for that community of learning of an benefiting from the Agency's various programs;
- continue efforts within ACOA to raise the awareness of the Minister and senior officials to the possibilities for addressing the needs of the official-language minority community in the context of ACOA's departmental mandate;
- support activities that promote the sustainable development of the official language minority community and increase its dynamism, thus contributing to its overall development;
- provide financial leverage to facilitate the establishment of sustainable partnerships and new methods of cooperation and in so doing to create a lasting change on the organizational culture of the federal and community partners.

Western Economic Diversification Canada Objectives of the Memorandum of Understanding

The objectives of Western Economic Diversification Canada under the IPOLC MOU are to:

- encourage new collaborative efforts and reinforce existing relationships through value added activities carried out by public, private and community partners, in order to achieve coordinated activities for the benefit of Francophone community economic development in the West;
- create awareness of the programs within WD and other departments committed to furthering the spirit of the Official Languages Act;
- reaffirm WD's commitment under Section 41 of the Official Languages Act as regards assistance provided to French official language minority communities in Western Canada in activity sectors and areas with the most potential economic development impact;
- recognize the economic development activities identified by Francophone economic development groups who have consulted with their communities to develop strategies reflecting the priorities of the official language minority communities they represent.

National Film Board of Canada

Objectives of the Memorandum of Understanding

The objectives the National Film Board of Canada under the IPOLC MOU are to:

- assure the emergence of a new generation of cinematographers in the official-language communities through the creation of a production program sustained by professional film makers and by participating in the creation of a network of alternative productions;
- reinforce the quality of the production of films and videos produced and directed by members of the official-language communities by offering training and perfectionism to professional writers, producer, film makers and technicians;
- allow for the distribution and marketing of these productions in the official-language communities and to expand the distribution network in those communities.

Canada Council for the Arts

Objectives of the Memorandum of Understanding

The objectives of Canada Council for the Arts under the IPOLC MOU are to:

- better inform and advise Anglophone artists and organizations in the out-lying regions of Quebec as well as in the greater Montreal area, about the Canada Council programs;
- assist the development of individual Anglophone artists in the out-lying regions of Quebec as well as in the greater Montreal area, and encourage the development of the Anglophone arts community in all of Quebec;
- increase professionalism and consolidate the development of arts organizations in the out-lying regions of Quebec as well as in the greater Montreal area;
- disseminate the work of Quebec Anglophone artists and organizations in Canada and abroad.

Telefilm Canada

Objectives of the Memorandum of Understanding

The Telefilm Canada proposal seeks in particular to contribute to the development of Francophone producers outside Quebec. More specifically, the objectives are to:

- improve professional training in French outside Quebec;
- bridge the distance between the Francophone communities outside Quebec and the large urban centres of business and decision-making;
- encourage continued working relations with distributors;
- contribute to the development of regional content in order to reflect the reality of the official language minority communities;
- permit Francophone communities outside Quebec to become familiar with methods of doing business on the international scene and to encourage the development of partnerships and sales in foreign countries.

CBC/Radio-Canada Objectives of the Memorandum of Understanding

In accordance with the mandate and the strategic orientations of CBC/Radio-Canada, the objectives under the IPOLC MOU are to:

- maintain, initiate and/or optimize sustainable partnerships with community organizations or linguistic groups in minority situations in order to improve the quality of independent productions in French coming from Francophone minority linguistic areas;
- encourage professional training activities in the industry of independent television production in French outside Quebec;
- offer a larger number of programs produced in Francophone minority regions;
- contribute to the development of a more sustainable production industry in Francophone minority regions, and this in all types of television programming;
- maintain, initiate and/or optimize sustainable partnerships with community organization or linguistic groups in minority situations in order to, among others, discover, develop and promote the next generation of Francophone singers in minority regions.