

Evaluation of the Museums Assistance Program (MAP) Final Report

September 18, 2002

SPR Associates Inc.
45 Granby Street, Toronto, Ontario, M5B 1H8
(416) 977-5773; FAX: (416) 977-7747
275 Slater Street, 9th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario, K1P 5H9
(613) 236-4384; FAX: (613) 236-3754

Table of Contents

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Executive Summary | i |
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. A Profile of MAP: Design, Objectives and Operations | 2 |
| 2.1 Overview and Background | 2 |
| 2.2 MAP in Context: Broader Funding for Museums | 3 |
| 2.3 A Description of MAP and Its Delivery | 4 |
| 3. The Evaluation Methodology | 7 |
| 3.1 Overview of the Evaluation Method | 7 |
| 3.2 Strengths and Limitations of the Methodology | 9 |
| 3.3 Data Presentation | 9 |
| 4. Relevance of MAP | 10 |
| 4.1 Heritage Interests of Canadians | 10 |
| 4.2 The Overall Role of the Federal Government in Addressing Heritage Interests of the Canadian Public | 12 |
| 4.3 Relevance of MAP's Components | 13 |
| 4.4 Conclusions: Relevance of MAP and Its Components | 16 |
| 5. Objectives Achievement by MAP | 17 |
| 5.1 Achievement of MAP Objectives | 17 |
| 5.2 Success of MAP Projects | 18 |
| 5.3 Conclusions Regarding Objectives Achievement | 22 |
| 6. MAP's Design and Delivery | 23 |
| 6.1 MAP's Overall Design and Delivery | 23 |
| 6.2 Component-Specific Implementation Issues | 26 |
| 6.3 Conclusions Regarding MAP Design and Delivery | 29 |
| 7. Accountability, Cost-Effectiveness and Alternatives | 30 |
| 7.1 Accountability: Performance Monitoring and Reporting | 30 |
| 7.2 Cost-Effectiveness of MAP | 32 |
| 7.3 Alternatives | 33 |
| 8. Conclusions | 34 |
| 8.1 Relevance | 34 |
| 8.2 Success | 36 |
| 8.3 Program Design and Delivery | 36 |
| 8.4 Cost-Efficiency | 37 |
| 8.5 Monitoring and Accountability | 37 |
| 8.6 Other Policy and Context Issues | 38 |
| 8.7 Need for New Directions | 39 |
| 9. Future Directions and Recommendations | 40 |

Management Response and Action Plan

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

The Museums Assistance Program (MAP) is a federal funding program that was created in 1972 for the improvement of Canadian museum collections and displays. It was delivered first by the National Museums Corporation, then by the Department of Communications, and since 1994 by the Department of Canadian Heritage.

In 1998-1999, MAP was reoriented to align its objectives with priorities of the Department of Canadian Heritage and strategic directions of the Government of Canada. New Terms and Conditions were developed, and the program's budget was increased to \$9,422,000. An evaluation of the reoriented program was planned with a view to identifying any design and delivery issues that require adjustment and, to the extent possible, determining program outcomes.

By fall 2001-2002, MAP staff had developed a Results-based Management and Accountability Framework (RMAF) for the program, including a plan for performance monitoring by program staff and a framework for the evaluation. The evaluation was started in 2001-02 and completed this year. This is the evaluation report.

MAP provides grants and contributions to Canadian museums and related heritage organizations through its: *Access and National Outreach* component (ANO), which supports travelling exhibits; its *Aboriginal Museum Development* component (AMD), which supports Aboriginal cultural institutions; and its *Organizational Development* component (OD), which supports professional development, collection management, exchanges of staff and management and planning studies at museums.

Non-profit Canadian museums¹ that provide services to the public year-round and have at least one full-time professional staff-person are eligible to apply to MAP. About 500 of Canada's 2,000 museums are eligible, and approximately 250 apply each year. Applications are invited through an annual call for proposals to qualifying heritage organizations. Proposals are reviewed by regional staff and a committee of peers.

Broader Context: MAP is one of many funding programs for museums. Museums are also supported by other federal programs, provincial/territorial and municipal programs, and private funders. Nevertheless, Canadian museums have encountered severe financial difficulties in recent years and face many challenges, such as competing with new technology and the Internet. Evaluators considered how MAP can best operate in this broader context, how the overall needs of museums can best be met, and the most appropriate role MAP can play in meeting these needs.

¹ This term is used to describe a wide range of heritage organizations, including heritage sites and art galleries.

Because the realignment of MAP was relatively recent, the evaluation is primarily formative in nature, utilizing the following methodologies:

- Key Informant Interviews, with 12 persons knowledgeable about MAP to obtain background information and insights about MAP, its operations and issues. Key informants included representatives of museum associations and individual museums. Departmental management and one regional officer who delivers MAP.
- A Census Survey of 1998-1999 MAP Applicants, a mail-out survey which collected data from successful and non-successful MAP applicants. Responses were obtained from 166 museums. Questions related to MAP-funded projects and MAP program features. As a census survey, the survey provided statistically reliable results.
- An Exit Survey of Museum Visitors to 26 MAP-funded exhibits at 22 museums. Visitors' appreciation of exhibits and their views on the importance of the federal government's role in supporting Canadian museums were examined. Data from 748 visitors provided a reliable view of the museum-going public's view of MAP-funded projects.²
- Other data, such as case studies of 12 MAP-funded projects, a survey of museum associations (12 respondents), a one-day workshop with representatives of regional consultants who deliver MAP, a document and literature review, and a comparison to programs in other countries, including the United States, United Kingdom, New Zealand, and Australia.

Strengths of the Methodology: Multiple data sources were a strength of the evaluation. Key informant interviews focused on individuals who have first-hand knowledge of MAP and museums, and surveys provided perspective on MAP's value to museums and museum visitors.

Limitations of the Methodology: Although lines of inquiry provided a useful assessment of MAP, there were limitations to the evaluators' ability to answer some questions. This was particularly true with respect to the impacts of MAP, as there is so far no database that links MAP inputs to changes in museum outputs (attendance, professionalism, public satisfaction). Nor was it possible to fully address issues of cost-effectiveness as no economic data has been collected to date. Thus, no analysis was possible to compare performance of museums which received MAP funding with the performance of museums which did not receive MAP funding.

Also, the evaluation did not seek input from museums that were eligible for, but did not apply for, MAP funding in 1998-1999. As a result, the extent to which MAP is known to all museums, and the extent to which there might be obstacles that prevent some museums from applying, could not be assessed. As well, the evaluation did not examine databases of provincial/territorial or municipal funding programs, or other federal programs.

These limitations notwithstanding, the evaluation provides an informative useful view of MAP and its strengths and weaknesses, as well as insights on how MAP could be improved.

² Results of this survey are reliable at better than $\pm 5\%$, 99 times in 100.

2. Key Findings

Relevance: The evaluation results indicate that MAP is relevant to the Department's strategic outcomes, museum visitors and, to some extent, to museums. For example, the census survey indicated strong support from Canadian museums on the importance of MAP. Additionally, the Museum Visitors Survey and a related³ national survey both indicated that Canadians who visit museums consider federal government support for museums as important. As well, an international comparison suggests that programs comparable to MAP are offered in a number of other countries.

Success: Evaluation data indicated that MAP has had many successes, with projects contributing to realization of the Department's strategic objectives of:

- Canadian Content (evidence from evaluation surveys, case studies);
- Cultural Participation and Engagement (evidence from literature, all of the evaluation surveys); and
- Connections (evidence from the MAP Applicant Survey, case studies).

Design and Delivery: There were, however, mixed results on some aspects of design and delivery. On the positive side, the Department's regional staff and peer review process were considered highly effective by most museums and key informants. The peer review process in particular was rated positively.⁴

The most significant concerns raised had to do with funding levels and timing. Several museums raised concerns about what they saw as too little funding for museums (a consideration beyond the scope of MAP), the cost of preparing proposals, the length of time required by the Department for decision-making on project proposals, and the length of time taken to deliver project funding (in some cases, several months), which they said often had negative impacts on museums and their projects.

Cost-Effectiveness: While information on costs and benefits of MAP was limited, the evaluators were able to examine some data which suggests that the program is cost-effective. For example, although program resources have been limited over the past decade,⁵ museums still indicated that MAP had made significant contributions to museum development, and assessed MAP funding awards as having been important to museums. They indicated that there were key activities they had undertaken which would not have been possible without MAP funding.

³ Environics Research Group Limited, *Arts and Heritage Participation Survey*, prepared for the Department of Canadian Heritage, September, 2000.

⁴ The evaluation also found were that the peer review process adds credibility to MAP projects, brings a practical understanding of what is required to achieve a project from a museological perspective, and helps ensure the wisest use of MAP funds.

⁵ MAP budgets, reflecting broader constraints in the expenditures of the federal government, declined from \$13.5 million in 1993-94 to less than \$10 million during the period of program review.

As well, analysis of data for a sample of MAP projects pointed to strong leveraging effects of MAP. Case study projects appear to have leveraged 2 to 5 times the MAP financial contribution,⁶ thus, the evaluators observed that \$8 million from MAP may have led to the expenditure of \$16 million, possibly as much as \$40 million, for projects in areas that are priorities for the Department. These additional funds which were "leveraged" came from such sources as provincial and municipal governments and foundations.

These "partner" dollars might have been spent on heritage projects of museums or other organizations in the absence of MAP, but the involvement of MAP meant that the funds were channelled to projects reflecting Departmental priorities. This suggests that MAP was cost-effective in furthering Departmental objectives.⁷

Performance Monitoring: The evaluators assessed the MAP *Result-based Management and Accountability Framework* (RMAF) both as a tool and on the extent to which its performance monitoring strategy is being implemented. The development of RMAFs reflect a new emphasis on performance monitoring and reporting in Canadian Heritage and across government.

At the theoretical level, the RMAF presents a logical model of the program, and is seen by the evaluators as a good guide for measuring progress, particularly if performance information is generated on a systematic basis,⁸ as would seem possible and desirable. The potential of the RMAF is reflected to some degree by this evaluation, which measures many of the key indicators set out in the RMAF.

However, there was no evidence that performance monitoring proposed by the RMAF had begun at the time of the evaluation, or that there were plans to begin such monitoring. This may reflect a historical reliance on periodic evaluations for validation of the program, rather than systematic monitoring. This lack of current systematic monitoring appears to be attributable to the lack of a formal implementation strategy in the RMAF, and an absence of clearly delineated responsibility, agreement, and resources for implementation.

⁶ Leveraging was estimated for case studies by computing a ratio of the total dollars obtained for a project from non-heritage funders, to the total MAP contribution. This result may, however, have been exaggerated by one unusual project in the case studies, with Department staff suggesting two times as a more typical result.

⁷ Case studies found that MAP's emphasis on the development of partnerships between museums and on the support of networking activities indicated cost-effective results, as knowledge and benefits were widely shared.

⁸ However, some limitations were noted in the RMAF's assumptions about the program, as described in Section 7.

3. Conclusions and Recommendations

Evaluation data indicates that MAP responds to important heritage needs of Canadians and many needs of museums, and it helps achieve a number of important goals of the Department, at a modest cost. As well, it leverages other funds for projects which address Departmental priorities. MAP achieves its intended results, enhancing Canadians' access to their cultural heritage, linking Canadians in different regions (particularly through travelling exhibits), aiding the development of Aboriginal museums and professional resources, and helping museums develop capacity. On these and more general grounds, MAP was seen by the evaluators as providing good value for money for the Department. *The evaluators therefore concluded that MAP components are relevant and should be maintained within MAP, or any successor program.* However, evaluation findings also pointed to areas for improvement regarding program delivery.

MAP Components: Evaluation data indicated that:

- Lack of operational funding is an issue for some museums that apply to MAP. Ideally, MAP should cover related operational costs for museums delivering MAP-funded projects.
- Take-up of the Exhibition Circulation Fund component is currently extremely low, calling for the reexamination of the design and or demand for this component.
- Historically, MAP had a broader scope of operation than it does today, with its focus on three types of projects. MAP could remain a *museums assistance program* if it provided other assistance, for example advice on how to access other funding programs. If not the program name should be changed to more clearly reflect its goals.
- The three-province criterion of the National Outreach Initiative should be made more flexible. Since many Canadians visit museums while travelling, the goals of connecting Canadians across regions could, in some cases, be aided by exhibits in place, as opposed to travelling exhibits per se.
- The design and delivery of the Aboriginal Museum Development component should be re-examined to ensure maximum cultural sensitivity.

Reach of MAP: Evaluation data indicated that:

- There could be value in MAP reaching more communities and smaller museums, a goal which would be assisted by improved museum access to MAP's regional consultants. This was indicated by observations from museum representatives and the Department's regional consultants.
- There is a need to assess whether there are any obstacles that make it difficult for museums to access MAP. Such a review could explore whether there are systemic barriers that prevent some museums from applying, or whether recipients of MAP funding tend to be the same each year. Since this evaluation did not reach non-users, the evaluators recommend a study of non-users to answer the above questions.

Operations and Implementation: The evaluation data indicated that:

- Museums need more access to MAP's regional consultants, as uneven levels of service run counter to MAP's objective of connecting different regions of the country.
- The evaluators also concluded that the process for preparing peer reviewers should be improved, particularly the definition of their role.
- There is a need for clearer information about MAP's objectives and eligibility criteria. This need was expressed by a number of museums that reported there are sometimes contradictions between published application guidelines and information from regional consultants.
- Museums need an opportunity to share expertise, lessons learned, best practices and success stories, possibly through a web-site.
- There is a need for a "how-to" kit to help small museums develop MAP applications. This need was expressed by many museums that found the process of developing applications difficult and costly.
- There is a need for improved feedback to museums on both successful and unsuccessful applications.
- There is a need for more consultation, collaboration and information-sharing between museums and Canadian Heritage regional consultants, and among regional staff in different parts of the country.
- A change in the application deadline should be considered. Many museums said the once-a-year deadline for MAP applications is problematic. (Canadian Heritage personnel, however, view yearly deadlines as contributing to an efficient process.)
- A key issue is the need to reduce the length of time involved in the Department's application review and delivery of funds to successful applicants. This was widely evidenced in surveys and case studies, where museums emphasized that delays are costly and undermine the planning process. The evaluators recommend that a system be established to monitor the flow of funds and that performance standards be established.

Monitoring and Accountability: The evaluators concluded that:

- Monitoring and accountability are key issues for the program: Historically, assessment of MAP results has been episodic, relying mainly on evaluations which occur infrequently. While the RMAF was found to have potential, it is not yet being implemented, and there is need to establish mechanisms to monitor project activity and success (e.g. where travelling exhibits go and who sees them). There is also a need for benchmarking (e.g. regular national surveys), and a need for a system to assess economic impact of MAP, and to monitor any losses to museums as a result of MAP processes. A strategy is recommended in Section 7 of the main report.

4. Other Policy and Context Issues

Two issues came to the evaluators' attention that were outside the scope of the evaluation, but were raised many times by museums: (1) the *strategic positioning of MAP* relative to other funding programs, including other Departmental programs and programs of other departments, governments and agencies; and (2) *communications and stakeholder relations*. Evaluators found considerable differences between the perspectives of museums and the Department, suggesting a need for more dialogue or even new mechanisms for governance.

Strategic Positioning of MAP: Evaluation results indicated that MAP's relevance to museums is lessened and its effectiveness reduced by museums' significant unmet needs for funding for collection care, development of temporary and permanent exhibits, and ongoing operations.⁹ In some cases, lack of such funds was reported to hamper the capacity of museums to undertake MAP-funded projects. There is also a need to better understand the impact on museums of Canadian Heritage programs introduced in the past two years which may address some of the needs identified by museums. Better understanding of the interplay of all funding programs for museums is required to ensure that Canadian Heritage's MAP strategy is optimal. The Department should work with other funders and museums to better understand the new programs' impact. Such understanding may help the Department to better focus MAP.

Communications and Stakeholder Relations: Although MAP no longer has a mandate to support museum operations, the need for such funding and a perception of Departmental disinterest in addressing that need, were frequently raised by museums. It was the view of many museum representatives that they have too little input into Departmental priority-setting and interpretation of Canadians' heritage needs. The evaluators see a need for improved dialogue between the Department and museums to remedy these differences, and offer some suggestions in the report.

⁹ The linkage of MAP components to basic funding can best be illustrated by comparing a museum to a large tree. In order for the tree to produce strong branches and healthy fruit (the types of "products" which MAP wishes to fund), the tree/museum must rely on strong roots (an excellent collection, well researched and documented and informative permanent exhibitions, which depend on core funding). Without "strong roots," the branches will wither over time, and the museums' capacity and desire to carry out activities such as travelling exhibitions will diminish.

1. Introduction

The Museums Assistance Program (MAP) is a federal funding program that was created in 1972 for the improvement of Canadian museum collections and displays. It was delivered first by the National Museums Corporation, then by the Department of Communications, and since 1994 by the Department of Canadian Heritage.

In 1998-1999, MAP was reoriented to align its objectives with priorities of the Department of Canadian Heritage and strategic objectives of the Government of Canada. New Terms and Conditions were developed, and the program's budget was increased to \$9,422,000. An evaluation of the reoriented program was planned with a view to identifying any design and delivery issues that require adjustment and, to the extent possible, determining program outcomes.

By fall 2001, MAP staff had developed a Results-based Management and Accountability Framework (RMAF) for the program, including a plan for performance monitoring by program staff and a framework for the evaluation. The evaluation was started in fall 2001 and completed in August 2002. This is the evaluation report.

Objectives: The objectives of the MAP evaluation were:

- To evaluate MAP's capacity to meet the strategic objectives of the Department of Canadian Heritage;
- To support and assist the management of MAP; and
- To validate the Results-based Management and Accountability Framework for MAP.¹⁰

Key Evaluation Issues: This report examines the following broad issues:

- Program relevance;
- Success (short-term outcomes);
- Appropriateness of program design and effectiveness of delivery; and
- Adequacy of performance measurement strategy and performance monitoring.

Plan of the Report: The pages that follow provide a profile of MAP, a description of the evaluation methodology, and an examination of the evaluation issues. There is a section each on relevance, achievement of results and success, design and delivery issues, and performance monitoring and cost-effectiveness. The final sections present main conclusions of the evaluation team and suggest future directions.

¹⁰ Canadian Heritage, *Results-based Management and Accountability Framework for the Museums Assistance Program, 2001*.

2. A Profile of MAP: Design, Objectives and Operations¹¹

2.1 OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND

Purpose of MAP: MAP provides financial assistance to Canadian museums and related heritage institutions¹² for museum activities that support the objectives of Canada's museum policy. To be eligible, projects must aid goals of ensuring that all Canadians can access museum collections that achieve standards of excellence in research, exhibitions, education, conservation and information technology. MAP assists Canadians with access to collections by supporting the development and circulation of travelling exhibitions which promote culture, heritage and diversity; supporting Aboriginal museums for the development and management of collections; and assisting museums and their employees in attaining professional standards, and strengthening their economic stability.

MAP was established in 1972 and delivered by the National Museums Corporation. It was delivered by the Department of Communications from 1989 -1993. After a major restructuring of federal departments in 1993, MAP was transferred to the Department of Canadian Heritage, and a major review was completed in 1994.¹³ In 1998-1999, with demand for MAP exceeding available resources, the program moved from its traditional role of supporting core activities of museums to focus on Departmental objectives. Since then, the program's focus has been on very specific types of projects, including inter-provincial travelling exhibitions, projects in professional development, new multimedia approaches and Aboriginal museum development. The evaluators note that in this respect the program is no longer a generic "museums assistance" program as it was before 1998-1999, but rather more of a "museums projects" program, creating confusion that could be ameliorated by a change in name to better reflect MAP's new emphasis.

Canada's Museums and Other Heritage Institutions: Over 2,000 Canadian museums provide Canadians with insights into their heritage and culture. Some are large, such as the national and provincial museums, and many others are small and specialized. Most museums serve small communities and operate with limited paid or volunteer staff. Institutions other than museums, such as historic sites and art galleries, also play an important role in preserving Canada's heritage. Canadian museums are visited by over 100 million persons annually, serving an important economic function in tourism and in leisure time activities of Canadians, and providing employment and volunteer opportunities to thousands of Canadians.¹⁴ Government funding to museums and related institutions totals over \$1 billion annually.¹⁵

¹¹ Adapted from Departmental documents.

¹² For example, art galleries and heritage sites.

¹³ Canadian Heritage, *Review of the Museums Assistance Program*, Final Report, N.L. Hushion and Associates, Ernst & Young, January, 1994.

¹⁴ Over 24,000 Canadians are currently employed by museums (excluding art galleries and other heritage institutions), according to the Canadian Museums Association, and over 55,000 volunteers are engaged in their work.

¹⁵ The federal contribution is about half of this total. From: *Recent Cultural Statistics*, Canadian Heritage, highlights from *Canada's Culture, Heritage and Identity: A Statistical Perspective*, 1997. That report showed that there were more than 111 million visitors at over 2,000 not-for-profit Canadian heritage institutions in 1993-1994, and showed government expenditures on these institutions as being more than \$1 billion in 1994-95, of which the federal share was estimated as 56%. This was part of a larger public expenditure on culture (including libraries) of about \$6 billion (in 1996).

2.2 MAP IN CONTEXT: BROADER FUNDING FOR MUSEUMS

Overview: While many museums regard MAP as a key source of funding, historically a mainstay of federal support to museums, it is in fact one of many sources of funding that can be accessed by Canadian museums.¹⁶ MAP is particularly significant to museums, however, because: (1) it is aimed exclusively at museums; and (2) it represents a key source of funding for innovation and change (e.g. developing new exhibits, new skills, new relationships, and in the case of Aboriginal communities, new museums).

Museums have many sources of funding: Current sources of funding available to museums include:

- **Non-Federal Programs:** programs offered by provincial/territorial and municipal governments and foundations;
- **Department of Canadian Heritage Programs:** MAP, Canadian Digital Content Online, Virtual Museum of Canada, Canadian Arts and Heritage Sustainability Program, Cultural Spaces Canada Program, Young Canada Works Program (Young Canada Works in Heritage Organizations component), Canada France Agreement Concerning Cooperation and Exchange in the Area of Museums, and the Moveable Cultural Property Program;
- **Programs of other Federal Departments and Agencies:** Human Resources Development Canada, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, Industry Canada, Canada Council for the Arts, and others.

New Canadian Heritage Programs: In 2001, the Department of Canadian Heritage introduced a number of new cultural programs which provide funding to a wide range of organizations. One of these programs, the *Cultural Spaces Canada Program*, which was announced May 2, 2001 and began operation in 2002, will infuse some \$80 million into Canada's cultural infrastructure over three years. It is not known at this time the extent to which museums will take advantage of this program and how successful they will be when compared to other applicants. This program could have a significant impact on museums, however, as museums represent a substantial portion of all existing heritage organizations that are eligible for this program.

¹⁶ Estimating federal expenditures on museums and related heritage institutions at about half a billion dollars, and MAP at a maximum of \$10 million, MAP would be about 2% of total federal expenditures in this area.

2.3 A DESCRIPTION OF MAP AND ITS DELIVERY

Overview: MAP provides financial assistance to museums¹⁷ that foster access by current and future generations of Canadians to their human, natural, artistic and scientific heritage, and enhance awareness, understanding and enjoyment of this heritage.¹⁸ There are three MAP components: the Access and National Outreach component (ANO), which aids travelling exhibits; the Aboriginal Museum Development (AMD) component, which aids Aboriginal museum and heritage preservation and development; and the Organizational Development component (OD), which supports aids professional development, planning and other museum projects.

Key Features¹⁹ of MAP are:

- *Priorities and Activities:* MAP provides funding for projects undertaken by traditional means as well as through the application of new technologies. Priorities for MAP funding include: projects which tell the Canadian story and promote inter-provincial perspectives such as travelling exhibitions, outreach, collaborative initiatives and partnerships; projects which foster and support Aboriginal museum development; and projects which support and encourage exchanges and dialogue between Canadian museum organizations and between museum professionals.
- *MAP Applicants* must be incorporated, non-profit Canadian museums which provide services to the public year-round, employ at least one full-time professional staff person and have policies regarding collections management and conservation, and medium-term organizational plans (3-5 years).
- *Funding Formula:* MAP provides funding assistance on a project-by-project basis. Generally, MAP provides 50%-70% of eligible project costs, depending on the component, assuming that the balance of funding can be obtained from other sources.
- *Timing:* MAP projects can be carried out over several fiscal years.
- *Program Delivery:* Program authority for MAP rests with the Citizenship and Heritage Sector of the Department of Canadian Heritage (National Headquarters). With MAP co-managed between the regions and headquarters, it is principally a regionally-delivered program. Annual operational costs for program administration at headquarters are modest.²⁰
- *Application Process:* MAP applicants are encouraged to discuss their proposals with regional staff in advance of the submission deadline date. The Departmental regional museum consultant applies the program criteria to determine eligibility of applicants and projects and assists in the development and preparation of submissions by explaining the program criteria and objectives and by providing feedback on submissions.

¹⁷ Generally, these include art galleries, historic sites and other heritage bodies. It is this broad range of organizations we refer to when we use the term *museums*.

¹⁸ Officially, these objectives are stated somewhat differently, as "...to increase access by Canadians to their heritage; to better preserve significant and representative heritage collections; and to enhance excellence in Canadian museum activities" (from MAP file documents).

¹⁹ Adapted from the *Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework*.

²⁰ No estimates of regional costs (including staff time utilization) were available as of the writing of this report.

- *Peer Review Panel:* Most elements of MAP include a peer review process whereby proposals are presented to a peer review committee composed of museum professionals with a range of disciplines and expertise. Peer review committees are nominated each year by regional staff and selected by headquarters personnel. These professionals evaluate each project according to quality and feasibility criteria set out by MAP, and they rank each submission on its museological merits. MAP staff use this ranking as a tool for drafting recommendations to the Minister.
- *Approval Process:* Recommendations for approval (and notifications of unsuccessful applications) are approved at the executive level within the regions or headquarters as appropriate. Recommended applications are sent to the Minister of the Department of Canadian Heritage for approval before the applicant receives notice of successful/non-successful application.
- *Overall Timing:* Applications must be received by the Department by November 1 of each year. The peer review committee is generally convened during the month of January and Departmental staff are expected to complete the recommendation process by the following March. This process is structured to support completion of the decision-making process early in the following year.
- *Resources:* MAP has authority for expenditures of up to \$9.4 million in grants and contributions, of which a total of \$8.4 million is allocated to grants and \$1 million to contributions, with no set limit for individual projects or applicants. While annual spending estimates have been relatively constant (\$7.4 million each year from 1994-1998; \$9.4 million from 1999-present), a variety of factors influence the budget process on an annual MAP grant run, and variations may occur.
- *Award Rate:* In 1999-2000, the "success" ratio (number of requests approved out of all applicants received for each component) was about 66%.
- *Overall Funding:* Actual approval levels vary each year taking into account commitments made in previous years. In 1999-2000, projects valued at over \$8.6 million were approved, compared to approximately \$9.7 million in 1998-1999.²¹ These grant levels compare to grants of about \$13 million in 1993-9 (the time of the last evaluation). During the period after 1984, MAP operated with variable budgets, for example \$15.5 million in 1990-91, with reductions to \$13.5 million in 1993-94 and less than \$10 million during the period of program review. MAP expenditures in 1999-2000 were less than two-thirds of the value of expenditures for MAP in 1993-1994.
- *Flexibility in Funding:* The budget has funds to address emerging priorities throughout the year (usually between \$500,000-\$700,000), and a reserve fund to address priority initiatives by National Service Organizations (approximately \$200,000).
- *Allocation of Funds:* MAP does not have a specific allocation formula for the division of grants and contributions funding between the three components of the program. The actual allocation for each component in any given year depends on demand, the peer review process, and the recommendations of regional staff.

²¹ This includes \$1.5 million provided in 1999 to help museums adjust to MAP's new orientation.

Characteristics of the MAP Components: Some characteristics of the MAP components (types of activities, funding success rates, etc.) are as follows:

Access and National Outreach (ANO): The ANO component was designed to connect different geographic regions of the country by assisting museums to reflect the nation's cultural diversity. This is accomplished by funding museum projects that develop and circulate travelling exhibitions and programs and products beyond local or provincial audiences. Typical ANO projects include: travelling exhibitions, new media initiatives, presentations of special educational or interpretative activities, and professional exchanges. By supporting these types of projects, MAP encourages partnerships, exchanges of information and dialogue between museums and their personnel. Funding is provided through two sub-components: the National Outreach Initiative; and the Exhibition Circulation Fund²² which covers up to 70% of eligible costs.

Applications for ANO component funding are reviewed against criteria by regional staff to ensure eligibility. In 1999-2000, the "success" ratio for this component (i.e., the number of applications approved as a percentage of total applications) was 72% for the Access and National Outreach sub-component. National Outreach Initiative project approvals totalled \$6.2 million in 1998-1999 and \$5.2 million in 1999-2000; the Exhibition Circulation Fund received \$42,000 in 1998-1999 and \$35,000 in 1999-2000.

Aboriginal Museum Development (AMD): The AMD component assists Aboriginal organizations to preserve their cultural heritage and increase and facilitate public understanding of the diverse cultures of Aboriginal peoples. Funding is provided for feasibility studies and other projects that encourage development of museums or cultural facilities in Aboriginal communities.

This component also supports partnerships between First Nations communities and established non-Aboriginal museums.²³ MAP can cover up to 70% of eligible costs. Applications are reviewed against criteria by regional staff to ensure eligibility. In 1999-2000, the success ratio for the AMD component was 64%. Funding awards totalled \$1.3 million in 1999 and \$1.5 million in 1999-2000.

Organizational Development (OD) Component: This component assists museums and their employees to attain professional standards in areas such as collections care and personnel development. It also aims to strengthen the economic stability of museums through support for projects to maximize human resource potential of staff, volunteers and trustees, and to ensure long-term conservation, preservation or management of collection resources in museums. Eligible projects include planning and feasibility studies, development of marketing and development strategies, and strategic planning initiatives. MAP can cover up to 50% of eligible costs.²⁴ In the OD component, submissions are assessed by regional staff, usually with consultative processes which may include a regional peer review panels. In 1999-2000, the success ratio was 67% for the OD component. The total value of OD project funding was over \$1.9 million in both 1998-1999 and 1999-2000.

²² The exhibit circulation funding option covers the borrower's fees and transportation costs of an exhibit. It is open to institutions with an annual budget up to and including \$1,000,000 and provides 50% funding of the borrower's exhibition fee, rental, transportation or similar cost, to a maximum of \$ 5,000 per grant, once annually.

²³ This component also supports other initiatives that are not necessarily related to other MAP components.

²⁴ Typical co-funders of MAP projects include: *federal departments and agencies* such as Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC) who fund the Summer Career Placement, and Young Canada Works; Indian and Northern Affairs, Industry Canada, agencies such as FEDNOR; *provincial agencies* such as the Ministère des Régions (Québec); and the Ministère de la Culture et des Communications du Québec; and other organizations such as First Nations, foundations, companies and unions.

3. The Evaluation Methodology

3.1 OVERVIEW OF THE EVALUATION METHOD

The evaluation of MAP addressed broad evaluation objectives (relevance, success, design and delivery, performance monitoring and cost-effectiveness), and specific questions.. The evaluation included methods that were identified by the Department in its *Results-based Management Accountability Framework for MAP*.²⁵ Specifically:

- **Key Informant Interviews:** (In-person or telephone) interviews were conducted with 12 representatives of museums, museum associations and the Department of Canadian Heritage to obtain background information and insights on the evaluation issues.
- **A Census Survey of 1998-1999 MAP Applicants:**²⁶ A survey (hereafter referred to as the *museum survey*) was sent by fax to all museums that applied to MAP in 1998-1999 to obtain their perspectives on the program from successful and non-successful applicants. The data presented in this report are based on 166 completed surveys (a response rate of over 80%).
- **A Survey of National, Provincial and Other Museum Associations:** A survey of national, provincial and other major museum associations was conducted by fax to complement information obtained from key informant interviews. Half the museum associations provided a response (most of the others responded to the applicant survey).
- **An Exit Survey of Museum Visitors:** In Fall 2001, visitors to 26 MAP-funded exhibits at 22 museums in regions of Canada that hosted MAP-funded travelling exhibits were surveyed. The questionnaires asked for visitors' assessment of the exhibits supported by MAP and the importance of federal support for Canadian museums. Exit survey data in this report are based on responses from 748 museum visitors. The exhibits included projects dealing with historical events (e.g. *Re-Shaping Memory, Owning History: Through the Lens of the Japanese Canadian Redress*); crafts and industry (e.g. *Matting Season: Hooked Rugs of the Grenfell Mission*); Aboriginal culture (e.g. *Nitsitapiisinni: The Blackfoot Way of Life*); science (e.g. *Magnesium: Metal of the Future*); social issues (e.g. *Stolen Dreams: Portraits of the World's Working Children*); and regional life (e.g. *Lifelines: Canada's East Coast Fisheries*).

²⁵ *Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework for the Museums Assistance Program*, Corporate Review Branch, Portfolio and Corporate Affairs Sector, Department of Canadian Heritage, July 4, 2001.

²⁶ Applicants were mostly museums, but included associations and a wide range of cultural bodies, such as art galleries, historic sites and other venues).

Case Studies: Twelve MAP-funded projects by nine museums across Canada were identified by the Department for in-depth case studies. Case studies examined MAP "on-the-ground" in the museum/heritage community in Canada to evaluate direct outcomes. Case studies included:

Access and National Outreach (three projects): a First Nations exhibit describing traditional economies in nature; a project to aid the development of low-cost travelling exhibits for community museums; and a travelling exhibit showcasing one artist's work.

Aboriginal Museum Development (three projects): a project chronicling a First Nation's tradition and history; a project replicating nineteenth century habitats; and a project cataloguing and presenting a photographic history of Aboriginal people in one community.

Organizational Development (six projects): a project to make better use the Internet; a project to develop funding tools and strategies; a research project; a project to develop storage systems; a project to improve partnerships and collaboration between museums; and a project to re-design a museum's space.

Case studies included projects from all regions (for reasons of confidentiality, names of projects and organizations are not provided).

A Review of Literature and MAP Documentation: A brief review of current academic and professional literature regarding the heritage interests of Canadians and the role the federal government in addressing them was conducted. Documents reviewed included MAP guidelines and application forms, a sample of files and project proposals, and descriptions of assessment criteria and processes, including the peer review process. Policy papers and the last evaluation of MAP were also reviewed.

- International Comparisons: International programs similar to MAP were examined in the United States, the United Kingdom, and a number of other countries. This review was conducted via the Internet and telephone.

Regional MAP Staff Workshop: A one-day workshop with a number of MAP regional consultants was held in Ottawa in January 2002 to discuss MAP's relevance, success, and design and delivery issues.

3.2 STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE METHODOLOGY

Strengths of the Methodology: Multiple data sources were a strength of the evaluation. Key informant interviews focused on individuals who have first-hand knowledge of MAP and museums, and surveys provided perspective on MAP’s value to museums and museum visitors. The survey of museum applicants achieved a good response rate and good data quality was evidenced by the statistical reliability of specific survey questions.²⁷

Limitations of the evaluation methodology: Although multiple lines of inquiry provided a useful assessment of MAP, there were some key limitations,²⁸ among them:

- *The evaluation did not seek input from museums that were eligible, but did not apply for, MAP funds.* As a result, the extent to which MAP is known to all museums, and the extent to which there were obstacles that prevented some museums from applying, could not be assessed. This also reduced the evaluators’ ability to measure cost-effectiveness and reach of the program.
- *The evaluation did not seek input from participants in the peer review process, regional stakeholders who help set regional MAP priorities, or representatives of other funding programs for museums.* Not interviewing other funders of may have limited the contextual discussion in the evaluation.
- *Canadian Heritage MAP databases contained little data.* Little or no cost-benefit or change data was available to assess MAP's effects to date or to compare components. With the institution of ongoing performance monitoring, as proposed in the RMAF, this situation is expected to change, and suggestions are provided within on ways to enhance data-gathering in the future.

3.3 DATA PRESENTATION

Presentation: The evaluators’ conclusions regarding each issue have been reached using data from the evaluation’s research components including surveys, interviews and case studies. Statistics are presented in text format, usually indicating key indicators such as the percentage of museums or visitors providing positive ratings of particular aspects of the program. Illustrative quotes from museum representatives and visitors, usually shown in *italics*, are included, and brief summary discussions are provided at the end of each section.

²⁷ An assessment of reliability of questions in the applicants and visitors surveys indicated good reliabilities (Cronbach's Alpha of .8 or higher). Cronbach's Alpha is an indicator of statistical reliability commonly used to test surveys scales or indicators. It is computed as the average inter-item correlation for all possible items in a scale, where 0 = no consistency and 1 = perfect consistency. A score of .7 or better is usually regarded as satisfactory in social science studies.

²⁸ Some limitations were minor, for example, the fact that no case studies examined the Exhibit Circulation Fund.

4. Relevance of MAP

Overview: This section examines MAP's relevance to the Department of Canadian Heritage strategic objectives. It also examines more specific relevance issues identified in MAP's Results-based Management and Accountability Framework.

4.1 HERITAGE INTERESTS OF CANADIANS

Heritage Interests of the Public and Museum Visitors: The evaluation relied on two data sources to draw an overall picture of heritage interests of Canadians: an Arts and Heritage Participation Survey, conducted by Environics Research Group in 2000,²⁹ and the evaluation's own Exit Survey of Museum Visitors.

The Arts and Heritage Participation Survey: This major national survey suggested that a high proportion of Canadians visit cultural heritage institutions such as museums. The survey estimated that 62% of Canadians had visited a historic site within the last five years, 59% had visited a museum (including science centres), and 41% had visited a public art gallery.

The survey found that Canadians visit heritage institutions for leisure, while travelling, and while on vacation.³⁰ In addition, the survey revealed that the desire to visit cultural heritage institutions influences the choice of travel or vacation destinations, underlining the link between culture and tourism. Nearly half of Canadians who visited cultural heritage institutions indicated they did so to learn; 40% said that they visited these institutions to be entertained or to relax/enjoy themselves; and 33% were interested in seeing a specific place, a well-known work or artefact, or something new or different. Importantly, since the survey found that cultural and heritage activities increase through middle-age years and peak between the ages of 45 and 65,³¹ and since the Canadian population is ageing, public use of cultural and heritage centres has potential to increase in the future.

Exit Survey of Museum Visitors: The survey of visitors to MAP-funded exhibits found that visitors attach great significance to heritage cultural institutions, and specifically to MAP-funded exhibits. Visitor ratings of MAP exhibits were high overall, with all exhibits receiving a positive rating of 78% or more. "*Exhibits on Canada's cultural heritage*" were most favourably rated with 89% of visitors rating them as important or very important. "*Exhibits from other provinces and territories*" were rated positively by 78% of visitors.

²⁹ Environics Research Group Limited, *Arts and Heritage Participation Survey*, prepared for the Department of Canadian Heritage, September, 2000.

³⁰ The survey indicated that 35% visit cultural heritage institutions locally as a leisure activity; 24% while travelling or away on vacation; and 41% make both types of visits. Among those who visited heritage institutions infrequently or not at all, lack of time and interest were the two main reasons given, along with expense and lack of accessibility and availability.

³¹ See: C. Cameron, "Cultural Tourism: Landmine or Gold mine?" (<http://crm.cr.nps.gov/archive/17-3/17-3-15.pdf>).

Museum visitors strongly endorsed federal support for travelling exhibits. When asked whether they thought it was a good idea for the Government of Canada to provide funding for exhibits such as the ones they had just seen, 93% answered “Yes.” Many museum visitors indicated that travelling exhibits allow museums to present more interesting and diversified programs. As one museum visitor noted: “*Our local museum needs an overhaul; every time we come here, we see the same exhibits. Travelling exhibits offer something new.*”

Interestingly, the *Arts and Heritage Participation Survey*³² found that a sizeable proportion of Canadians visit cultural heritage institutions while travelling or on vacation. These findings suggest that the Department may be able to achieve its strategic goal of connecting Canadians, at least in part, without making exhibits travel but by improving exhibits in high tourism areas.

Public Views on the Federal Government's Support for Museums: The 2000 Arts and Heritage Participation Survey indicated that most Canadians place great value on preservation and presentation of their history and cultural heritage and on Canada's role in supporting this: 59% strongly endorsed the importance of “*Preserving Canada's heritage if we are to remain distinct as a country.*” Additionally, 57% strongly agreed with the statement,³³ “*governments have a responsibility to present Canada's cultural heritage.*”³⁴

The majority of visitors to MAP-funded exhibits (90%) also endorsed the role of the federal government in supporting museums. When asked: “*What is the most important thing the Government of Canada can do to assist museums to help Canadians to understand their history and heritage?*” the majority of respondents indicated that federal funding is important.³⁵ Visitors also supported MAP activities such as the exchange of exhibits, Aboriginal exhibits, and multicultural exhibits.³⁶

Analysis: The evaluators view the above findings -- in particular on Canadians' strong agreement with federal support to heritage institutions -- as reaffirming MAP's relevance. As well, the public's interest in visiting museums was seen as highly consistent with MAP's objective of enhancing the awareness, understanding and enjoyment of Canadian heritage.

³² Environics Research Group Limited, *Arts and Heritage Participation Survey*, prepared for the Department of Canadian Heritage, September, 2000.

³³ The other statements were: “It is important to preserve Canada's historic and heritage buildings” (69% strongly agreed); and “Canada's history and heritage are sources of pride for you” (60% strongly agreed).

³⁴ Supporting minority heritage was rated lower, with 4 in 10 Canadians (43%) strongly agreeing that “*it is important to assist Canada's Aboriginal population to preserve their heritage,*” and 37% strongly agreeing that “*it is important to assist Canada's ethnic groups to preserve their cultural heritage.*”

³⁵ Nearly 40% suggested more or continued funding to museums and over 10% suggested supporting programs and activities targeting children and youth. Other activities suggested included field trips to museums, incorporating heritage into the curriculum of schools and supporting joint projects with museums, and designing child-friendly exhibits. Other suggestions included supporting the promotional and publicity efforts of museums to make their collections and permanent and temporary exhibits known; supporting TV programs and documentary series on Canada's heritage; and raising the public's awareness of museum collections through national campaigns.

³⁶ Supporting more widespread access to museums through reduced or free admission was also suggested by many visitors to MAP exhibits.

4.2 THE OVERALL ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN ADDRESSING HERITAGE INTERESTS OF THE CANADIAN PUBLIC

MAP's and the Department's Strategic Objectives: Although there are other federal programs that can assist museums, MAP has a unique role in relation to heritage. MAP contributes to Canadian Heritage's strategic objectives in a number of ways.³⁷ For example, MAP *fosters and strengthens connections among Canadians and deepens understanding across diverse communities* by promoting and supporting inter-regional activities such as travelling exhibitions, electronic outreach, and national symposia.

MAP also *promotes the creation, dissemination and preservation of diverse Canadian cultural works, stories and symbols reflective of our past and expressive of our values and aspirations* by supporting museum activities and Canadian content development, and promoting a better understanding of Canadian history, identity and symbols. MAP also *fosters access to and participation in Canada's cultural life, and it builds capacity in museums and in the museum workforce*. It also promotes excellence in people, through support for professional development through the Canadian Museum Association and provincial/territorial museum associations, national conferences, etc. The emphasis is on promoting awareness and ensuring access to heritage across regions access to heritage materials and experiences in both official languages, and supporting cultural diversity. These MAP roles underline the program's relevance.³⁸

However, museums would like greater input into decisions about what MAP should support. This view is illustrated by the following comments from one museum official: *"The Government of Canada can provide support to museums to improve what they do. It can elevate the importance and relevance of museums in the public eye. It can improve the link between education and museums so that students are aware of Canadian culture and heritage... It can educate the market for museums, co-sponsor museum development with other levels of government. [But] It can stop thinking that museums can be replaced by computers... [and] it should stop telling museums what they should do. Museums already know what culture and heritage are..."*

Analysis: The overall evidence of MAP's relevance indicates that MAP is highly relevant to the Department's strategic objectives and valued by museums, and that a strong federal role in this area is valued by the Canadian public. However, examination of the federal government's role reveals that somewhat different views are held by museums. This difference in views may indicate a need for improved communications and understanding between the Department and its museum constituency.

³⁷ Heritage Policy Branch, Canadian Heritage (June 16, 2001). Museums Assistance Program, Connecting Canadians to Heritage Collections.

³⁸ Relevance of MAP was further underlined by international comparisons, which suggest that similar programs operate in a number of Canada's peer countries, especially in the UK and Australia.

4.3 RELEVANCE OF MAP'S COMPONENTS

Overview: A number of themes emerged regarding MAP's relevance, as well as a number of common strengths and weaknesses of MAP components. With only minor variations, findings from the museums survey indicated a high level of support for the federal government's role regarding specific MAP activities. For example, a federal role in *"the assistance to museums and related organizations in the preservation/ conservation of Canada's cultural heritage"* was endorsed almost unanimously (by 96% of respondents). Other roles were also strongly endorsed, for example, support for *"the development and enhancement of professional standards and expertise"* (endorsed by 79% of museums).

Relevance of the ANO Component: 84% of museums rated federal support for *"exhibits which contributes to the appreciation of Canada's many cultures"* as important and 81% rated the federal role as important regarding *"circulation of exhibits between provinces"*. Demand for ANO was also substantial, indicating that this component of MAP is highly active.³⁹

The key argument for the continued relevance of this component is economic. Without ANO funding, many travelling exhibit projects could not be undertaken. By helping cover costs, ANO provides an incentive to overcome the reluctance of some museums to circulate objects.⁴⁰ Relevance of ANO is also underlined by its uniqueness; no other national program provides financial support for funds to travelling exhibits and at the provincial level, only Quebec has a program similar to the ANO component. Additionally, it is apparent from the museum survey that ANO-type projects would not be undertaken without ANO funding.⁴¹

Continued Relevance of the AMD Component: The evaluation findings indicated a high degree of relevance for the AMD component. This was evidenced, for example, in the survey of museums, where the federal government's role in supporting *"preservation and presentation of Aboriginal cultures"* was rated important by 84% of responding museums. Relevance of the AMD component was also reflected in the high number of applications for this component in 1999-2000.⁴²

³⁹ However, between 1999 and 2000, the number of applications and the amounts requested and approved declined slightly.

⁴⁰ This reluctance is due in part to concerns about the wear-and-tear on objects and in part to the fact that many museums do not see travelling exhibitions as a priority. ANO funding ensures resources for good handling and other protective measures.

⁴¹ Among National Outreach Initiative applications which were not funded by MAP in 1999, only about 20% were fully implemented. Among Exhibition Circulation Fund applications which were not funded by MAP, about 33% were fully implemented. Note that museum take-up for this funding option was quite low in 1999, which is addressed in the design and delivery discussion in Section 4. Similarly, evaluation case studies indicated that, for 3 out of 4 ANO cases, projects would not have been realized without MAP funding. As for the fourth project -- a very ambitious travelling exhibit -- MAP funding was seen as an important element of the total federal government's contribution to its realization.

⁴² From 1999 to 2000, the number of applications submitted increased substantially, the number of applications approved increased slightly, the number of dollars requested increased substantially, while the amounts approved increased slightly.

Aboriginal Views on the Relevance of AMD: The continued relevance of the AMD component was evident in reports from Aboriginal museums. It was generally reported that Aboriginal heritage would not have been preserved to the extent that it has been had it not been for this component and the financial support it provided. Aboriginal heritage organizations reported that they require ongoing financial support for the presentation and preservation of their cultural heritage due to a scarcity of funds within First Nations.

Obstacles to AMD Utilization: On reserves, priority is more likely to be placed on the construction of roads and sewage systems than on the construction or development of museums. In addition, a museum based on the European model is not a part of Aboriginal culture, where there is more likely to be a focus on language preservation and oral traditions. Geography was also seen as amplifying needs. As one respondent noted: *"...First Nations in our province need assistance and resources to undertake museum development and cultural presentation in an organized manner as a 'collective' group because our communities are dispersed throughout the province."*

Relevance of MAP was evident in the three AMD case studies, which demonstrated that MAP funding was and is required to preserve and present the cultural heritage of Aboriginal peoples. In two of three case studies, results indicated that the projects would not have gotten off the ground without MAP funding. Another case study project would have been undertaken, but MAP funding was necessary to ensure a high quality production.

Aboriginal respondents indicated that the AMD component helps to return collections to Aboriginal organizations and communities. As the recipient of one AMD funding award noted: *"Funding for our [repatriation project] has helped redress the wrongs of the past." The need for such projects will likely increase, as there is increased awareness of the American Aboriginal Repatriation Legislation and of initiatives for repatriation of Aboriginal material in Canada and in Australia.*⁴³

It was noted that the AMD component helps Aboriginal communities improve their museological expertise so that they can more effectively become repositories for their own heritage, and assists Aboriginal museums to develop partnerships with other museums. As well, AMD was seen as helping to develop community pride among Aboriginal people and aiding the revival, retention and preservation of their heritage. AMD was also seen as valuable in assisting Aboriginal communities to educate non-Aboriginal people about Aboriginal history.

Continued Relevance of the OD Component: The relevance of OD projects was strongly endorsed by museums: 88% rated federal support for *"effective management of collections"* as important; and 79% of museums rated federal support for the *"development and enhancement of professional standards and expertise"* as important.

⁴³ The absence of a policy on repatriation was identified in the course of the case studies as an important factor in the relevance of AMD.

Indicators of Relevance: High utilization of the OD component was seen by the evaluators as an important indicator of relevance. In 1999-2000, 121 applications were received for OD projects for professional development and for strengthening the economic stability of institutions. More than half were approved, for a grants total of approximately \$2 million.⁴⁴

The continued relevance of this component is further indicated by museum reports that OD projects contribute to sustainable programs by strengthening professional skills and reinforcing care of collections, so that investments from previous years will not be undermined. Indeed, many cultural institutions (mainly art galleries and small museums), can only apply to the OD component. Relevance is also suggested by the positive reports on collections preservation, the very foundation of museums. For some museums, the OD component is their only funding source for collection preservation. MAP applicants indicated that more than 75% of MAP projects not approved for funding from the OD component were cancelled, postponed or reduced.⁴⁵

Additionally, OD funding from MAP since 1972 was reported by many museums to have been instrumental in making museology a recognized profession, improving professional standards, and encouraging professional training. It was noted that, in the 1960's, few universities offered museology programs, but now such programs are offered across Canada. A number of museums emphasized that many small institutions would not be where they are today in terms of professional standards without MAP. They also said that MAP has contributed to the establishment of new museum positions.

Relevance of MAP was further indicated by an international comparison, which illustrated that in countries such as the UK, Australia, and New Zealand, programs similar to MAP were relatively common.

Analysis: All of the evaluation data sources indicate that current levels of MAP funding for OD are insufficient to support all of the organizational development needs of museums. Evaluation findings also suggest that other MAP activities would have been adversely affected without this component. As one key informant indicated: *"This component is, in a way, a balancing act with travelling exhibits: you would be building travelling exhibits on a house of cards without it."*

⁴⁴ Between 1999 and 2000, the number of applications requested and approved has remained constant, but the amount requested has decreased by about 20%.

⁴⁵ However, the OD case studies did not result in a clear indication of the need for MAP funding as was observed for the ANO and AMD components. This was particularly true for case study projects under the category "planning and feasibility studies, marketing and development strategies, and strategic planning initiatives."

4.4 CONCLUSIONS: RELEVANCE OF MAP AND ITS COMPONENTS

Overview: Evaluation findings suggest that MAP addresses the most important heritage interests of Canadians, museums and the Department. Each component was found to be relevant in meeting specific needs or supporting aspects of the museum system as a whole.

There are indications, however, that interests of the Department and museums do not always converge. This is particularly true of the ANO and the OD components. MAP's continued relevance is also diminished by factors beyond MAP's control -- particularly by inadequate funding for museums' basic elements of collection care, temporary and permanent exhibits and day-to-day operations. These are all key components that museums have to have in place before specific projects which fall within the scope of MAP criteria can be considered or mounted. These findings point to a possible need for MAP to aid museums in better meeting basic needs to provide a sound environment for the mounting of MAP-type projects.

The museum survey suggested that changes in MAP priorities have weakened the sense of partnership the museum community feels with the Department. Many museums expressed the view that the Department does not recognize the contribution of museums or extend its fullest efforts to assist the museum community with conservation and education. As one museum noted: *"MAP's approach to the community has not felt co-operative or empowering. It feels like we are working for MAP, not with MAP"*. These findings further suggest a need to improve communications between the Department and the museum community.

5. Objectives Achievement by MAP

5.1 ACHIEVEMENT OF MAP OBJECTIVES

Indicators of Success From Museums: The evaluation data indicated that overall, MAP is making progress towards the achievement of its objectives. Indeed, much of the evidence collected was extremely positive. For example, considering museums' assessments of success, the most positively rated aspect was *"MAP has assisted the development of Canadian museums since the 1970s,"* with 80% of museums indicating that this objective has being met "to some extent" or "to a large extent."

Other assessments were also positive with high ratings being given to the AMD component and *"its assistance to First Nations communities/groups in establishing partnerships and projects with established museums"* (rated positively by 72% of museums), and *"assisting in retention, preservation, conservation and presentation of the cultural heritage of Aboriginal people"* (rated positively by 66% of museums).

Indicators of success for the OD component were also favourable. For example, museums gave positive assessments to *"the development of museums through planning and feasibility studies"* (67% rated positive), followed by *"assistance in the effective long-term management of collections"* (64% positive), and *"assistance in the professional development of staff, volunteers and trustees"* (53% positive). Museum survey respondents suggested that impacts on Canadians were also positive with MAP rated as *"helping Canadians to learn and understand more about each other through better access to heritage, identifying history and symbols"* by 63% of responding museums for the National Outreach Initiative and by 61% for the Exhibition Circulation Fund.

Indicators of Success from the Visitor Survey: The evaluation results indicated that the level of appreciation of map-funded exhibits by museum visitors was very positive and achieved results important to the Department. When asked if they agreed that the MAP exhibit they had visited helped them *"gain a better understanding or knowledge about Canada's history or heritage,"* 63% of visitors agreed to some or to a large extent and 75% agreed that they *"gained increased understanding about the subject, culture or region presented in the exhibit"*.⁴⁶

Discussion: Based mainly on the survey data, the evaluators concluded that MAP activities have been relatively successful in meeting the Department's objective of *"promoting the creation, dissemination and preservation of diverse Canadian cultural works, stories and symbols reflective of our past and expressive of our values and aspirations"* and also in developing museums organizationally and professionally. Museum and visitor ratings also demonstrated that MAP exhibits have contributed to meeting MAP's objective of *"enhancing awareness, understanding and enjoyment of heritage among Canadians."*⁴⁷ As is seen below, this success was indicated for specific projects, particularly in the evaluation case studies.

⁴⁶ These ratings are considered by the evaluators to be particularly positive in light of the fact that not all MAP exhibits were focused on Canadian heritage -- some were focused on science and technology or international topics.

⁴⁷ Interestingly, the origin of the exhibit (whether it was from another province or not) did not, in and of itself, have any significant impact on the visitors understanding of the subject, culture or region presented in the exhibit.

5.2 SUCCESS OF MAP PROJECTS

Overview: Overall, the evaluation data suggested a good degree of success for individual projects. Museum applicants for example, rated the MAP projects very positively with 58% of MAP projects considered Fully Successful, 36% Partially Successful, and only 2% considered Not Successful at All. Asked “On what do you base your assessment [of the success of your MAP projects?]”, museums reported that their assessments of project success were based mostly on whether projects were completed and whether they were completed within budget.

Success of ANO Projects: The evaluation indicated a variety of positive results for ANO projects, based on evidence from museum reports, case studies and other data sources.

Reports by Museums: ANO projects were generally rated "very successful" by museums. Only 3% were rated "not successful at all." Success assessments were almost as high for sub-components, with only 4% of National Outreach projects and 6% of Exhibition Circulation projects considered not "successful at all." Museums based their assessments of the success of ANO projects on factors such as attendance, visitor comments, press coverage, the number of sites the exhibits travelled to, whether the project was completed as planned, and whether the project met its budget target.

Over and above these indicators, ANO projects were reported to have had other positive impacts, including: increasing community support for the museum (as travelling exhibits, both their production and the exchange of exhibits stimulate attendance and interest in the museum); helping museums develop new partnerships; helping museums develop networks; assisting museums in developing new contacts; identifying expertise; providing museums with cross-Canada exposure; and aiding the development of new tools for use by small museums.

Case Study Indications of Success: Case studies of ANO projects illustrated other positive impacts, for example, one project provided national visibility to a regional artist. Several projects were seen as promoting better understanding of Canada’s diverse heritage across the country.⁴⁸ Other project benefits were identified as having helped to improve professional skills in smaller museums, stimulating other local initiatives, developing innovative techniques for travelling exhibit presentation, and building community pride (with positive spin-offs, for example, in tourism).

Obstacles to Success: Museums whose projects were not successful reported difficulties in promoting their projects to other museums. One such difficulty was that some exhibits do not “sell” well across cultures and provinces. For example, a highly successful western Canadian exhibit did not find “takers” east of Ontario, and a Quebec exhibit could not find a host museum in English Canada, even though the exhibit had been very popular locally.

⁴⁸ Results suggest that the exchange of exhibits alone contributes to this objective, and that the subject matter of the exhibit is only part of the contribution by which this objective is met.

Other concerns noted were that not enough museums in Canada can house some specialized exhibits such as anthropology exhibits, and space requirements can make it difficult to find host museums. Other challenges reported by museums included overestimates of attendance targets and underestimates of maintenance and travelling costs.⁴⁹

Museums identified a number of other obstacles that hindered their use of the ANO component. One was the limited capacity of museums to support travelling exhibits. Many museums reported having important major unmet needs with respect to preservation of their own collections and maintenance of their infrastructures. In some cases, needs were reported to be so great that undertaking the types of projects ANO can support may become impossible.

Another obstacle was the unpredictability of circulating exhibits. Of the four case studies involving travelling exhibits, only two travelled as planned. A number of factors accounted for this. Cost was one, but the fit between supply and demand and the timeliness of the exhibit were often reported as obstacles to greater circulation. In this vein, the capacity of MAP travelling exhibits to attract visitors was reported to be changeable and uncertain.

Museums also reported that failure or limited success of projects can result in severe financial losses for museums⁵⁰ This suggests that originating museums assume significant risk in initiating travelling exhibits. For example, there were unexpected costs for some museums because of the time taken by the Department to consider applications and the related funding uncertainties for host museums. As one museum representative commented: *“We had to bear the brunt of the deficit (additional storage costs, hiring someone to find other host museums and unrealized revenues) because the museums that had committed themselves to host the exhibit did not get the funding they needed.”*

Limits in ANO Reach: In the four travelling exhibit case studies, it was found that despite their quality (evidenced by media coverage, visitor comments and exit surveys), the reach (and thus objectives achievement) was unequal. For example, one provincial museum exhibit was very successful and was accepted by five galleries in three provinces. In other cases, reach was limited by transportation costs.⁵¹

Visitors' Evaluations of ANO Exhibits: Over 20 MAP exhibits (mostly inter-provincial travelling exhibits) were evaluated by museum visitors and were generally rated very positively. Ratings of *good to excellent* were reported by 85.6% of museum visitors. Only 3.8% of visitors rated ANO exhibits as *poor* or *very poor*.

⁴⁹ A number of museums in the survey indicated that MAP itself may underestimate these costs.

⁵⁰ Some museums also returned their MAP funds, for example, because a host could not be found for the exhibit.

⁵¹ One regional museum exhibit was reported to be very successful in its region, with 54 bookings in three provinces. However, they received no bookings east of their province. Two provincial museums did not manage to find hosts for their exhibits in Canada at all. One exhibit is still offered for circulation; one has since been withdrawn.

The vast majority of museum visitors (84%) indicated that they *"enjoyed the exhibit"*, *"enjoyed objects presented in the exhibit"* (82%); *"would recommend the exhibit to a friend"* (80%), and *"gained increased understanding of the subject, culture or region"* (75%). Positive, but somewhat lower ratings were given to the statements: *"I enjoyed the variety of presentations used in the exhibit such as films, sounds, photography, computers"* (70% and *"I gained a better understanding or knowledge about Canada's history or heritage"* (63%).

When visitors were asked what they particularly liked about the travelling exhibits, most said they appreciated the overall experience and viewing the original objects and artefacts. What visitors most disliked was poor quality of information (not enough, too much, not sufficiently accessible) and the lack of brochures. Suggestions for improvement included presenting original objects instead of reproductions.

Success of AMD Projects: The evaluation data indicated that AMD projects were very successful. AMD projects had the highest proportion of projects rated "fully successful" (73%) by museums. However, AMD museums also reported the highest proportion as "not successful at all" (9%). While the percentage of "not successful" projects was modest, it suggests that Aboriginal museums face challenges in achieving their goals.

Success indicators for AMD projects were similar to ANO projects and OD projects (as discussed below). Aboriginal museums evaluated the level of success of their projects based upon whether the project was completed as planned, attendance, visitor comments, and staying within budget.

Case Study Indications of AMD Success: The evaluation data indicated that the impacts of AMD involve not only heritage preservation and presentation but also Aboriginal community development. According to Aboriginal museums and partners, impacts of MAP-funded projects included: improved understanding about Canada's Aboriginal peoples; a contribution to the preservation of Aboriginal artefacts; facilitation of the donation/loan of artefacts (repatriation, loan and donations from elders); supporting the acquisition of professional skills; and the development of the infrastructures to help Aboriginal museums meet conservation standards.

Additionally, case study results indicated that MAP projects aid in: reviving cultures through the recognition of Aboriginal history and the rediscovery of traditional skills and knowledge that was in danger of being lost. It was also noted that passing traditions on to new generations and showcasing Aboriginal cultures as living and dynamic and in their context resulted from AMD projects. Developing communities by contributing to cultural pride, job creation, and tourism; developing partnerships with non-Aboriginal museums; and increasing international exposure were additional impacts.

Obstacles to AMD Utilization: Several obstacles to the use of the AMD component were, however, reported by AMD applicants and key informants.⁵² One was differing views on the role and objectives of the AMD Component. Views varied from the need to play an advocacy and developmental role, to the need to play a supporting role (as with non-Aboriginal museums).

⁵² Key informants noted the existence of many similar funding programs. Although not identified in detail, a variety of other public funding sources were reported to exist for AMD-type projects. As one Canadian Heritage respondent noted: *"we find out about new things everyday."*

The need for infrastructure was seen as key to Aboriginal cultural institutions. Aboriginal museums and key informants emphasized that support may be required for the construction of museum buildings in communities where there is currently no place to store or present artefacts. This perspective came from the workshop with regional consultants and the findings from case studies.

Differences in outlook on heritage were also noted. For example, while the mainstream museum community is more likely to focus on objects to present cultural heritage, many Aboriginal respondents noted that Aboriginal peoples attach more value to the preservation of tradition than the preservation of objects.

Though evaluation data indicate that AMD projects were generally successful, some experienced significant difficulties. For example, some Aboriginal museums reported financial losses related to MAP-funded projects. In some cases, the losses were reported to set back the museums' development. As one museum respondent noted: *"we incurred important cost overruns because of MAP delays and because our partner could not come through"*.

Success of OD Projects: The evaluation data generally indicated that OD projects were successful in achieving their goals, and that they had positive results a number of areas. For example, OD projects were generally considered successful by museums with 57% of OD projects considered *"fully successful"*; 40% considered *"partially successful"*; and 3% considered *"not successful at all"*.

Museums generally assessed the success of their OD projects on the quality of output and factors such as business plans, strategic plans, marketing plans, participants' feedback (i.e., at training sessions), the level of success in integrating new systems, and increased capacity to manage collections. As to specific results, OD funding was reported to have assisted museums in: building strategic intent; promoting partnerships; identifying new resources and funding sources; adapting to new technologies; and enhancing professional standards and expertise.

Case Study Indications of OD Success: The evaluation case studies provided "on-the-ground" evidence of positive impacts of OD projects.⁵³ For example, the digitization of collections in one project increased the museum's capacity to contribute to the understanding of Canada's cultural heritage across the country. Other identified outcomes included: greater museum capacity to use web-sites to make collections known; increased demand for loans and increased capacity to respond quickly to requests, including requests from other countries; development of collaborative projects with other Canadian museums/art galleries; increased capacity to develop public programs; and improved collection management and collection management expertise.

⁵³ Case study data generally represent a melding of data from such diverse sources as the MAP grantee, partner museums and Department of Canadian Heritage Regional staff.

Other illustrations of success included an OD project which helped a museum to in develop and stabilize-its education mission in its community. The project helped consolidate the organization’s links with the educational sector of the region and led to new community exchanges, partnerships and longer-term projects. Yet another OD project developed a new storage system which permitted the museum to continue accepting donations of artefacts and to ensure their preservation. The project also raised professional standards for care for collections. Additionally, this project was seen as having developed a sense of pride among staff and volunteers and improved public access to collections.

Analysis: The evaluators saw these highly tangible results for museums and their communities as contributing to the achievement of the strategic objectives of the Department and providing practical positive outcomes for the museums that undertook the projects. These results were seen as strongly supporting the value of MAP.

5.3 CONCLUSIONS REGARDING OBJECTIVES ACHIEVEMENT

Data from various sources (museums, departmental staff, the museum-going public, and others) suggests that MAP projects achieved many important objectives. MAP projects helped to provide Canadians with better access to their culturally diverse heritage, identity, history, and symbols; helped Canadians learn and understand more about each other; aided more effective retention, preservation, conservation and presentation of the cultural heritage of Aboriginal peoples in Canada; aided more effective management; and helped build capacity for museums. Additionally, impacts such as increased pride were noted as important outcomes, although such results are difficult to measure.

These results point to the program being highly effective, with economic impacts considerably beyond the annual MAP budget of \$9 million. Case study research findings, for example, suggest that MAP projects have multiplier effects, estimated at a factor of 2-5 and the program’s emphasis on the development of partnerships between museums and support for networking activities reinforces this. These indications should be affirmed through more rigorous measurement of results in the future, as discussed in Section 7.

6. MAP's Design and Delivery

6.1 MAP'S OVERALL DESIGN AND DELIVERY

Evaluation Assessments from the Museum Survey: Evaluation indicators on delivery of MAP were mixed. Some MAP features were assessed very positively, and others were assessed very poorly. For example, 79% of museums rated their *“satisfaction with the assistance provided by Department of Canadian Heritage staff”* positively, but only 12% rated their *“satisfaction with the length of time for approvals, timeliness of decisions”* positively.

Assistance from Department of Canadian Heritage Staff: Evaluation results were very positive regarding the role of Departmental staff. Museums and museum associations reported a high level of satisfaction with the assistance provided by Canadian Heritage staff. Many museums spoke highly of the role regional consultants play in making the program known and answering questions about criteria.

Many museums suggested that more access to regional staff is needed, a point that was also raised in case studies, particularly by Aboriginal groups. Regional consultants who participated in the regional consultants one-day workshop also identified this need; Regional consultant who participated in the evaluation workshop they said budget limitations prevent them from attending meetings with museums in remote locations. This was seen as creating unequal access to MAP and reducing the ability of some museums to develop successful applications.

MAP Peer Review: Evaluation results were very positive on the peer review process for MAP applications. It was suggested that the process adds credibility to MAP projects, adds a museological perspective on what is required to undertake a project, and helps ensure the best use of MAP funds. Nevertheless, some respondents identified areas for improvement.

One suggestion was better preparation peer reviewers and clarification of the role of peer review committees. Key informants, museum representatives and regional consultants all suggested that better preparation would make the peer review process more efficient and help peer review committees make their recommendations more quickly. Clarifying peer reviewers' role at the outset (peer reviewers may think that they are a jury but their role is advisory), and having a good chairperson were other suggestions. Another suggestion was to strengthen panels' credibility by increasing recruitment of high-level participants. Several key informants said that, because of the challenges of recruiting panel members, peer reviewers can be called on to assess project proposals developed by more experienced people.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ Many capable people are not eligible to sit on peer review committees (one can't have an application in the system to be eligible, and there is a requirement for bilingualism).

Regional-Headquarters Roles: The evaluation data pointed to a need to further define regional-headquarters roles. For example, there were mixed views regarding the regional role in MAP delivery. A satisfaction rating of 53% in the museum survey indicates some satisfaction with the regional role and indeed, a number of respondents supported a greater voice for regional staff. However, concern was expressed that the regionalization of the program is inconsistent with its high profile and at the small staff at the national level. Regionalization was seen as weakening the program and complicating decision-making. One key informant commented: *“While regional field officers play a valuable role, many [of the responsibilities] should be reappropriated by national headquarters.”*

Similarly, key informants suggested that regional and national priorities can vary. They suggested that better communication of priorities to museums is required, including the basis for regional priorities. It was also suggested that regional MAP consultants to meet more frequently than once a year. Finally, it was suggested that more national-regional information-sharing would help ensure consistent program implementation across the country.

Communications: Museums asked for clearer communication of MAP objectives and eligibility criteria by the Department. A number of museums reported confusion and sometimes at times contradictions between application guidelines and information from regional consultants, for example, on the project budget ceiling. Although MAP’s annual setting of new priorities makes it possible for the program to address new needs, this also appears to have increased museums’ frustration. As one museum representative noted: *“We need more advance notice with accompanying rationale when the program changes. Changes from year-to-year are troublesome”.*

This feedback suggests room for better public information about the MAP program. While recent improvements to the OD section of MAP brochures were recognized, museums suggested that the English and French materials should be published simultaneously and translations should be reviewed by terminologists who know museology. Some museums wanted more clarity in eligibility criteria descriptions in the program due in part to the quality of the language used in the brochures.

MAP Timeframes: Research data pointed to timelines as a particularly serious issue for MAP. Dissatisfaction was widely noted, especially on the length of time taken by the Department to make decisions on applications, reported to be as long as a year, and the length of time between Departmental decisions and receipt of a cheque. These waiting times increased the financial risk of MAP applicants and reduced MAP’s credibility. As one museum respondent noted, *“[the timing is a] terrible problem: [decisions] come way too late. Museums have to take the risk to go ahead with the project or not. They guarantee April but in reality it is June and sometimes November. They demand that we respect their deadlines; they should do the same with us.”*

The Application Process: Other evaluation results pointed at difficulties in the application-process, with lowest ratings given to the National Outreach Initiative and the OD component. Some museum representatives noted that the MAP application process has become *“so complex that it could require a person working full-time.”*

A related design concern was the short lead time between the release of MAP application forms and the deadline for submission of applications. This was very problematic for some museums. The post-application period was also a concern. Museums would like better feedback on why their funding applications are accepted or rejected. This would help them, result in better proposals, and lessen workloads of regional consultants.

The complexity of the funding environment was also evident from the evaluation. This was best put by one museum association respondent who noted: *“Added to the problem of reduced funding is the ... fractured state of ... funding mechanisms that includes a welter of federal, provincial and municipal programs, each operating according to its own objectives and guidelines... This imposes a particular burden upon the scant resources of small institutions that make up the bulk of the museum community. Museum managers are confronted by a bewildering array of programs and grant runs with varying but onerous administrative requirements.”* This comment may point to value in the Department working with other funders to provide better information to museums about all their funding options.

Level of funding: Concern about funding levels influenced all assessments of MAP. *Museums' satisfaction with the level of MAP funding was generally low, with some variations across components.* This may in part be a function of the decline in the MAP budget.

Many museums expressed concern about the difficulty of securing supplementary funding, the reduction of provincial funding in some jurisdictions; the burden on museums to raise funds (which takes scarce human resources from core activities), and the exclusion from MAP of worthwhile projects for which supplementary funding could not be found.

On the other hand, case study research found no evidence that the funding levels were too low for individual projects to be carried out successfully, although the amounts awarded were in most cases less than amounts requested. This suggests that museums were able to adjust their total project budgets and achieve the same results, possibly by using internal resources. At the same time, evaluation findings indicate that MAP could be more efficient if more resources were allocated to administration, for example, for travel by regional consultants, for dissemination of best practices, and for sharing of lessons learned.

Leveraging: Museum representative key informant interviews, surveys and case studies all indicated that MAP funding lends credibility to a project and thus helps leverage funds from other sources. Indeed, examination of a sample of projects indicated that overall, MAP may leverage two to five times its dollar value from other sources.

Other MAP General Design and Delivery Factors: Two aspects of the annual competition process were commented on: the competitive process and the frequency of competitions. Museums had mixed views on the competitive process. Some said “*competitions are excellent; they keep us on our toes,*” while others said this is not a suitable approach: “*MAP needs to foster a network of national exchange. The competitive process does not help in this respect. Competitions may foster the tendency of institutions to go in their own silo.*” The once-a-year deadline was considered problematic by many museums. Canadian Heritage personnel, however, viewed yearly deadlines as an efficient way of coping with funding constraints and ensuring equity.

6.2 COMPONENT-SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

6.2.1 Implementation of the ANO Component

The National Outreach Initiative: Some aspects of the National Outreach Initiative were poorly rated by museums. “*The types of eligible projects (eligibility criteria)*” received a 39% positive rating, *the evaluation criteria* a 38% rating, and “*the cost to museums of preparing proposals (staff time, costs)*” had a 21% positive rating. Some improvements were suggested, including support for partnership projects involving national and regional museums; improved project marketing; and a balance in the types of heritage institutions approved for funding. As one museum respondent noted: “*the [National Outreach Initiative] is biased toward the arts because arts is two-dimensional. As a result, there are not enough object-based travelling exhibits; archaeology and science museums are at a disadvantage.*”

The Three-Province Criterion: To be eligible for funding, travelling exhibits must circulate to at least three provinces. This requirement is seen as too demanding as it is difficult to obtain support from museums in two other provinces and some support factors are not often controllable or predictable, such as the level of provincial support, timing, demand, competition, etc. One museum representative summarized the challenges in the following way: “*First, it is a real challenge to attract museums to what is not yet a finished product and to find museums with the capacity to host our type of exhibit; and second, we have to find a topic that will be of interest to both local people and to other provinces and that will also fit with MAP objectives, then we have to start designing the exhibit not really knowing where the exhibit will be going and whether it will fit in the space provided by the host museums.*”⁵⁵

⁵⁵ Some respondents suggested different criteria depending on distance. For example, a project travelling from New Brunswick to Manitoba could have more merit than a project travelling between New Brunswick and Newfoundland, or a project travelling north and south or reaching different types of communities.

Level of Funding for National Outreach: Satisfaction of museums with the level of funding for National Outreach was low, but key informants from museums and Department of Canadian Heritage were generally satisfied with funding levels. They also indicated that MAP funding gives credibility to projects and levers other funding.⁵⁶ One key informant added: *"MAP has become a kind of accreditation process. It gives the project legitimacy, credibility, visibility. A MAP-funded project carries with it a seal of excellence. It is a good leverage tool"*. This important role of MAP in enhancing credibility, and leveraging funding was corroborated by findings from the evaluation case studies.

The Exhibition Circulation Fund: Museums rated the Exhibit Circulation Fund poorly from an operational perspective. While 39% of museum applicants rated *"eligibility criteria"* positively, only 29% rated *"the cost to museums of preparing proposals (staff time, costs)"* positively.⁵⁷

Few suggestions were offered concerning this component, which funded only 13 projects in 1999-2000 and 10 in 2000-01. Museum take-up, particularly by smaller museums, was expected to be much higher. The Exhibit Circulation Fund option may not have achieved the desired results of fully supporting the travel of MAP exhibits. Lifting the \$1,000,000 eligibility ceiling has been suggested as a potential improvement.

6.2.2 Implementation of the AMD Component

Overview: Generally, there was a more positive view of the design and delivery for the AMD component than for the ANO and OD components. High ratings were noted by museums regarding: *"types of eligible projects,"* and *"evaluation criteria"* (68% and 57% respectively). The operational aspect of the AMD component which received lower ratings: *"the cost to museums of preparing proposals (staff time, costs),"* was rated positively by 32% of museums.

Program Criteria: A number of museums said the funding limit of 70% of eligible project costs is a barrier as some Aboriginal communities cannot secure the remaining 30% from other sources and/or Aboriginal cultural centres have no mandate to raise funds. Related obstacles include the fact that Aboriginal communities generally do not have a tax base from which to raise funds, few Aboriginal communities are cultural or tourism venues, and that status as a First Nations museum or cultural centre makes it difficult to seek other funding, as this may be vetoed by the Band Council.

Need for Flexibility: One issue raised was the need for greater flexibility for the AMD component. In general, key informants understood and supported the flexibility of this component's design and how this enables it to reach target institutions. As one noted: *"criteria are very broad to include museums and First Nations partnerships. There is still much to be learned on both sides and the flexibility takes into account that we are in a learning process."*

⁵⁶ At the same time, concern was expressed that the museums' ability to leverage funds from provincial sources has been diminishing in some provinces/territories because of provincial/territorial budget restraints.

⁵⁷ Note, however, that the achievement of objectives for the Exhibition Circulation Fund was rated more positively, with *"how the Exhibition Circulation Fund helps Canadians to learn and understand more about each other through better access to their diverse heritage, identity, history, and symbols"* receiving a 61% positive rating.

Aboriginal Interpretation of "Heritage:" A point that emerged from case studies and key informant interviews was that the Aboriginal concept of heritage differs from MAP's definition. Aboriginal communities are more interested in the preservation of their cultures, languages and craft skills than with the presentation and preservation of heritage objects.

Cultural Sensitivity: It was suggested that the design and delivery of AMD may not fully meet Aboriginal needs and suggestions that the application process is not sufficiently culturally-adapted (e.g. in administrative processes, language, cultural foreignness of the application process, lack of proposal writing experience in some Aboriginal organizations).⁵⁸ Such issues were also raised in the AMD case studies.

Need for Basic Infrastructure: From the perspective of Aboriginal museums, MAP should provide funds for the basic development of museums. Departmental managers emphasized that this component does not have a mandate to create new museums or enhance facilities. One key informant indicated that the need is greater for infrastructure than for products: *"they have to catch up before we can keep up; projects of collaboration help in that respect but without the bricks and mortar, we can't do much more"*.

Other Issues: An issue raised in key informant interviews and case studies concerned governance, particularly the complexity of Aboriginal institutions and governments. As one interviewee emphasized, *"the governance authority from cultural centres is not the same as in [non-Aboriginal] communities. The money goes to Band Councils"*. There is a need to ensure the full support of the community and key partners, -a criterion which is not always respected. Often Aboriginal organizations are required to contact Aboriginal consultants, but this does not guarantee grass-roots support essential to success. The peer review process for AMD projects was also an issue as there have been difficulties finding experienced and culturally sensitive people to sit on AMD peer review committees. Politics may also be an issue, as one evaluation participant noted: *"a Band Chief is not necessarily always the best person to play this role."*

6.2.3 Implementation of the OD Component

Overview: The most highly rated feature of the OD component was satisfaction with *"the types of eligible projects"*, which was positively rated by 43% of responding museums. The lowest rated feature was satisfaction with *"the cost to museums of preparing proposals (staff time, costs)"*, which received a 21% positive rating. Eligibility and evaluation criteria features of this program were rated more highly than those of the ANO component but all features of OD were rated less positively than the AMD component.

⁵⁸ It was suggested that hiring one or more Aboriginal staff for MAP might aid cultural sensitivity of the program.

Yet a predominant view of museums was that this component should place more emphasis on capacity and museum infrastructure development. As noted above, the overwhelming majority of museums felt that the OD component does not sufficiently address OD needs of museums. Museums proposed that more emphasis should be placed on capacity building and museum infrastructure (see *Section 4: Relevance*). A number of core activities need to be addressed such as how institutions address their audiences, whether they provide effective marketing, and whether they are involved in networking. It is also important to move organizations into new frameworks of thinking (weight of the past, values, human resources), into addressing human resources and volunteer needs, and to assessing the feasibility of an accreditation program. From the perspective of museums, these would be appropriate roles for MAP.

Level of Funding: In light of museums' views of needs, it is not surprising that the level of funding available was considered the most unsatisfactory aspect of the OD component. This component has the smallest budget, yet is the one where museums report the greatest need.

6.3 CONCLUSIONS REGARDING MAP DESIGN AND DELIVERY

The evaluation generally indicated that funding levels are a particular problem for MAP. Satisfaction with the level of MAP funding awards is generally low, with some variations across components. This may, in part, be a result of the decline of funding for MAP. In 1999-2000, for example, the value of MAP was about two-thirds of what it was in 1993-1994.

While the evaluation results revealed many positive features, some suggestions for improvement of a number of implementation and operational program features included modifying the three-province criteria of the National Outreach Initiative, which was found to be too restrictive, remedying delays between making application decisions and delivery of cheques and supporting some exhibits which do not travel where the connecting Canadians objective is supported in other ways (for example, by showing regional exhibits in museums with a large tourist clientele).

The Exhibition Circulation Fund should be examined to determine why its use is so low, and perhaps redesigned, as the current low take-up indicates it does not fully reach the target audience or contributes to MAP's objectives. Additionally, the AMD component should be examined to ensure that delivery is culturally sensitive.

Leveraging: Museum representative key informant interviews, surveys and case studies all indicated that MAP funding lends credibility to a project, thus helping leverage funds from other sources (this is somewhat circular logic, since projects must obtain matching funding for parts of project costs to be eligible for MAP). Since MAP is currently not a costly program to operate and due to the level of success of the program and of MAP projects, the evaluators conclude that MAP delivery is generally efficient.

7. Accountability, Cost-Effectiveness and Alternatives

7.1 ACCOUNTABILITY: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND REPORTING

Overview: the evaluators were expected to look at whether performance information on MAP is now being captured by the Department, and whether the RMAF is a useful guide to performance measurement. They found that performance monitoring proposals of the RMAF are not yet being implemented; the main use of the RMAF so far has been to inform this evaluation. Most of the evaluator's assessments are therefore prescriptive regarding how the Department should use the RMAF in the future.

Performance Monitoring and Reporting: Although the RMAF is useful as a guide to evaluation questions and performance measurement,⁵⁹ some features of the program could be more fully addressed. The document would benefit from a fuller discussion of the program context, the program's decentralization, and the diversity of MAP components, and the heterogeneity of the museum community. To some extent these gaps could be filled in the course of the evaluation, but they should be discussed in planning for future applications of the RMAF.

More importantly, evaluators found there has been little performance monitoring by the program so far. Informal performance monitoring is usually done at the museum and project level, but no program-wide system to capture information annually has been put in place. Evaluations (in 1980, 1994 and 2002) have been the only assessments of program results.

Using ANO as a key example, there are no measures in place to collect data on the movement of exhibits, attendance figures, and other data. This means that results of ANO are difficult to measure and cost-effectiveness is difficult to assess.

Need for Improved Monitoring to Aid Accountability: This evaluation of MAP occurred at a time when museums are undergoing significant changes, in part due to the refocusing of MAP in 1999. There is an increased emphasis on public accountability and the demonstration of results. As well as accounting for funding received, museums have to demonstrate that their activities are of benefit to Canadians.

Monitoring is not a simple task. The majority of MAP regional consultants, Canadian Heritage management museums and museum associations agreed that the design of performance monitoring present significant challenges in areas such as the identification of expected outcomes, the information collection strategy, and the conducting of evaluations. These accountability challenges require not only the creation of a framework, but also the creation of effective operational systems. A related challenge is that stakeholders are usually hesitant to move resources from programs to monitoring or research.

⁵⁹ With a few possible refinements, for example, the RMAF could better address the issue of placing MAP among other funding programs, better address the strong Regional role in the program, and better address the complexity of MAP and the heterogeneity of the museum community.

Identification of Expected Outcomes: Evaluation participants stressed the importance of carefully articulating expected outcomes and results and developing indicators that take into account the overall context in which museums, museum associations and Aboriginal organizations operate: for instance *“museums which draw on volunteers have a continuing need for renewal; in this case, not falling behind may be just the right outcome to be aimed at”*, or the need to *“recognize that change is a very slow and sometimes a very gradual process”* was also emphasized. This suggests a need to measure basics of museum performance, which can be a challenge, as museums are highly independent (responsive to their local boards and communities) and known for resistance to measurement and audit.

Use of Existing Processes: Development and use of program data bases to collect available data was suggested as one effective and cost-efficient way of monitoring program results. One museum association respondent noted: *“since MAP has a good set of criteria and collects a great deal of data through application forms, this information should be used to evaluate the program on a regular basis to better meet the needs of the [museum] clients and adjust for the changing climate”*. Another museum association representative suggested that *“as a part of the evaluation process, information generated by peer review panels could be used to track client progress from year-to-year, and in this way more substantial and meaningful help could be provided to clients to ensure that they improve”*.

The need for performance monitoring raises questions about the potential for improving existing processes, such as the peer review process. For example, the evaluators note that a good measure for assessing performance could be to extend the peer review process to include follow-up assessments of projects by the same experts who originally recommended them. All of these steps, including reporting by museums, will require additional expenditure of effort and resources, which must be recognized.

Offsetting the Impact of Monitoring on Museums: Performance monitoring should be developed in a way that will encourage museum buy-in while recognizing the complexity of museum projects. Particular consideration should be given to smaller museums which do not have the financial and human resources to monitor performances as larger museums do. It was suggested by evaluation respondents that tools should be designed that make it easy for museums to report on results, and additional project funding should be provided specifically for monitoring and reporting so that this activity does not become an additional burden on museums' scarce human and financial resources.

MAP's Own Resources for Monitoring: The introduction of performance monitoring mechanisms raises human resources issues for the Department. For example, MAP does not, to date, have a financial officer at Headquarters dedicated to this program. As one key informant noted *“If we had one person assigned strictly to MAP, this would help for reporting.”* The evaluators noted that staff resources for developing monitoring systems are essential. The evaluation team concluded that developing a reporting system will be a challenge. A file review at national headquarters found extremely useful information but it is not easily accessible or summarizable. The evaluators noted, for example, that reporting on OD projects is only done at the regional level and that reporting mechanisms have no common basis across the country, with reporting being done more systematically in some provinces than others.

To build capacity in the Department and in museums, evaluators believe MAP regional and headquarters staff and museum staff will need training in administering, managing and supporting any performance monitoring mechanisms. There also has to be buy-in from museums themselves, with consideration given to the smaller museums which may not have the same financial and human resources to monitor performances as larger museums. Tools must make it easy for museums to report on results and funding must be provided specifically for monitoring and reporting.

Develop a Monitoring System to Implement Performance Monitoring Requirements of the RMAF: Several steps are required: a policy or agreement to implement performance monitoring with associated delineations of responsibility and resources; and a technical plan for data collection and reporting. This system could be a useful place to "park" responsibility for needs assessment for museums (several such studies were suggested within this report, and a place also to better link MAP information needs to surveys).⁶⁰ As is noted in Section 9, some linkages to facilitate access to and reporting systems for related programs may be desirable.

7.2 COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF MAP

The cost-effectiveness of MAP was an evaluation issue that was addressed with certain limitations.⁶¹ Although data limitations were noteworthy, the evaluators found some data which suggested that the program is indeed cost-effective. For example, while resources for MAP have been constrained over the past decade,⁶² museums still identified the program as making important continuing contributions to museum development, and assessed its financial transfers as being very important to museums and specific types of projects.

Additionally, the ability of museums to leverage additional funds from other sources for MAP-funded projects is indicative of cost-effective program results. Assessments of a sample of MAP projects also pointed to MAP having strong leveraging effects (MAP case study projects appeared generally to have leveraged up to five times the MAP financial contribution).⁶³ Thus, \$8 million in MAP funding could drive at least \$16 million, and possibly as much as \$40 million, for projects which address Departmental priorities. These funds came from varied sources (see Section 2). These "partner" monies might have been spent on cultural heritage projects even without MAP. However, *use of MAP meant that these funds were channelled towards the types of projects which address Departmental priorities. MAP therefore might be deemed as very cost-effective in aiding achievement of the Department's strategic goals.* On these and more general grounds, MAP is seen by the evaluators as cost-effective.

⁶⁰ Population surveys are recommended as a key part of any broader monitoring strategy, as they can be implemented on a wide range of issues while making few or no demands on museum.

⁶¹ A particular limitation being that a design decision was made early in the study not to collect historic or change data on performance of museums.

⁶² MAP budgets, reflecting broader constraints in the expenditures of the federal government, declined from 1993-1994 to 1999-2000, to approximately two-thirds of 1993-1994 level.

⁶³ These cost data came from the twelve case studies. This result may, however, have been exaggerated by one unusual case study project. Departmental staff suggested "2 times the leveraging effect" as a more typical result.

7.3 ALTERNATIVES

During the course of the evaluation, some suggestions were provided by MAP evaluation participants. Additionally, one consideration is presented which was not taken from an evaluation participant, but was inspired by a particular set of comments. Some ideas the Department may wish to consider are noted below.

An international element: Some museum representatives noted potential value in support for international activities. One museum representative noted a need for *“federal government opportunities to allow/assist Canadian museums to bring International content (exhibits) to Canada.”* Another museum representative suggested *“there is a need for MAP to have a funding category that allows for Canadian museums to bring or collaborate with other Canadian museums to bring International exhibits to Canada. ...the inter-provincial focus neglects opportunities at the international level [to aid] international research, extension and exchange.”* While international travelling exhibits would, strictly speaking appear not to fit the Department's goals for this program, allowing international elements could be of value in some areas, for example, professional exchanges, or aiding "twinning" of Canadian and foreign museums. Such efforts, for example, might have unique value for some smaller museums, or Aboriginal museums which might teach and learn much with Aboriginal museum professionals in the United States, New Zealand, etc.

A Regional Outreach Component: One museum representative suggested *“that MAP consider creating a new [MAP component] ...which could be called the ‘Regional Outreach Initiative,’ and which would be for museums in communities under 10,000 people. This component could support the research, documentation and interpretation of local and regional art and history, as well as the presentation of special educational or interpretative activities and professional exchanges. It could be the catalyst that would build the foundation for cultural tourism in remote communities, and could be a means to create jobs in the cultural sector and improve the local economy. To give small museums access to this program MAP could consider creating a ‘Regional Exhibition Circulation Fund’, which could be part of the proposed Regional Outreach Initiative.”* The evaluators regard such a program idea as worthy of filling important gaps which have been noted in MAP as it now exists.

MAP as a Link to Other Programs: One museum representative emphasized the complexity of contemporary funding alternatives, the challenges of learning about new programs, and using them. The evaluators note that MAP could play a useful role by helping museums to access these programs, and by coordinating efforts with other funding agencies. This would be a new meaning for "museums assistance," but potentially one of great importance, were this added as a role for MAP.

8. Conclusions

8.1 RELEVANCE

Overall Relevance: The broad question of whether MAP remains relevant today was addressed in terms of the following evaluation issues:

- *Need for assistance in producing travelling exhibits:* The evaluation evidence indicated that museums continue to require financial assistance to design, transfer and display their exhibits across provinces. MAP is relevant in meeting these needs although it could not meet all goals of museums or all strategic objectives of the Department of Canadian Heritage, as there are a number of challenges that make it difficult for museums to use the program.
- *Need for financial support in the preservation/presentation of the cultural heritage of Aboriginal peoples:* The specific and continued relevance of the AMD component of MAP was demonstrated by reports of numerous successful AMD projects which would not have been undertaken without MAP, and indications that preservation of Aboriginal heritage was enhanced by AMD funding.
- *Need for financial assistance in developing and enhancing professional standards and expertise in all museum management areas:* Other museum activities would be adversely affected without the OD component, underlining the value of this component, which was seen to allow many projects which museums could not have undertaken without MAP. It is noted however, that evaluation data sources indicated that the current levels of funding for the OD component could not support all of the OD needs of museums.

Overall, MAP was found to be highly relevant in providing financial assistance, particularly through the ANO and AMD components. Effectiveness and continued relevance are reduced, however, by insufficient funding for museums for basic collection care, development of temporary and permanent exhibits, and museum operations. These are activities that aid museums to undertake projects that would be eligible for MAP funding. Relevance was also underlined by an international comparison of similar programs, which indicated that such programs are relatively common among peer nations such as the UK, Australia and New Zealand.

MAP helps meet the current needs of Canadians in regard to awareness and understanding of their culturally diverse heritage:

- Most Canadians visit cultural heritage institutions for leisure or other reasons within any given five year period.⁶⁴
- Canadians are likely to visit cultural heritage institutions to expand their knowledge or for educational purposes.
- Canadians strongly approve of federal support for heritage institutions through programs such as MAP.

A federal government role in supporting museums is essential, but the shape of that role requires further clarification:

- The fundamental premise upon which the Department of Canadian Heritage defines the role of the federal government vis-à-vis museums is that the primary clients of the federal government are the public, not the country's museums. With this premise in mind, the Federal Government's heritage priorities are prescribed by federal policy goals toward the public, and its interpretation of the public's needs.
- Emphasis is placed on education, ensuring access to heritage across geographic locations, ensuring access to heritage materials and experiences in both official languages, and supporting cultural diversity.
- The Department sees the ultimate beneficiary of MAP as the public, and it works with museums to address public needs. Many in the museum community feel that the role of the federal government should be to support museums' contributions to heritage preservation and presentation, recognizing the important role museums play in the identification and teaching of national heritage. In this vein, museums feel that the most appropriate role for the federal government is to help create a nurturing environment for museums.

These differing perspectives were seen as pointing to important needs for improved dialogue between the Department and the museum community.

⁶⁴ Environics Research Group Limited, *Arts and Heritage Participation Survey*, prepared for the Department of Canadian Heritage, September, 2000.

8.2 SUCCESS

MAP is seen as a success, with various components contributing to achievement of program goals. Indicators of MAP's success included: creation of Canadian content, fostering and strengthening connections, and fostering cultural participation and engagement. The program contributes to the retention, preservation, conservation and presentation of the cultural heritage of Aboriginal peoples in Canada, improved capacity of museums to meet new challenges, and the long-term financial stability of museums across Canada.

8.3 PROGRAM DESIGN AND DELIVERY

Consistency/Logic of Objectives and Design: Design and delivery of the three program components were deemed by the evaluators to be generally consistent with MAP objectives. Each component is designed to complement the other and to help meet strategic objectives of the Department. However, the evaluators concluded that the Exhibition Circulation Fund should be reassessed and perhaps redesigned. Low utilization of this component indicates that it reaches only small audiences and thus contributes only modestly to the achievement of MAP objectives.

Operational Assessments: The evaluation produced mixed results as regards the overall operations and implementation of MAP. A number of positive results, were identified, but also some areas requiring improvement. The design and delivery of MAP through regional staff and the peer review process work well. However, some other aspects of program implementation, including project funding levels, raised concern. The cost of preparing proposals was another issue for museums. The length of time between applications and Departmental decisions was a major issue, which impacts negatively on some MAP-funded projects. A related concern was frequent delays in delivery of funds after projects are approved. These delays made it difficult for museums to plan and operate cost-effectively.

Other Design Issues: Other issues that detract from MAP's success include:

- Unmet funding needs in infrastructure may undermine museums' capacity to undertake MAP-funded projects, and benefits that could be realized from earlier projects could be lost;
- Museums find the three-province criteria of the National Outreach Initiative restrictive; more flexibility would not diminish this component's ability to reach MAP objectives, e.g. reaching targeted institutions; and
- Delivery of the AMD component should be re-examined to ensure that delivery aspects are sufficiently culturally sensitive to the needs of Aboriginal communities.

8.4 COST-EFFICIENCY

Overview: Cost-effectiveness of MAP was addressed with certain limitations because of data limitations and the fact that the program realignment is still recent.

Within these limitations (further information is provided in *Section 9. Future Directions and Recommendations*), available data suggest the program is cost-effective. For example, while resources for the program have been limited, museums still identified MAP as an important continuing contribution to museum development. Additionally, the program's emphasis on the development of partnerships between museums and in supporting networking activities is indicative of highly cost-effective results.

Finally, assessments of a sample of MAP projects pointed to MAP having strong multiplying or leveraging effects (case study projects appeared generally to have leveraged 2 to 5 times the MAP financial contribution). Thus, \$8 million from MAP could drive about \$16-\$40 million of non-Departmental funding towards projects of the specific types the Department gives priority to.

8.5 MONITORING AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Performance Monitoring: One objective of the evaluation was to assess the extent to which the *Results-based Management and Accountability Framework* is a useful guide to performance monitoring and whether ongoing performance information is being collected by the Department.

Model of the RMAF: The RMAF is seen as a logical model of MAP and a generally good guide for a program evaluation, some conceptual limitations notwithstanding (as noted in Section 7). This evaluation has followed RMAF evaluation questions.

Actual Performance Monitoring: The RMAF was seen as a useful guide to performance monitoring; however, evaluation research suggests it is not yet being implemented by the Department. This is because in the past there has been little data, and no system for ongoing results measurement for MAP. Indeed, the evaluation identified little in the way of ongoing performance monitoring at the Departmental level (no annual reports), and generally only informal evaluations at the museum and project level, for MAP as implemented in 1999-2001.

This situation was seen in contrast to the highly formalized approaches suggested by the *RMAF*, and reflective of the new Departmental results measurement strategy which has not yet been incorporated into MAP. For example, the ANO component places emphasis on the travelling of exhibits from province-to-province, but no database exists to track the movements of the exhibits, their attendance, etc. Because of such gaps, certain results of MAP, and key issues such as cost-effectiveness have not been assessed to date.

This gap in monitoring reflects the historical pattern where reliance has been placed on periodic evaluations to provide validations of the program. Since the last evaluation of MAP was conducted more than eight years ago, it appears that steering the program has been left to micro-decisions by NHQ and regional staff -- micro decisions which are more likely to be based on immediate circumstances than on performance indicators of results and outcomes. This lack of ongoing monitoring and reports may reinforce the situation where MAP appears to have limited systematic dialogue with its museum constituency on program issues. This gap may exacerbate differences in views between the Department and the museum community.

8.6 OTHER POLICY AND CONTEXT ISSUES

Two issues were noted which were outside of the formal scope of the evaluation, but which came to the evaluator's attention a number of times throughout the data collection and analysis. One issue was the overall *strategic positioning of MAP* relative to other programs, including other Departmental programs and funding programs of other governments and agencies. Another issue centred around the area of *communications and stakeholder relations*. This concern was evidenced by considerable differences between the outlook of museums and the Department. For example, museums objected to what they saw as the Department appropriating the interpretation of the public's needs for museums. The evaluators saw these differences as pointing towards a need for improved dialogue or new mechanisms for information-sharing or governance for MAP.

Strategic Positioning of MAP: Evaluation results indicated that MAP's relevance to the needs of museum is lessened and its effectiveness reduced because in 2002, Canadian museums have very significant unmet needs regarding funding for collection care, temporary and permanent exhibits and museum operations. Such needs are significant when the importance of basic functions and museum system development are considered. In some cases, lack of such funds was reported to hamper the capacity of museums to undertake MAP-funded projects.

In a related vein, there is also a need to better understand the impacts of other Canadian Heritage programs which have been introduced in the past two years which may meet some of the needs identified by museums. Better understanding of the interplay of all funding for museums is required in order to ensure that Canadian Heritage's strategy with MAP is optimal. To improve understanding of this issue, the Department should initiate work with its partners (museums, other governments) to understand how all public and private funds lead to improved operations and services for museums. Such understanding may allow the Department to better strategize the use of MAP.

Communications and Stakeholder Relations: While it is no longer an objective of MAP to deal with operational funding problems of museums, these needs -- and the perception of Departmental disinterest in these needs -- were constantly raised by museums as a criticism of MAP and Departmental efforts more generally. As well, many museum representatives were severe in their characterization of the Department's priority setting as minimizing the importance of museums themselves in the overall interpretation of Canadian's heritage needs and how they should be met. In some cases, these differences were seen as reflecting significant differences in goals. The evaluators see these differences as pointing to a need for improved dialogue and communications with museums. Some suggestions are offered in Section 9, in the area of information-sharing, for example, through ongoing advisory committees, and alternate approaches to governance of MAP.

8.7 NEED FOR NEW DIRECTIONS

While results from the MAP evaluation per se have been very positive, a number of potential areas for change have been noted, both for the specifics of MAP, and the way in which it is nested in broader Departmental efforts. Some of these possible directions are discussed in Section 9, below.

9. Future Directions and Recommendations

Many of the findings regarding MAP point to areas for improvement. Some of these, including some specific recommendations by the evaluators, are noted below in summary form.

| ISSUE/DISCUSSION | FUTURE DIRECTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS |
|--|--|
| <p>Overall Value of MAP: MAP achieves its intended results, aiding the Department in enhancing Canadians' access to heritage, and in linking Canadians in different regions (particularly through travelling exhibits), aiding the development of Aboriginal museums and professional resources, and aiding museums in developing capacity.</p> <p>MAP was also found to leverage substantial funds for the types of projects which are relevant to the Department's strategic goals. In these ways, MAP was deemed by the evaluators to be cost-effective.</p> | <p>Strengthening this program in the future will aid broader Departmental goals. <i>Thus, MAP or any equivalent new program should be strengthened.</i></p> |
| <p>MAP Design Issues: While the program is making progress towards achievement of most of its goals, some features have been identified which are inefficient or require retooling.</p> <p>Most important of these is the lack of operational funding for museums, which makes it difficult for some museums to mount MAP projects, because basic infrastructure is lacking.</p> <p>Other design features may require review such as the overall role of the Exhibit Circulation Fund, which is little used, or the issue noted below of support for some exhibits "in place" (not travelling) when they have special potential for connecting Canadians.</p> | <p><i>Funding for MAP projects could include support for some of the operational costs associated with such projects.</i></p> |
| <p>Name of the Program: MAP historically was a more broadly oriented program to assist museums, but its focus has shifted in recent years to focus on more specific types of projects. MAP could remain a <i>museums assistance program</i> if it provided other types of assistance to museums, for example advice on how to access other funding programs.</p> <p>Alternatively, if MAP is to remain focused mainly on specific types of projects, the name should be changed to more closely match its actual goals.</p> | <p><i>If MAP is to remain a program for special projects it should be renamed, for example, to <u>Museum Special Projects Program</u>.</i></p> <p>This would aid the communication of the program museums, and reduce expectations attached to the old name.</p> |

| ISSUE/DISCUSSION | FUTURE DIRECTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|---|
| <p>The Three-Province Criterion: The three-province criterion of the National Outreach Initiative may be too restrictive for some exhibits and museums. More flexibility would enhance this component's ability to reach MAP objectives of connecting Canadians in different regions while ensuring that MAP reaches audiences in ways that reflect the full diversity of Canada's heritage.</p> | <p><i>The three-province criterion should be modified to allow for additional ways of meeting this "connections" goal. Modifications could be to allow projects to be eligible if crossing language or regional barriers within larger provinces (e.g. North-South within a region, for example, aiding a project going from NWT to three museums in Alberta could qualify.</i></p> |
| <p>Emphasis on Travelling Exhibits: Because museums reach many Canadians outside their home region (e.g. while travelling), development of non-travelling exhibits with specific "connections" goals could be supported by MAP, achieving heritage goals by supporting exhibits on their home ground.</p> | <p><i>Projects could be eligible for MAP support when it can be demonstrated that projects would "reach out" without travelling, for example where substantial out-of-region audiences for "home-based" exhibits could be found in tourism areas.</i></p> |
| <p>Sensitivity to Aboriginal Culture: The evaluation data indicated that many Aboriginal stakeholders see the application process and other features of MAP as not being sufficiently sensitive to their circumstances (language, bureaucratic process, etc.).</p> <p>Additionally, it was noted that there are currently no Aboriginal Staff involved in the delivery of MAP.</p> | <p><i>Sensitivity to Aboriginal culture should be enhanced in a number of ways: by identifying MAP staff needs for training and information needs for dealing with Aboriginal heritage issues (or Aboriginal communities and institutions generally), and developing a strategy to meet these needs; examining reach of MAP to Aboriginal institutions; creating an Aboriginal advisory committee; and creating an Aboriginal presence in the MAP staff complement.</i></p> |
| <p>Access to Regional Consultants: Lack of contact with regional consultants was reported to result in unequal levels of service to museums and was seen as running counter to MAP's objective of connecting different geographic regions of the country. Lack of full access was seen as minimizing the impact of MAP on Canadians in remote or isolated communities and in Aboriginal communities.</p> | <p><i>The Department should expand its means for regional consultants to travel and meet with target museums, and identify means to better connect with a full range of communities and museums.</i></p> <p>Some additional strategies could include MAP staff making telephone contacts with a wider range of museums, more attendance at conferences, etc.</p> |
| <p>Barriers to Using MAP: The evaluation did not assess whether non-users of MAP are non-users for systematic reasons such as lack of resources, lack of awareness, etc.</p> | <p><i>To ensure that access is equitable, a study of non-users could be undertaken</i></p> |
| <p>Innovative and Best Practices: Many museums indicated a need for ways to share expertise and lessons from MAP more effectively. This could be especially helpful to smaller museums.</p> | <p><i>A Web-site for success stories and innovative approaches should be established to allow for sharing of reports, experiences and insights. MAP presence at museum association meetings could also promote a venue for sharing success stories, project development strategies, etc.</i></p> |

| ISSUE/DISCUSSION | FUTURE DIRECTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS |
|--|--|
| <p>Tool Kits for Smaller Museums: There appears to be a need for a "how to" kit-for MAP applicants. Many museums indicated that applying for MAP is too costly. This type of kit might be especially useful to smaller museums which lack experience in proposal writing.</p> | <p><i>MAP should aid the development of kits or tools to aid small museums in preparing applications. This type of effort might also increase the flow of applications, allowing MAP a better selection of potential projects.</i></p> |
| <p>Need for Better Feedback on Applications: Some museums indicated they would like more feedback on both their successful and unsuccessful applications.</p> | <p><i>MAP should establish a protocol for a detailed written debriefing for museums, with comments from the peer review panel, and an opportunity for a telephone debriefing. This should be offered proactively by the Department.</i></p> |
| <p>MAP Timing/Administration Issues: Delays in communication of funding decisions and the delivery of payments were found to be major issues in MAP program delivery.</p> <p>For example, award announcements were reported to often be made much later than the annual deadlines suggested in program materials.</p> <p>Delays in the delivery of the project funds resulted in further delays for museums (e.g. museums needing to re-hire personnel they had let go due to the funding delays, or other failures of projects (where the potential partners pulled out due to delays)).</p> | <p><i>The points of delay should be identified and performance standards should be set for Canadian Heritage parties involved at each step in the process.</i></p> <p>A computerized tracking system should be established to monitor the meeting of these standards.</p> |
| <p>Monitoring and Benchmarking: The evaluation indicated the need for substantially improved monitoring data and benchmarking for MAP results areas. It was noted that it had been 8 years since the last systematic assessment of the program, and that no regular reports on key program features were available on an annual or other basis for senior management or the public.</p> <p>No regular program results were monitored, for example, Departmental records currently do not reveal key facts regarding travelling exhibits, where exhibits went, who saw them, etc.</p> <p>Further, no plans were found to be in place for implementation of the RMAF, or any new monitoring system.</p> | <p><i>A number of steps should be taken to improve monitoring and reporting, beginning with the establishment of a plan for refinement and implementation of the RMAF, including a delineation of responsibilities, resources, methods to be applied and reports to be produced.</i></p> <p>This could be aided by a variety of steps in the design of applications, databases, and surveys. Additionally better reporting should be requested from applicants, i.e., forms for reporting on results (where exhibits went, estimates of attendance, numbers and size of museum partners involved, etc.), and computerization of results.</p> <p>Results reports should be produced by the Program on a regular, ideally annual basis, to provide senior managers more information for program management, and also to provide information to museums and the public.</p> |

| ISSUE/DISCUSSION | FUTURE DIRECTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|---|
| <p>Assessing Economic Benefits/ Impacts: Economic impacts of MAP have not been assessed in the past and no mechanism is currently in place for such assessments.</p> | <p><i>Economic impacts of MAP projects on specific museums and communities should be assessed on a regular basis, which would support MAP strategic development.</i></p> <p>Such studies could focus on impacts on employment, tourism and related areas, and could be developed with academic partners interested in cultural issues.</p> <p>Such analyses could be used by museums to aid other funders in seeing the benefits of MAP projects.</p> |
| <p>Need to Monitor Losses: MAP projects led to financial losses for some museums, particularly where delays in funding were experienced. Tracking this type of negative impact should be built into the monitoring process.</p> | <p><i>Losses to museums should be tracked as a particular concern in any new monitoring system. This could be addressed through follow-up contacts and reporting forms.</i></p> |
| <p>Access to MAP in the Context of all Department of Canadian Heritage Programs: There is a need to understand better how MAP and museum needs are linked to, supported by or not supported by other Canadian Heritage programs.</p> <p>Currently, it appears (with new programs) that the many Departmental programs operate independently, creating potential for some confusion, or less efficient funding decisions (e.g. in a case where one program may receive many good applications while another program might receive too few good applications).</p> | <p><i>The Department should establish a system for monitoring all of its major funding flows to museums.</i></p> <p>Regional or other staff may fill some needs to direct museums to alternate funding sources, but a system could improve the efficiency of coordinating these various programs, and also allow for more strategic MAP allocations.</p> <p>For example, a procedure could be put in place to monitor museums' applications for grants across all programs (e.g. a database, or intranet site). This is an aspect of MAP context and outcomes that is currently overlooked by the RMAF.</p> |
| <p>Understanding Museum Funding Better and Improving the Development of the Broader Museum Environment: The substantial funding needs of museums and the lack of agreement between the Department and museums on this matter, and the Federal role in dealing with it, points to the need for new mechanisms to track and maximize funding for museums across all governments, and for the development of priorities in a more collaborative manner.</p> | <p><i>Research should be undertaken to improve the broader understanding of this issue of funding patterns, and to acquire more up-to-date information on this topic on a regular basis, to understand not just all Canadian Heritage funding, but also other Federal and Provincial/ Territorial funding, etc. Additionally, a dialogue on this information issue should be opened with other funding partners.</i></p> <p>Ideally, this type of effort would help to position MAP more clearly, and could provide a focus for efforts, not just by the Department, but by all key partners concerned with Canadian museums.</p> |

| ISSUE/DISCUSSION | FUTURE DIRECTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS |
|--|--|
| <p>Improving Communications and Harmonizing the Department of Canadian Heritage and Museum's Goals: Generally, museums and the Department appear to differ in their view as to what MAP should be about and who the ultimate clients of MAP are.</p> <p>These gaps appear to be substantial, suggesting that the Department's MAP processes since 1999 have not explained its goals well to the museum community or achieved buy-in to program changes, and may have alienated a substantial element of the museum community.</p> <p>Generally, these differences appear to reflect a lack in communications -- a lack in genuine dialogue -- between the Program and the museum community.</p> | <p><i>A strategy should be developed to improve communications and aid harmonization of these different views of goals.</i></p> <p>Generally, there is a need for better communications and a stronger partnership and collaboration between Canadian Heritage and museums (which are both key partners in meeting heritage needs of Canadians).</p> <p>Solutions might also be linked to new forms of information-sharing or governance for the program, for example, development of advisory or consultation committees, or even the development of alternative forms of governance such as an independent agency for administration of MAP.</p> |
| <p>Developing Future Directions: Many of the suggestions put forward in this report are complex, and would benefit from discussion by the key parties in the program -- the MAP regional staff who know the delivery of the program best -- and the museums, who know their own and the Canadian public's heritage needs.</p> | <p><i>The Department should undertake a consultation process with its own staff and with museums to develop future directions from this evaluation.</i></p> <p>This would be a good start towards improved communications which appear to be much needed for this program.</p> |

Appendix A: Evaluation Issues and Data Sources

Display A.1 Evaluation Questions⁶⁵

Relevance

- 1 Do MAP objectives remain relevant within the current policy context?
- 1A Do museums across Canada continue to require financial assistance to design, present and circulate their exhibits/products outside of their own facility, across provinces?
- 1B Do Aboriginal heritage organizations continue to require financial support in the preservation and presentation of the cultural heritage of Aboriginal peoples?
- 1C Do museums across Canada continue to require financial assistance to develop and enhance professional standards and expertise in all museum component areas?
- 2 If MAP had not been implemented in the early 1970's, to what extent would MAP-funded museum activities still have occurred?
- 3A What are, at the beginning of the 21st century, the current needs of Canadians in regard to their awareness and understanding of their culturally diverse heritage?
- 3B What is the appropriate role of the Federal Government in regard to addressing these needs? For example, should the Federal Government identify the various "collections of national significance" across the country and provide support for their effective management?

Success

- 4A To what extent have projects funded under MAP led to Canadians knowing and understanding more about each other because of better access to their culturally diverse heritage, identity, history, and symbols? Specifically through: (1) the National Outreach Initiative; and (2) the Exhibition Circulation Fund?
- 4B To what extent have projects funded under MAP led to the more effective retention, preservation, conservation and presentation of the cultural heritage of Aboriginal peoples in Canada? Specifically through: (1) funding of feasibility and other studies; and (2) funding of First Nations communities/group partnerships with established museums and other projects.
- 4C To what extent have projects funded under MAP led to the more effective management and greater capacity to meet new challenges as well as ensuring long term financial stability of museum organizations across Canada regarding: (1) the professional development of trustees, staff and volunteers; (2) effective long-term management of collections; and (3) planning and feasibility studies?

Program Design and Delivery

- 5 What performance monitoring mechanisms have been put in place to measure MAP performance? What annual reporting and/or periodic reviews should be implemented?
- 6 Is the level of funding appropriate in each of the three MAP components?
- 7 More generally, to what extent are the design and delivery of the three MAP components consistent with MAP objectives?
- 8 More specifically, is MAP (three components) designed appropriately to reach targetted institutions?
- 9 Are there design/delivery elements that work against the success of MAP regarding: (1) focus of the three components; (2) approval criteria; (3) peer review and regional review; (4) Dept. of Canadian Heritage-MAP funding/budgetting processes (program/project, regional/headquarters); (5) reporting structure; (6) other? What are they? What changes should occur?

Cost-Effectiveness and Alternatives

- 10 Is the current MAP delivery approach cost-effective? How does it compare to similar (provincial/municipal/international) programs?
- 11 What alternatives are possible in terms of design and delivery?

⁶⁵ Adapted from the RFP.

Display A.2 Evaluation Issues by Data Source

| Evaluation Issues | Census Survey of 1999 Applicants | Key Informant Interviews | Exit Survey | Museum Association Survey | Regional Workshop | Case Studies | File/Literature |
|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| A. Relevance | | | | | | | |
| 1. Do MAP objectives remain relevant within the current policy context? | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| (a) Do museums across Canada continue to require financial assistance to design, present and circulate their exhibits/products outside of their own facility, across provinces? | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| (b) Do Aboriginal heritage organizations continue to require financial support in the preservation and presentation of the cultural heritage of Aboriginal peoples? | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| (c) Do museums across Canada continue to require financial assistance to develop and enhance professional standards and expertise in all museum component areas? | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| 2. If MAP had not been implemented in the early 1970's, to what extent would MAP-funded museum activities still have occurred? | X | X | | X | X | | X |
| 3A. What are, at the beginning of the 21st century, the current needs of Canadians in regard to their awareness and understanding of their culturally diverse heritage? | X | X | X | X | | | X |
| 3B. What is the appropriate role of the Federal Government in regard to addressing these needs? For example, should the Federal Government identify the various "collections of national significance" across the country and provide support for their effective management? | X | X | X | X | | | X |
| B. Success | | | | | | | |
| 4A. To what extent have projects funded under MAP led to Canadians knowing and understanding more about each other because of better access to their culturally diverse heritage, identity, history, and symbols? Specifically through: (1) the National Outreach Initiative; and (2) the Exhibition Circulation Fund? | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| 4B. To what extent have projects funded under MAP led to the more effective retention, preservation, conservation and presentation of the cultural heritage of Aboriginal peoples in Canada? Specifically through: (1) funding of feasibility and other studies; and (2) funding of First Nations communities/group partnerships with established museums and other projects. | X | | | | X | X | X |
| 4C. To what extent have projects funded under MAP led to the more effective management and greater capacity to meet new challenges as well as ensuring long term financial stability of museum organizations across Canada regarding: (1) the professional development of trustees, staff and volunteers; (2) effective long-term management of collections; and (3) planning and feasibility studies? | X | | X | | X | X | X |

| Evaluation Issues | Census Survey of 1999 Applicants | Key Informant Interviews | Exit Survey | Museum Association Survey | Regional Workshop | Case Study | File/Literature |
|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|-------------------|------------|-----------------|
| C. Program Design and Delivery | | | | | | | |
| 5. What performance monitoring mechanisms have been put in place to measure MAP performance? What annual reporting and/or periodic reviews should be implemented? | X | | | | X | | X |
| 6. Is the level of funding appropriate in each of the three MAP components? | X | X | | X | X | | X |
| 7. More generally, to what extent are the design and delivery of the three MAP components consistent with MAP objectives? | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| 8. More specifically, is MAP (three components) designed appropriately to reach targetted institutions? | X | X | | X | X | | X |
| 9. Are there design/delivery elements that work against the success of MAP regarding: (1) focus of the three components; (2) approval criteria; (3) peer review and regional review; (4) Dept. of Canadian Heritage-MAP funding/budgetting processes (program/project; Regional/Headquarters); (5) reporting structure; (6) other? What are they? What changes should occur? | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| D. Cost-Effectiveness and Alternatives | | | | | | | |
| 10. Is the current MAP delivery approach cost-effective? How does it compare to other similar (provincial/municipal/international) programs? | X | X | | X | X | | X |
| 11. What alternatives are possible in terms of design and delivery? | X | X | | X | X | | X |

| | Census Survey of 1999 Applicants | Key Informant Guide Question Number | Exit Survey Question Number | Museum Association Survey | Regional Workshop | Case Study | File/ Literature |
|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|------------|------------------|
| Evaluation Issues | | | | | | | |
| Other Data and Indicators | | | | | | | |
| MAP funding applications in the 1999 application period: | X | | | | | | |
| – Number of applications submitted in the 1999 application period by component | | | | | | | |
| – Number of applications fully funded from the 1999 application period by component | | | | | | | |
| – Number of applications partially funded from the application period by component | | | | | | | |
| – Number of applications not funded from the 1999 application period by component | | | | | | | |
| Performance Indicators: | X | | | | | | |
| Funding Sources: | | | | | | X | |
| Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework Measures | | | | | | | |
| Visitor satisfaction | | | X | | | | |
| Increased awareness of Canadian heritage | | | X | | | | |
| Increased awareness of Aboriginal heritage | | | X | | | | |
| Additional measures | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of visitors who saw the MAP exhibit | | | X | | | | |
| Visitor profile | | | X | | | | |
| Knowledge about the ownership of the exhibit | | | X | | | | |
| Knowledge about the source of funding of the exhibit | | | X | | | | |

Appendix B: Additional Notes on Methodology and Data Limitations

Census Survey of 1999 MAP Applicants: The statistical summaries presented below are based on 166 survey returns (a response rate of over 80%). The samples of MAP applicants represents a significant portion of all applicants for 1999, and thus should be very reliable. A caution, however, is that the number of respondents that received Aboriginal Museum Development funding was small. No breakdowns or assessments by region were possible, as sample sizes were too small to allow statistically reliable conclusions regarding differences.

Characteristics of Institutions: As shown in Display B.1, 70.3% of those responding to the census survey were museums, followed by art galleries (24.2%), and historic sites (17%), with a wide range of other types of organizations reported as well. The majority of these institutions classified themselves as non-profit associations/non-governmental organizations. The significant majority of respondents were involved in exhibits related to the history (63.3%), or the arts sector (48.8%), with about 19% each related to Aboriginal culture, nature and science, and about 26% indicating "other" sectors of activity.

Display B.1 Characteristics of Responding Museums

Description of organizations and their governing body as of 1999:⁶⁶

| Type of Organization | | Governance | |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------------|--|
| 70.3% | Museum | 6.7% | Provincial Sector |
| 24.2 | Art Gallery | 12.2 | Municipal Sector |
| 2.4 | Science Centre | 3.0 | First Nation |
| 17.0 | Historic Site | 3.7 | Educational Sector (e.g. a university) |
| 13.9 | Exhibition Centre | 1.2 | Religious Organization |
| 2.4 | Eco-museum | 64.0 | Non-profit or non-governmental org. |
| 1.2 | National Museum Association | 2.4 | Other Aboriginal Organization |
| 6.7 | Provincial/Territorial Museum Association | 4.9 | Other |
| 15.2 | Other | | |

Organization's main areas of activity in 1999:⁶⁷

| | |
|-------|--------------------|
| 63.3% | History |
| 48.8 | Arts |
| 18.7 | Aboriginal culture |
| 25.9 | Other |
| 18.7 | Nature |
| 19.3 | Science |

⁶⁶ Percentages may total more than 100% as respondents could "check all that apply."

⁶⁷ Percentages may total more than 100% as respondents could "check all that apply."

Statistical Characteristics of MAP Applicants: As noted in Display B.2 below, the largest segment of respondents (41.8%) had annual budgets ranging between \$100,000 - \$500,000. The majority (64.2%) had fewer than ten full-time employees, but over 60% of responding museums had over 20 volunteers. The median number of visitors to museums was 20,000 visitors per year.

Display B.2 Museum Statistical Data

Organization's best estimate for each of the following for 1999:

Annual operating budget (1998/99 fiscal year):

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| Under \$100,000 | 15.8% of respondents |
| \$100,000 – 499,999 | 41.8 |
| \$500,000 – 999,999 | 12.7 |
| \$1 million or more | or 29.7 |
| Median | \$375,000/year |

Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) employees:⁶⁸

| | |
|-------------|----------------------|
| 2 or fewer | 27.7% of respondents |
| 3 – 9 | 36.5 |
| 10 – 19 | 13.8 |
| 20 – 99 | 17.0 |
| 100 or more | 5.0 |
| Median | 5 FTEs |

Number of volunteers:

| | |
|-------------|----------------------|
| 2 or fewer | 12.5% of respondents |
| 3 – 9 | 15.6 |
| 10 – 19 | 9.4 |
| 20 – 99 | 40.0 |
| 100 or more | 22.5 |
| Median | 30 volunteers |

Number of visitors per year:

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Under 10,000 | 22.2% of respondents |
| 10,000 – 19,999 | 27.1 |
| 20,000 – 49,999 | 23.6 |
| 50,000 – 99,999 | 10.4 |
| 100,000 or more | 16.7 |
| Median | 20,000 visitors |

⁶⁸ FTE = total employee hours per week divided by the number of hours usually worked by a full-time employee in an organization.

EXIT (VISITOR) SURVEY

Travelling Exhibits: A total of 26 exhibits were examined in the MAP visitor exit survey (further information is provided in Display B.3, next page). Three were in B.C., five in Alberta, one in Saskatchewan, one in Manitoba, four in Ontario, four in the National Capital Region, five in Quebec, two in New Brunswick, and one in Newfoundland. Themes of the exhibits were: 14 historical/heritage exhibits; 3 multicultural exhibits; 3 Aboriginal exhibits; 3 science and technology exhibits; 2 art exhibits; and 1 human rights exhibit.

Visitor Demographics: Of the 723 visitors who completed surveys, 18% were 25 years of age or less, 17.7% were aged 26-35, 17.1% were 36-45, 20.8% were 46-55, and 26.5% were 56 or older. Seventy-five percent of respondents reported English as their first language, 16% reported French, and 9% reported another language as their first language. Exit survey respondents tended to be frequent users of museums, indicating that, on average, they visit a Canadian museum an average of 6.5 times per year.

About one-third (31.3%) were aware that the exhibit had received funding from the federal government, and over 90% of these respondents thought it is a good idea for the Government of Canada to provide funding for the type of exhibit they had just seen.

SURVEY OF MUSEUM ASSOCIATIONS: Six museum associations completed surveys which are included in the analysis in Sections 4-7.

Display B.3 MAP Visitors Exit Survey Travelling Exhibits Assessed and Museums

| Name of Travelling Exhibit | Location Where Surveys Were Collected |
|--|--|
| Billy's Vision | Walter Phillips Gallery, Banff, AB |
| Matting Season: Hooked Rugs of the Grenfell Mission | Red Deer and District Museum, Red Deer, AB |
| Toy Soldiers: Playing for Keeps | The Fort: Museum of the Northwest Mounted Police, Fort MacLeod, AB |
| Sacred Arts of Tibet | Whyte Museum of the Canadian Rockies, Banff, AB |
| Nitsitapiisinni: The Blackfoot Way of Life | Glenbow Museum, Calgary, AB |
| Re-Shaping Memory, Owning History: Through the Lens of the Japanese Canadian Redress | Japanese Canadian National Museum, Burnaby, BC |
| St. Roch | Maritime Museum of B.C., Victoria, BC |
| Kimonos of the Geisha Ichimaru | Art Gallery of Greater Victoria, Victoria, BC |
| WWI Journals of Fred Strickland | Moose Jaw Museum, Moose Jaw, SK |
| The Mark of Time | Saint Boniface Museum, Winnipeg, MB |
| Marian Dale Scott | Art Gallery of Windsor, Windsor, ON |
| Mohawk Ideals, Victorian Values: Oronhyatekha, M.D. | Woodland Cultural Centre, Brantford, ON |
| My Name is Nanuq | St. Catharines Museum, St. Catharines, ON |
| Diana Thornycroft: The Body, Its Lesson-Camouflage | Agnes Etherington Art Centre, Kingston, ON |
| Lifelines (four MAP-funded exhibits)* | Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull, QC |
| Magnesium: Metal of the Future | Bombardier Museum, Valcourt, QC |
| Full Circle: First Contact. Vikings and Skraelings in Newfoundland/Labrador | McCord Museum of Canadian History, Montreal, QC |
| Les Sciences de la Mer | Musée Régionale de Rimouski, Rimouski, QC |
| Jerry Pethick: Drawing Room | Musée Régionale de Rimouski, Rimouski, QC |
| Plus Que Parfaites | Centre d'Histoire de Montréal, QC |
| Stolen Dreams: Portraits of the World's Working Children | New Brunswick Museum, Saint John, NB |
| Our Place in Space | Moncton Museum, Moncton, NB |
| National Furniture Exhibition, Newfoundland | Arts and Culture Centre, St. John's, NF |

* This exhibit was a cluster of four separate MAP exhibits from various parts of Atlantic Canada.

Display B.4 Case Studies

-
- **An ANO project in Central Canada:** This was a partnership formed between four mid-size "community" museums with the object of developing four quality, low-cost travelling exhibits for community museums across Canada, and improving the professional skills of staff.
 - **An ANO project in Western Canada:** This exhibit was developed to be a world-class and international travelling exhibit showcased the sixteen tribes of a First Nation who have long been involved in whaling. Central to the exhibit was "the idea that the Nations themselves would be directly involved in the story to be told by the travelling exhibit."
 - **An ANO project in Central Canada:** This exhibit consisted of research and production of an artist's works and was aimed at demonstrating the artist's innovative integration of sculpture and architecture. A catalogue and promotional work were included in the project costs.
 - **An AMD project in Atlantic Canada:** This exhibit had two phases: (1) a travelling exhibit of photographs depicting the life of Aboriginal people of a specific region prior to centralization; and (2) creation of an exhibit catalogue.
 - **An AMD project in Central Canada:** This exhibit focused on the creation of an exhibit to tell the story of the Aboriginal people, who they are, how they came to be in this place, and aspects of their cultures. The project was to demonstrate the continuity of life from earlier times as a basis for contemporary values; to communicate the importance of oral traditions; to communicate these concepts in ways that are accessible to all visitors; and provide opportunities for community involvement in the exhibit development, content, and fabrication.
 - **An AMD project in Northern Canada:** The objective of this exhibit was the creation of two replicas of a nineteenth-century skin lodge. Project partners included a community services board, a high school, the Treaty Council, and the museum. A mentoring program had young people working with Elders to make lodge replicas.
 - **An OD project in Central Canada:** This project involved a study of the feasibility of the re-design the museum's space to create an educational area, in co-operation with schools in the community.
 - **An OD project in Central Canada:** The project involved making a museum's collection available to the general public and museum researchers interested in Canadian art by Internet, since education is central to the museum's raison d'etre is education.
 - **An OD project in Central Canada:** This project involved the development of tools for the solicitation of major contributions and planned donations. The project consisted of three phases: research; computerization; and promotion.
 - **An OD project in Central Canada:** The first phase of this project consisted of research into, and production of, an exhibit of an artist's work and was aimed at making the artist's work better known to the Canadian public. The second phase involved the circulation of the exhibit in at least three regions.
 - **An OD project in Central Canada:** This project involved installation of a high density mobile compact storage system for the museum's artefacts, to accommodate its growing collection and to increase the length of use of the facility to ensure that the needs of its community are met well into the 21st century.
 - **An OD Project in Atlantic Canada:** This project was undertaken to meet the changing needs of the museum community, by expanding on its traditional audience to strengthen the heritage sector links within and outside the province. The project was designed to help implement the association's lore program and enable the association's museum members to participate in the program.
-

Appendix C: List of Key Informants and Workshop Participants

Museum Organizations

Dr. Charles Arnold, Director Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre.

Mme Marie Émond, Directrice des expositions, Pointe à Callière Musée d'archéologie et d'histoire de Montréal.

Mr. Tom Hill, Executive Director, Woodland Cultural Centre.

Mr. Douglas Leonard, Executive Director, Whyte Museum of the Canadian Rockies.

Mr. James Marchbank, Chief Executive Officer, Science North Foundation.

Mr. John McAavity, Executive Director, Canadian Museums Association.

Mr. Bernard Riordon, Director and CEO, Art Gallery of Nova Scotia.

Department of Canadian Heritage

Mr. Roger Baird, Senior Program Officer, Museums Assistance Program, Department of Canadian Heritage.

Ms. Arlette Blanchet, Senior Advisor – Museums, Department of Canadian Heritage (Québec).

Mr. Ronal Bourgeois, Director, Strategic Issues, Heritage Policy Branch, Department of Canadian Heritage.

Mr. Mark O'Neill, Acting Director, Cultural Property Directorate, Heritage Policy Branch, Department of Canadian Heritage (until September, 2001).

Ms. Eileen Sarkar, Assistant Deputy Minister, Arts and Heritage, Department of Canadian Heritage.

PCH Regional Consultants (Regional Consultants Workshop)

Mme Ghislaine Alexandre (Québec); Mme Eve Bardou (Québec); Ms. Michelle Beitel (Saskatchewan); Ms. Arlette Blanchet (Québec); Mr. Denis Greenall (Ontario); Ms. Kimberley Jones (Ontario); Mme Mireille Lamontagne (Prairies/Northern Regions); Mme France Lévesque (Québec); Ms. Tracy Marsh (Ontario); Ms. Jeanette Monk (Ontario); Ms. Philippa Syme (British Columbia); and M. Paul Thériault (Atlantic).

Appendix D: Literature, Databases, Documents and Web-Sites Examined

Reports and Documents

- Boylan, P. "Museums 2000 and the future of museums" in Patrick Boylan (ed) *Museums 2000: Politics, people, professionals and profit*, 1992.
- Cameron, Christina. "Cultural Tourism: Landmine or Goldmine?" (<http://crm.cr.nps.gov/archive/17-3/17-3-15.pdf>).
- Corporate Review Branch, Canadian Heritage, Review of the Museums Assistance Program: Final Report, Ernst & Young and N.L. Hushion and Associates, 1994.
- Corporate Review Branch, Canadian Heritage, Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework for the Museums Assistance Program (July, 2001).
- Franco Mastroddi, "Electronic publishing trends and advances" (<http://academia.darmstadt.gmd.de/sweden/mastroddi.html>) (1997).
- Griffin and Abraham, "Management of Museums in the 1990s: Governments and Organizational Reform" in Kevin Moore (ed) *Management in Museums*, 1999.
- Heritage Policy Branch, Canadian Heritage. Canadians and Their Heritage: Some Trends, Issues and Ideas: A Dialogue on Heritage in the 21st Century. October 2001.
- Perot, Paul. "Profits and Museums" in "Museums 2000 and the future of museums" in Patrick Boylan (ed) *Museums 2000: Politics, people, professionals and profit*, 1992.
- San Roman, Lorena. "Politics and the role of museums in the rescue of identity" in Patrick Boylan (ed) *Museums 2000: Politics, people, professionals and profit*, 1992.

Web-Sites and Other Data Sources

- <http://www.cee.ca/index.html> (URL for Centre for Exhibition Exchange).
- http://www.chin.gc.ca/Museums/Cma/e_cma.html (Official Directory of the Canadian Museums Association).
- http://www.virtualmuseum.ca/English/Museum/index_flash.html (Virtual Museum of Canada - Find a Museum).
- <http://www.cee.ca/> (Centre for Exhibition Exchange).
- <http://www.cee.ca/english/exhibitions/default.html>
- http://daryl.chin.gc.ca:8000/BASIS/cee/www/ins_browse/SAC?T=I&F=institution_name.
- Canadian Heritage, MAP Administrative Data Base, MAPbyProv72-00.xls.
- Canadian Heritage, selected project files.

Appendix E: Key Survey Instruments



Survey of 1999 MAP Applicants

An Evaluation of the Museums Assistance Program for the Department of Canadian Heritage

c/o SPR Associates Inc., 275 Slater Street, Ottawa, Ontario, and 45 Granby Street, Toronto, Ontario 1-800-363-0832

PURPOSE OF THIS SURVEY: This survey is an important component of an Evaluation of the Museums Assistance Program (MAP) which is currently being conducted for the Department of Canadian Heritage. Museums who applied for funding in the Fall of 1999, are being surveyed to gather data, information and the viewpoints of museum professionals. All survey responses will be kept completely confidential and will only be seen by the consulting company conducting the survey for the Department, SPR Associates of Toronto (for information on SPR, see www.spr.ca). Individual organizations' responses will not be revealed and the study report will contain only anonymous and statistically summarized information.

OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION: The objective of the MAP Evaluation is to evaluate the program in terms of its continued relevance; its success (short-term outcomes and ultimate impacts); the appropriateness of its design; the effectiveness of its delivery; its cost-effectiveness and alternatives to the program.

WHO SHOULD COMPLETE THIS SURVEY: The survey should be completed by the person(s) or their successor(s) who is/are most knowledgeable about your organization's needs as they relate to MAP and to your 1999 MAP application(s) and how it has been used within your organization.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete each question by checking, circling, or writing in the appropriate answer. The survey should take about 30 minutes to complete. Once complete, the survey can be FAXED to: 1-877-518-9958 or (416) 977-7747 (within the local Toronto calling area), or returned by mail in the postage-paid envelope provided.

NOTE: *Within the survey, the term "your organization" refers to the museum, association or organization that applied for funding in the Fall of 1999.*

A. About Your Organization

1. Please indicate which of the following best describes your organization and its governing body as of 1999:

Type of Organization

(CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- Museum
- Art Gallery
- Science Centre
- Historic Site
- Exhibition Centre
- Eco-museum
- National Museum Association
- Provincial/Territorial Museum Association
- Other (please specify): _____

Governing Body

(CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- Provincial Sector
- Municipal Sector
- First Nation
- Educational Sector (e.g. a university)
- Religious Organization
- Non-profit or non-governmental organization
- Other Aboriginal organization
- Other (please specify): _____

2. What were your organization's main sectors of activity in 1999? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- Aboriginal culture
- Nature
- Science
- Arts
- History
- Other (please specify): _____

3. Please provide your best estimate for each of the following for your organization in 1999:

(a) Annual operating budget (1998/99 fiscal year): \$ _____

(b) Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) employees: _____ (FTE = total employee hours per week divided by the number of hours usually worked by a full-time employee in your organization)

(c) Number of volunteers: _____ (INDICATE "0" IF NONE)

(d) Number of visitors per year: _____ OR Not Applicable

B. MAP Components

4. Please indicate your satisfaction with each of the following aspects of MAP. (Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 5, where "1" = Not Satisfied at All and "5" = Very Satisfied. Circle "DK" if you don't know or "NF" if you are not familiar with a particular component.)

| | Not Satisfied At All | | | | | Very Satisfied | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|-----------------------|-----------|--|--|
| MAP Overall: | | | | | | | | | |
| (a) The application process in general | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (b) The assistance provided by Department of Canadian Heritage staff | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (c) The peer review process | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (d) The Department's regional review process | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (e) The length of time for approvals, timeliness of decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| The Access and National Outreach Component: | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>National Outreach Initiative</u> (option under this component) | | | | | | | | | |
| (f) The types of eligible projects (eligibility criteria) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (g) The evaluation criteria for this option | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (h) The level of funding available to individual projects | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (i) The cost to museums of preparing proposals (staff time, costs) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| <u>Exhibition Circulation Fund</u> (option under this component) | | | | | | | | | |
| (j) The types of eligible projects (eligibility criteria) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (k) The evaluation criteria for this option | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (l) The level of funding available to individual projects | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (m) The cost to museums of preparing proposals (staff time, costs) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| The Aboriginal Museum Development Component: | | | | | | | | | |
| (n) The types of eligible projects (eligibility criteria) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (o) The evaluation criteria for this component | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (p) The level of funding available to individual projects | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (q) The cost to museums of preparing proposals (staff time, costs) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| The Organizational Development Component: | | | | | | | | | |
| (r) The types of eligible projects (eligibility criteria) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (s) The evaluation criteria for this component | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (t) The level of funding available to individual projects | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |
| (u) The cost to museums of preparing proposals (staff time, costs) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF | | |

5. What improvements (if any) would you recommend for MAP as regards the program overall or any of its components or options? (Please indicate if your comments apply to a specific component or option. Feel free to add additional pages.)

C. About your 1999 MAP Application(s)

6. How many MAP applications did your organization submit in the Fall of 1999? _____

**Please complete one block below for each MAP application you made in the Fall of 1999.
(If you applied for more than 3 projects, please copy this page and attach to the survey)**

7. What was the name of the Project? _____

(a) Was the application under: The Access and National Outreach Component ⇨ National Outreach Initiative
 Exhibition Circulation Fund
 The Aboriginal Museum Development Component
 The Organizational Development Component

(b) Was the application approved?
 Yes, for full amount
 Yes, partially
 No

(c) (IF NOT APPROVED)
 Was the project:
 Cancelled ⇨ **(GO TO Q.8)**
 Postponed
 Reduced
 Implemented

(d) (IF CARRIED OUT)
 Was the project successful?
 Yes, fully
 Yes, partially
 No
 Don't know ⇨ **(GO TO Q.8)**

(e) What is your assessment of the project's level of success based on?

8. What was the name of the Project? _____

(a) Was the application under: The Access and National Outreach Component ⇨ National Outreach Initiative
 Exhibition Circulation Fund
 The Aboriginal Museum Development Component
 The Organizational Development Component

(b) Was the application approved?
 Yes, for full amount
 Yes, partially
 No

(c) (IF NOT APPROVED)
 Was the project:
 Cancelled ⇨ **(GO TO Q.9)**
 Postponed
 Reduced
 Implemented

(d) (IF CARRIED OUT)
 Was the project successful?
 Yes, fully
 Yes, partially
 No
 Don't know ⇨ **(GO TO Q.9)**

(e) What is your assessment of the project's level of success based on?

9. What was the name of the Project? _____

(a) Was the application under: The Access and National Outreach Component ⇨ National Outreach Initiative
 Exhibition Circulation Fund
 The Aboriginal Museum Development Component
 The Organizational Development Component

(b) Was the application approved?
 Yes, for full amount
 Yes, partially
 No

(c) (IF NOT APPROVED)
 Was the project:
 Cancelled ⇨ **(GO TO Q.10)**
 Postponed
 Reduced
 Implemented

(d) (IF CARRIED OUT)
 Was the project successful?
 Yes, fully
 Yes, partially
 No
 Don't know ⇨ **(GO TO Q.10)**

(e) What is your assessment of the project's level of success based on?

D. Objectives of MAP

10. From your organization's perspective, to what extent has MAP achieved its objectives as regards each of the following? (Circle one number for each on a scale of 1 to 5 where "1" = Not at All and "5" = To a Great Extent, or circle "DK" if you don't know.)

| | Not At All | | | | | To a Great Extent |
|--|-------------------|---|---|---|---|--------------------------|
| (a) The National Outreach Initiative helps Canadians to learn and understand more about each other through better access to their diverse heritage, identity, history, and symbols | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (b) The Exhibition Circulation Fund helps Canadians to learn and understand more about each other through better access to their diverse heritage, identity, history, and symbols | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (c) MAP assists in the retention, preservation, conservation and presentation of the cultural heritage of Aboriginal peoples in Canada | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (d) MAP assists First Nations communities/groups in establishing partnerships with established museums and other projects | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (e) MAP funding assists museums in the professional development of staff, volunteers, and trustees | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (f) MAP funding assists the development of museums through planning and feasibility studies | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (g) MAP has assisted the development of Canadian museums since the 1970's | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (h) MAP assists the effective long-term management of collections | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |

11. In your opinion, how important is it for the Government of Canada to assist museums and related organizations in each of the following activities? (Circle one number for each on a scale of 1 to 5, where "1" = Not Important at All and "5" = Very Important, or circle "DK" if you don't know)

| | Not Important At All | | | Very Important | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---|-----------|
| (a) Circulation of exhibits between provinces | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (b) Preservation and presentation of Aboriginal cultures | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (c) Exhibits which contribute to the appreciation of Canada's many cultures | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (d) Preservation/conservation of Canada's cultural heritage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (e) Preservation/conservation of Canada's scientific and technological heritage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (f) Preservation/conservation of Canada's natural heritage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (g) Provision of support for effective management of collections | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (h) Development and enhancement of professional standards and expertise | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (i) Development of public programming activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (j) Development of Canada's museums generally | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (k) Identification and support of "collections of national significance" across the country | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (l) Other (please specify): _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

12. Considering the rapid social and technological changes in the 21st century, are there other things that the Government of Canada could do through MAP to improve Canadians' awareness and understanding of their diverse Canadian heritage? If so, please explain.
13. Are there better ways the Government of Canada could assist and support museums? Please elaborate.
14. Feel free to provide any other comments/suggestions you have regarding MAP (attach pages if needed).

E. Contact Information

The following information is required in the event that we need to re-contact you to clarify your answers. It will also be used to record your response so that you do not receive follow-up reminders. Please note that all information provided will be kept **totally confidential**. The information you provide below will only be seen by members of the SPR Associates research team and will be destroyed following completion of the study.

Name: _____ Position/Responsibility: _____

Organization: _____ Address: _____

Phone: _____ FAX: _____ E-mail: _____

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Please FAX your completed survey to 1-877-518-9958 or 416-977-7747 (within the local Toronto calling area), or return the survey by mail in the postage-paid envelope provided.



Visitors Survey

A study for the Department of Canadian Heritage

c/o SPR Associates Inc., 275 Slater Street, Ottawa, Ontario and 45 Granby Street, Toronto, Ontario 1-800-363-0832

The Government of Canada is conducting a survey to gain insight on how museums relate to the needs of Canadians regarding their natural and cultural heritage, and how it can assist Canadians to better understand this heritage. The Department of Canadian Heritage is currently evaluating its Museums Assistance Program which provides financial assistance to non-federal museums for exhibits to travel from province/territory-to-province/territory, as well as for other museum activities. Could you please take a couple of minutes to answer the following questions? Note that all of your answers will be kept strictly confidential. (Ce sondage est aussi disponible en français.)

- Do you live in Canada? Yes ⇒ (PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SURVEY)
 No, I am a tourist visiting Canada ⇒ (DO NOT COMPLETE THIS SURVEY, please return it to the researcher)

1. During your visit today, did you see the exhibit entitled: _____
 Yes ⇒ (PLEASE COMPLETE THE SHADED BOX BELOW)
 No ⇒ (GO TO QUESTION 7 ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE)

Please note: Questions 2 to 6 below relate only to the exhibit entitled: _____ . Please answer these questions based on your opinions of this exhibit and NOT ON YOUR VISIT AS A WHOLE.

2. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements: (Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 5 where "1"= Do Not Agree at All and "5"= Strongly Agree, or circle "NA" if the statement does not apply.)

| | Do Not Agree at All | | | | | Strongly Agree | |
|--|---------------------|---|---|---|---|----------------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA | |
| (a) I appreciated/enjoyed the exhibit | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA | |
| (b) I gained increased understanding about the subject, culture or region presented in the exhibit | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA | |
| (c) I gained better understanding or knowledge about Canada's history or heritage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA | |
| (d) I would recommend this exhibit to a friend | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA | |
| (e) I enjoyed the selection of objects presented in this exhibit | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA | |
| (f) I enjoyed the variety of presentations used in this exhibit (e.g. films, sounds, photography, computers) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA | |

3.(a) Is there any one element that you particularly **liked** in this exhibit? If so, please describe below.

3.(b) Is there any one element that you particularly **disliked** in this exhibit? If so, please describe below.

4. Overall, how would you rate this exhibit? Very Poor Poor Fair/Average Good Excellent

5. Did you know that this exhibit received funding from the Canadian Government? Yes No

6. Do you think it is a good idea for the Government of Canada to provide funding for exhibits such as this one?

- Yes No Don't know

➡ **Please turn over and complete page 2 of this survey**

7. Turning your thoughts to museums in general, how important do you think it is for the Government of Canada to provide financial support to museums for each of the following? (Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 5 where "1"= Not Important at All and "5" = Very Important, or circle "DK" if you don't know.)

| | Not Important At All | | | Very Important | | |
|---|----------------------|---|---|----------------|---|----|
| (a) Circulating exhibits between provinces or territories | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (b) Preserving and presenting Aboriginal cultures | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (c) Presenting and understanding Canada's many cultures | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (d) Preserving Canada's cultural heritage, including its scientific and technological heritage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (e) Preserving Canada's natural heritage (physical environment etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (f) Presenting collections of national significance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (g) Developing Canada's museums in general | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |

8. How important to you are each of the following types of exhibits? (Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 5 where "1"= Not Important at All and "5"= Very Important, or circle "DK" if you don't know.)

| | Not Important At All | | | Very Important | | |
|--|----------------------|---|---|----------------|---|----|
| (a) Exhibits from other provinces and territories | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (b) Exhibits on Canada's cultural heritage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (c) Exhibits on Canada's cultural diversity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (d) Exhibits on Aboriginal cultures | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (e) Exhibits on Canada's natural heritage (physical environment etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (f) Exhibits on Canada's scientific and technological heritage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |
| (g) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY): _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK |

9. On average, how many times per year do you visit Canadian museums? _____ TIMES PER YEAR

10. In which province or territory do you live? _____

11. What is your age group? 18 and under 19-25 26-35 36-45 46-55 56 or older

12. What is your mother tongue (i.e., the first language you learned as a child)?

English French Other (PLEASE SPECIFY): _____

13. In your opinion, what is the most important thing that the Government of Canada can do to assist museums to help Canadians to understand their history and heritage?

**Thank you very much for your assistance.
Please return your completed questionnaire to the researcher at this museum.**



MAP Key Informant Interview Guide (English)

Name: _____ Organization: _____

Coordinates: _____

Position/Responsibility (within the organization): _____

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of the Evaluation of the Museums Assistance Program (MAP) is to provide views to the Department of Canadian Heritage on MAP and to assess the success of MAP in supporting and promoting the goals of the government and museums.

Key informant interviews are being conducted to gather the perceptions, opinions and knowledge from individuals like you who have had an important role/experience with MAP.

A. Role and experience of respondent and organization with MAP

1. Would you please tell me a little bit about your responsibilities with museums and with MAP in particular?
2. Which aspects of MAP are you most familiar with? (Probe for overall design, delivery, Access and National Outreach, Aboriginal Museum Development, Organizational Development)?

[IF NOT A RECEIVING INSTITUTION]

3a. What is your understanding of the Program?

3b. What is your experience with the Program?

[IF A RECEIVING INSTITUTION]

4a. Over how many years has your institution been submitting applications to MAP? How many did you submit in 1999? How many were successful/not successful, etc.?

4.b What were your institution's main objectives in applying to the Museums Assistance Program?

B. MAP Components

[**INTERVIEWER:** Ask questions in Sections B.1 to B.3 only to those respondents who have indicated they are very familiar with the corresponding component]

B.1 Concerning the Access and National Outreach component

The objective of the Access and National Outreach component is to connect different geographic regions of the country, by assisting museums to reach wide and diverse Canadian audiences that reflect the nation's cultural diversity. Two funding options are available under this component: the National Outreach Initiative and the Exhibition Circulation Fund.

1. How have museum organizations benefited by the Access and National Outreach component with regard to their own organization's needs and objectives?
2. How have Canadians benefited from the activities of the Access and National Outreach component of MAP?
3. Are there negative impacts associated with the Access and National Outreach component of MAP? What are they and how could they be remedied? (for museum organizations? for Canadians in general?)
4. To what extent are you satisfied with the design of the Access and National Outreach component? Please explain. How could the design of this component be improved?

PROBE FOR:

- The types of projects supported (e.g. the *National Outreach Initiative* supports travelling exhibitions, new media initiatives, the presentations of special educational or interpretative activities and professional exchanges and the *Exhibition Circulation Fund* assists in covering the borrower's fees and transportation costs of an exhibit)
 - The approval criteria of the National Outreach Initiative (e.g. the three province criteria)
 - The approval criteria of the Exhibition Circulation Fund (e.g. institutions with an annual budget up to and including \$1,000,000)
 - Annual competitions
 - Any other aspect of the design of this MAP component (which ones?)
5. To what extent are you satisfied with the delivery of the Access and National Outreach component? Please explain. How could the delivery of this component be improved?

PROBE FOR:

- Assistance in the application process
- Quality of application and program information (guidelines)
- Peer review
- Regional review
- Timeframe (how timeframe affects planning; impact of negative news)
- Any other aspect of the delivery of this MAP component (which ones?)

6. Would you say the level of funding of the Access and National Outreach component is appropriate? Please elaborate.
(i.e., up to 70 % of direct project costs for the National Outreach Initiative depending on available funding or, in the case of the Exhibition Circulation Fund, 50 % funding of the borrower's exhibition fee, rental, transportation or similar cost, to a maximum of \$ 5,000 per grant)
7. Is the amount of funding under this component worth the administrative costs, expertise and time required by the application process? Please elaborate.
8. Are you aware of similar provincial/municipal/ international programs? What are they? How effective are they? Please elaborate. How do they compare to MAP in terms of design, delivery and cost-effectiveness?
9. Do you know if any mechanisms have been put in place to measure the performance of projects similar to those funded by this component How are they undertaken? Are you familiar with how effective these mechanisms are? In what way are they effective?
10. What annual reporting and/or periodic reviews by the Department of Canadian Heritage do you think should be implemented regarding the program?

B.2 Concerning the Aboriginal Museum Development Component

The objective of the Aboriginal Museum Development component is to assist Aboriginal organizations in the preservation of their cultural heritage, and to increase and facilitate public understanding of the rich and diverse cultures of Aboriginal peoples.

1. How have museum organizations benefited from the Aboriginal Development component?
2. How has the public benefited from the activities of the Aboriginal Development component of MAP? In what way? (example)
3. Have there been negative impacts associated with the Aboriginal Development component of MAP? What are they and how could they be remedied? (For established museums? For First Nations communities or groups? For the public in general?) Do you foresee potential negative impacts?
4. To what extent are you satisfied with the design of the Aboriginal Development component? Please elaborate. How could the design of this component be improved?

PROBE FOR:

- The types of projects supported (e.g. funding of feasibility and other similar studies, support for museum projects, support for initiatives not necessarily related to other MAP components)
- The approval criteria
- Annual competitions
- Any other aspect of the design of this MAP component (which ones?)

5. To what extent are you satisfied with the delivery of the Aboriginal Development component? Please elaborate. How could the delivery of this component be improved?

PROBE FOR:

- Assistance in the application process
 - Quality of application and program information (guidelines)
 - Peer review
 - Regional review
 - Timeframe (how timeframe affects planning; impact of negative news)
 - Any other aspect of the delivery of this MAP component (which ones?)
6. Would you say the level of funding of the Aboriginal Development component is appropriate? Please elaborate.
(i.e., projects are eligible for up to 70% of project costs, depending on available funding)
7. Is the amount of funding under this component worth the administrative costs, expertise and time required by the application process? Please elaborate.
8. Are you aware of any similar provincial/municipal/international programs? What are they? How effective are they? Please elaborate. How do they compare to the Aboriginal Development component in terms of design, delivery and cost-effectiveness?
9. Do you know if any mechanisms have been put in place to measure the performance of projects similar to those funded by the Aboriginal Development component? Who is doing it? How effective are these mechanisms?
10. What annual reporting and/or periodic reviews do you think should be implemented?

B.3 Concerning the Organizational Development Component

The objective of the Organizational Development component is to assist museums and their employees in attaining professional standards in areas such as collections care and personnel development, as well as strengthening the economic stability of the institutions.

1. How have museum organizations benefited from the Organizational Development component?
2. Have there been any negative impacts associated with the Organizational Development component? What are they and how could they be remedied?
3. To what extent are you satisfied with the design of the Organizational Development component? Please elaborate. How could the design of this component be improved?

PROBE FOR:

- The types of projects supported (e.g. human resources development, planning and feasibility studies, marketing and development strategies, projects supporting long term conservation, preservation or management of collection resources)
- The approval criteria
- Annual competitions
- Any other aspect of the design of this MAP component (which ones?)

4. To what extent are you satisfied with the delivery of the Organizational Development component? Please elaborate. How could the delivery of this component be improved?

PROBE FOR:

- Assistance in the application process
 - Peer review
 - Regional review
 - Timeframe (how timeframe affects planning; impact of negative news)
 - Any other aspect of the delivery of this MAP component (which ones?)
5. Would you say the level of funding of the Organizational Development component is appropriate? Please elaborate.
(i.e., up to 50% of project funding, depending on available funding)
6. Is the amount of funding under this component worth the administrative costs, expertise and time required by the application process? Please elaborate.
7. Are you aware of any similar provincial/municipal/ international programs? What are they? How effective are they? Please elaborate. How do they compare to the Organizational Development component in terms of design, delivery and cost-effectiveness?
8. Do you know if any mechanisms have been put in place to measure the performance of projects similar to those funded by the Organizational Development component? How are they being undertaken? Are you familiar with how effective these mechanisms are? In what way are they effective?
9. What annual reporting and/or periodic reviews by the Department of Canadian Heritage do you think should be implemented?

| |
|-------------------------------------|
| C. Concerning MAP in general |
|-------------------------------------|

[INTERVIEWER: Ask questions in this section to all respondents]

The Museums Assistance Program provides financial assistance to Canadian museums and related institutions, for activities that:

- *foster access by present and future generations of Canadians to their human, natural artistic and scientific heritage;*
 - *enhance awareness, understanding and enjoyment of this heritage.*
1. Do you think MAP overall objectives are relevant today at the beginning of the 21st century? Please elaborate.
- 2a. To what needs (of museums, of heritage organizations, or Canadians) does the program respond to particularly well? Please elaborate.
- 2b. To what needs (of museums, of heritage organizations, or Canadians) does the program respond to poorly or not at all? Please elaborate.
3. What has been/would be the impact of not responding to those needs?

4. What should be the role of the federal government in addressing these needs (met or poorly met)?

PROBE FOR:

- Identify “collections of national significance” across the country and provide support for their effective management? Please elaborate.
- Develop/support exchange programs between various cultural communities for youth and adults?
- Provide support to touring exhibitions which explore issues of cultural heritage and diversity?
- Include examples of diversity in the Department of Canadian Heritage web site?

D. Other aspects of Program Design and Delivery

[INTERVIEWER: Ask questions in this section only to respondents who are NOT from receiving institutions]

1. Do any of the following design/delivery elements hinder the success of MAP? How can these elements be improved?
 - PCH-MAP funding processes (program/ project; Regional/Headquarters)
 - PCH-MAP budgeting processes (program/ project; Regional/Headquarters)
 - The reporting requirements
 - Other? Please elaborate.
2. Do you think the current delivery approach of MAP is cost-effective? Please elaborate.
3. Are you aware of any similar (provincial/municipal/international) programs? What are they? How effective are they? Please elaborate. How do they compare to MAP in terms of design, delivery and cost-effectiveness?
4. Do you know if any mechanisms have been put in place to measure the performance of the activities funded under or similar to MAP? How are they undertaken? Are you familiar with how effective they are?
5. What annual reporting and/or periodic reviews by the Department of Canadian Heritage/government do you think should be implemented?

E. General

1. Do you have any other comments or observations regarding MAP?
2. Do you have any other comments or observations regarding this evaluation?
3. What reports or other information should be looked at?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION



Survey of Museum Associations

An Evaluation of the Museums Assistance Program for the Department of Canadian Heritage

c/o SPR Associates Inc., 45 Granby Street, Toronto, Ontario, M5B 1H8 1-800-363-0832

PURPOSE OF THIS SURVEY: This survey is an important component of an Evaluation of the Museums Assistance Program (MAP) which is currently being conducted for the Department of Canadian Heritage. **Museums associations are being surveyed to gather data, information and the viewpoints of museum professionals regarding this program.** All survey responses will be kept completely confidential and will only be seen by the consulting company conducting the survey for the Department, SPR Associates of Toronto (for information on SPR, see www.spr.ca).

OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION: The objective of the MAP Evaluation is to evaluate the program in terms of its continued relevance; its success (short-term outcomes and ultimate impacts); the appropriateness of its design; the effectiveness of its delivery; its cost-effectiveness; and alternatives to the program.

WHO SHOULD COMPLETE THIS SURVEY: The survey should be completed by the person(s) who is/are most knowledgeable about MAP and its relevance and appropriateness of design to your association and by its members .

INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete each question by checking, circling, or writing in the appropriate answer. The survey should take about 30 minutes to complete. Your completed survey can be FAXED to: 1-877-518-9958 (416-977-7747 within the local Toronto calling area); or returned by mail in the postage-paid envelope provided.

NOTE: *Within the survey, the term “museum” refers to museums, art galleries, science centres, historic sites, exhibition centres, eco-museums, museum service organizations, and others that fall under MAP’s definition of museums.*

A. About Your Association

1. Is your museum association: (CHECK ONE)

- A Provincial Association
- A National Association

2.(a) Is your association specialized in a specific sector of activity? (CHECK ONE)

- Yes
- No ⇒ (GO TO Q.3)

2.(b) What are your association’s main sectors of activity? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- Aboriginal culture
- Nature
- Science
- Arts
- History
- Other (please specify): _____

3. Please provide your best estimate for each of the following as regards your association:

- (a) Number of members (individuals) in your association: _____ OR Not Applicable
- (b) Number of museums represented by your association: _____ OR Not Applicable

B. MAP Components

4. Please indicate your satisfaction with each of the following aspects of MAP as regards the **museums that you represent**. (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON A SCALE OF 1 TO 5, WHERE "1" = NOT SATISFIED AT ALL AND "5" = VERY SATISFIED. CIRCLE "DK" IF YOU DON'T KNOW OR "NF" IF YOU ARE NOT FAMILIAR WITH A PARTICULAR COMPONENT)

| | Not Satisfied at All | | | | | Very Satisfied | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|-----------------------|-----------|
| MAP Overall: | | | | | | | |
| (a) The application process in general | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (b) The assistance provided by Department of Canadian Heritage staff | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (c) The peer review process | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (d) The Department's regional review process | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (e) The length of time for approvals, timeliness of decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| The Access and National Outreach Component: | | | | | | | |
| <u>National Outreach Initiative</u> (option under this component) | | | | | | | |
| (f) The types of eligible projects (eligibility criteria) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (g) The evaluation criteria for this option | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (h) The level of funding available to individual projects | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (i) The cost to museums of preparing proposals (staff time, costs) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| <u>Exhibition Circulation Fund</u> (option under this component) | | | | | | | |
| (j) The types of eligible projects (eligibility criteria) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (k) The evaluation criteria for this option | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (l) The level of funding available to individual projects | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (m) The cost to museums of preparing proposals (staff time, costs) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| The Aboriginal Museum Development Component: | | | | | | | |
| (n) The types of eligible projects (eligibility criteria) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (o) The evaluation criteria for this component | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (p) The level of funding available to individual projects | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (q) The cost to museums of preparing proposals (staff time, costs) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| The Organizational Development Component: | | | | | | | |
| (r) The types of eligible projects (eligibility criteria) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (s) The evaluation criteria for this component | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (t) The level of funding available to individual projects | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |
| (u) The cost to museums of preparing proposals (staff time, costs) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | NF |

- 5.(a) To the best of your knowledge, are there any factors that prevent museums in your association from applying to the MAP?

- 5.(b) What improvements (if any) would you recommend for MAP as regards the program overall or any of its components or options? (PLEASE INDICATE IF YOUR COMMENTS APPLY TO A SPECIFIC COMPONENT OR OPTION. FEEL FREE TO ADD ADDITIONAL PAGES)

C. Objectives of MAP

6. **Regarding the museums that your association represents**, to what extent has MAP achieved its objectives as regards each of the following? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ON A SCALE OF 1 TO 5 WHERE "1" = NOT AT ALL AND "5" = TO A GREAT EXTENT, OR CIRCLE "DK" IF YOU DON'T KNOW)

| | Not At All | | | | | To a Great Extent | |
|--|-------------------|---|---|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| (a) The National Outreach Initiative helps Canadians to learn and understand more about each other through better access to their diverse heritage, identity, history, and symbols | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (b) The Exhibition Circulation Fund helps Canadians to learn and understand more about each other through better access to their diverse heritage, identity, history, and symbols | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (c) MAP assists in the retention, preservation, conservation and presentation of the cultural heritage of Aboriginal peoples in Canada | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (d) MAP assists First Nations communities/groups in establishing partnerships with established museums and other projects | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (e) MAP funding assists museums in the professional development of staff, volunteers, and trustees | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (f) MAP funding assists the development of museums through planning and feasibility studies | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (g) MAP has assisted the development of Canadian museums since the 1970's | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (h) MAP assists the effective long-term management of collections | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |

7. In your opinion, how important is it for the Government of Canada to assist museums and related organizations in each of the following activities? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ON A SCALE OF 1 TO 5, WHERE "1" = NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL AND "5" = VERY IMPORTANT, OR CIRCLE "DK" IF YOU DON'T KNOW)

| | Not Important At All | | | | | Very Important | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|-----------------------|--|
| (a) Circulation of exhibits between provinces | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (b) Preservation and presentation of Aboriginal cultures | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (c) Exhibits which contribute to the appreciation of Canada's many cultures | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (d) Preservation/conservation of Canada's cultural heritage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (e) Preservation/conservation of Canada's scientific and technological heritage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (f) Preservation/conservation of Canada's natural heritage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (g) Provision of support for effective management of collections | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (h) Development and enhancement of professional standards and expertise | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (i) Development of public programming activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (j) Development of Canada's museums generally | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (k) Identification and support of "collections of national significance" across the country | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | |
| (l) Other (please specify): _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |

8.(a) In your opinion, are their similar programs that are equally or more effective than MAP in assisting and supporting museums and museums organizations? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- Yes, provincial program(s)
- Yes, municipal program(s)
- Yes, international program(s)
- No other programs ⇒ (GO TO Q.9)
- Don't know ⇒ (GO TO Q.9)

8.(b) (IF YES TO ANY ABOVE) Please describe which program(s) and which aspects of these programs are equally or more effective in terms of design, delivery and cost-effectiveness.

9. What annual reporting and/or periodic reviews by the Department of Canadian Heritage do you think should be implemented regarding MAP?

10. Considering the rapid social and technological changes in the 21st century, are there other things that the Government of Canada could do through MAP to improve Canadians' awareness and understanding of their diverse Canadian heritage? If so, please explain.

11. Are there better ways the Government of Canada could assist and support museums? Please elaborate.

12. Feel free to provide any other comments/suggestions you have regarding MAP (attach pages if needed).

E. Contact Information

The following information is required in the event that we need to re-contact you to clarify your answers. It will also be used to record your response so that you do not receive follow-up reminders. Please note that all information provided will be kept **totally confidential**. The information you provide below will only be seen by members of the SPR Associates research team and will be destroyed following completion of the study.

Name: _____ Position/Responsibility: _____

Organization: _____ Address: _____

Phone: _____ FAX: _____ E-mail: _____

Thank you very much for your assistance.
Please FAX your survey to 1-877-518-9958 or (416) 977-7747 (within the local Toronto calling area),
or mail the survey in the postage-paid envelope provided.

Appendix F: Some Additional Notes on Museums' Needs and Role

Changing Needs and Roles: This evaluation of MAP occurred during a time of significant change for museums. Over the past several years, funding from all levels of government has not kept pace with increased costs. Museums have had to find new sources of revenue for programs and preservation, collections management and research.

Museums have also had to look at ways of expanding their audiences. This is being done, for example, by reconfiguring their permanent exhibitions and introducing more interactive educational and interpretive approaches. New technology has also been a factor in change, with many museums applying new technologies.⁶⁹ There is also an increased demand on the government for accountability and results for programs such as MAP. Some of these issues and the role of museums are discussed below.

New Technology: When asked what else the Government of Canada could do to improve Canadians' awareness and understanding of their diverse Canadian heritage, many a significant number of MAP applicants emphasized the important role that new technology plays and the importance of integrating new technology into their activities. These needs were varied, ranging from help for the acquisition of computers, web-site development, digitization and assistance in the training of new media curators (or loan of qualified personnel), to the development of new media exhibitions and the production of CDs for use in schools, circulating virtual exhibits, and copyrights. Concern was also expressed that utilization by small museums was far too limited due to the lack of human and financial resources to support the technology.

While museums suggested that they generally support the introduction of new technologies, a number expressed concern that investment in new technology could spell dis-investment for the basic, more traditional functions of museums. As one museum representative noted: *"There is a lot of funding at the moment for these types of initiatives either through MAP or the Virtual Museum of Canada, etc. Although there has been rapid social and technological changes, many of the Museums' core function – collections care, public and educational programming, in-house exhibits development – remain. Many of these functions are not cutting edge but are critical to the every day work museums do. These are the ones that are often difficult to fund given the new focus on the virtual and the digital and yet they support those functions to improve Canadians' awareness and understanding of their diverse heritage."*

⁶⁹ It is still too early to predict the impact of the Internet and virtual museums on Canadians, and Canadians' interest in subsequently viewing the 'real' object -- this will be an important subjects for research in the future.

Many MAP applicants suggested that the virtual experience cannot be a replacement for the real “thing”. As one applicant noted: *“...the success of museums and galleries is dependent on satisfying the hunger audiences have for meaningful and tangible experiences. While the web provides a point of access, an enrichment or as a tool to market the galleries, it cannot replace the direct relationship to a painting or dinosaur skeleton and the research and educational programs that support the experience.”*

One museum respondent was concerned that, while MAP has used technology to some advantage, it has tended to fund pre-packaged presentations for the Internet. It was suggested that the continued relevance of such MAP-funded projects would be better assured through *“projects that bring museums’ databases via the Internet to the public by putting greater emphasis on content generation in a fashion that supports both museum core functions and public access to information contained to collections”*.

It was noted that while MAP has supported museums for taking the technological turn, the Virtual Museum Program has supported similar programs, pointing to risks of duplication or uneven prioritization of projects.

Role of Museums vis-à-vis the Federal Government: Differences exist between the view of MAP held by the Department and that held by museums, particularly as to who the main clients of the program are. Generally, the view of the Department appears to be that its primary client is the Canadian public.⁷⁰ Museums’ views are that they should be the clients -- that the role of the Federal Government should primarily be one of support to the museums’ mission of heritage preservation and presentation, of recognition of the important role they play in the identification and teaching of national heritage and of helping shape a nurturing environment for museums. In this respect, the following measures and initiatives are proposed:

- Development of a heritage national policy;
- Co-operation and co-ordination with provincial authorities;
- Interdepartmental co-ordination (e.g. between Canadian Heritage, Indian Affairs, Industry Canada, Parks Canada, etc.);
- Development and implementation of a national museum promotion strategy; and
- Addressing the issue of Canadian content in history lessons in Canadian schools.

⁷⁰ Although the Evaluation Framework also identifies museums as the MAP “clientele.”

Such a vision of a more central role of museums in relation to heritage is supported by the literature examined. One author describes museums as *“housing the product of societies as a whole in the past and (they) have a responsibility to share this with society as a whole in the present, but our ultimate justification is to make sure that these things are there, and understood, and preserved and studied for the delectation and understanding of future generations.”*⁷¹

In the same vein, another author states that *“museums, in one way or another, are reservoirs of the natural and cultural heritage, and always rescue part of the identities of the communities, not only showing their history but also the current events of a given area of the world, and they must present events of a given area of the world. They must communicate through objects, designs, lectures and other activities, non-tangible values of each society.”*⁷²

Funding Issues: In addition to many comments by museums on their role, the issue of funding in general (insufficient funding) was often expressed.

MAP’s emphasis on project funding was not met with enthusiasm by a great number of museum representatives. They stressed the importance of basic funding for museum operations, infrastructure and permanent and temporary exhibits. As one respondent noted: *“project dollars are great provided you can afford to sustain (financially) other fixed costs associated with access.”*

The need to support and encourage the marketing efforts of museums and the need for support for research were also emphasized as important to the benefit of the Canadian public. One museum representative emphasized *“we need the benefit of high quality research into collections and content – which can then become a power house for outreach and exhibitions... This is a fundamental activity which crystallizes itself around the collection, its enrichment and its development. This is a judicious investment since the work done regularly ends up in exhibitions, publications, conferences, seminars, and colloquia.”*

The evaluators note that funding sources are highly varied for museums, that information on this topic is lacking or incomplete, and that this gap makes it difficult to address the issue of insufficient funding with the data now available. Yet insufficient funding remains an important issue for museums and an obstacle to clear and focused discussions on MAP. This issue might be resolved by clarifying the current funding situation.

⁷¹ Paul Perot, “Profits and Museums,” in “Museums 2000 and the Future of Museums,” in Patrick Boylan (ed.) *Museums 2000: Politics, people, professionals and profit*, 1992.

⁷² Lorena San Roman, “Politics and the role of museums in the rescue of identity” in Patrick Boylan (ed.) *Museums 2000: Politics, people, professionals and profit*, 1992.

An Additional Note on Statistics Regarding Heritage Institutions⁷³: A comparison was made by Statistics Canada⁷⁴ for 1991-92 and 1997-98, indicating the number of Canadian museum institutions, number of museum employees, museum attendance, and museum revenues and expenditures. The resulting statistics are shown below:

| | <u>1991/92</u> | <u>1997/98</u> |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| Number of museums in Canada | 2,098 | 2,357 |
| Number of persons employed by museums ⁷⁵ | 23,969 | 23,510 |
| Attendance (thousands) | 54,464 | 53,825 |
| Revenue (\$ thousands) | \$1,015,050 | \$1,118,525 |
| Expenditures (\$ thousands) | \$1,004,794 | \$1,110,088 |

As can be seen by the above statistics, the number of heritage institutes increased by almost 300, while the attendance at, and number of employees of, heritage institutions decreased slightly. Statistics Canada also estimated that in 1998, 29.7% of Canadians, aged 15 and over, visited a Canadian museum or art gallery.⁷⁶

⁷³ Heritage institutions include community museums, art museums, history museums, historic sites, archives. Does not include nature parks.

⁷⁴ Source: Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 87F0002XPE.

⁷⁵ Includes full-time and part-time.

⁷⁶ Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 1998.

Appendix G Selected Statistical Tables

Selected statistical results from the census survey of museums, the visitor's survey and other sources are provided below.

Display G.1 Visitor's Ratings of Importance of Types of Exhibits

| How important are each of the following: | % Rated Important⁷⁷ |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| Exhibits on Canada's cultural heritage | 89% |
| Exhibits on Canada's natural heritage (physical environment, etc.) | 86 |
| Exhibits on Canada's cultural diversity | 85 |
| Exhibits on Aboriginal cultures | 80 |
| Exhibits from other provinces/territories | 78 |
| Exhibits on Canada's scientific and technological heritage | 78 |

Display G.2 Visitor's Ratings of the Importance of the Government of Canada Providing Financial Support to Museums

| How important is it for the Government of Canada to provide financial assistance to museums for the following? | % Rated Important⁷⁸ |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Developing Canada's museums in general | 93% |
| Preserving Canada's natural heritage (physical environment, etc.) | 93 |
| Presenting collections of national significance | 92 |
| Circulating exhibits between provinces or territories | 89 |
| Presenting and understanding Canada's many cultures | 89 |
| Preserving Canada's cultural heritage, including its scientific/technological heritage | 89 |
| Preserving and presenting Aboriginal cultures | 86 |

⁷⁷ Percentages are based on responses from 723-736 visitors, drawn from the MAP Visitor Survey, Question 9: *How Important are the Following Types of Exhibits?* Percentage choosing "4" and "5" on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = "Not Very Important at All" and 5 = "Very Important". Excludes "Don't Know" responses.

⁷⁸ Percentages are based on responses from 734-742 visitors, drawn from the MAP Visitor Survey, Question 7: *How Important is it for the Government of Canada to provide assistance to museums in the following areas?* Percentage choosing "4" and "5" on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = "Do Not Agree at All" and 5 = "Strongly Agree." Excludes "Don't Know" responses.

Display G.3 Museum's Ratings of the Importance of the Government of Canada in Providing Assistance to Museums for Certain Activities

| In your opinion, how important is it for the Government of Canada to assist museums and related organizations in the following activities: | % Rated Important ⁷⁹ |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Preservation/conservation of Canada's cultural heritage | 96% |
| Development of Canada's museums generally | 93 |
| Provision of support for effective management of collections | 88 |
| Identification/support of "collections of national significance" across Canada | 86 |
| Preservation/conservation of Canada's natural heritage | 85 |
| Preservation and presentation of Aboriginal cultures | 84 |
| Exhibits which contribute to the appreciation of Canada's many cultures | 84 |
| Preservation/conservation of Canada's scientific and technological heritage | 83 |
| Development of public programming activities | 82 |
| Circulation of exhibits between provinces | 81 |
| Development and enhancement of professional standards and expertise | 79 |

Display G.4 Number and Amount of Access and National Outreach Applications Requested and Approved

| | 1998-1999 | | 1999-2000 | |
|--------------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|
| | Requested | Approved | Requested | Approved |
| Number of Projects | 149 | 108 (72%) | 143 | 97 (68%) |
| Amount | 11,158,579 | 6,181,306 (55%) | 9,805,686 | 5,233,749 (53%) |

⁷⁹ Percentages are based on responses from 144-162 museums, drawn from the MAP Applicant Survey, Question 11: *In your opinion, how important is it for the Government of Canada to assist museums and related organizations in the following activities?* Percentage choosing "4" and "5" on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = "Not Important at All" and 5 = "Very Important." Excludes "Don't Know" responses.

**Display G.5
Aboriginal Museum Development Applications
Requested and Approved in 1998-1999 and 1999-2000**

| | 1998-1999 | | 1999-2000 | |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|
| | Requested | Approved | Requested | Approved |
| Number of Projects | 39 | 25 (64%) | 46 | 26 (57%) |
| Amount | 2,440,807 | 1,247,477 (51%) | 3,821,973 | 1,526,556 (40%) |

**Display G.6
Organizational Development Applications
Requested and Approved in 1998-1999 and 1999-2000**

| | 1998-1999 | | 1999-2000 | |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|
| | Requested | Approved | Requested | Approved |
| Number of projects | 123 | 80 (65%) | 121 | 81 (67%) |
| Amount | 5,570,334 | 1,988,010 (36%) | 4,713,144 | 1,902,803 (40%) |

**Display G.7
Museum's Ratings of the Extent
that MAP Has Achieved its Objectives**

| Question: From your organization's perspective, to what extent has MAP achieved its objectives as regards the following? | % Rated as Achieved⁸⁰ |
|--|---|
| MAP has assisted the development of Canadian museums since the 1970's | 80% |
| MAP assists First Nations communities/groups in establishing partnerships with established museums and other projects | 72 |
| MAP funding assists the development of museums through planning/feasibility studies | 67 |
| MAP assists in the retention, preservation, conservation and presentation of the cultural heritage of Aboriginal peoples in Canada | 66 |
| MAP assists the effective long-term management of collections | 64 |
| The National Outreach Initiative helps Canadians to learn and understand more about each other through better access to their diverse heritage, identity, history, and symbols | 63 |
| The Exhibition Circulation Fund helps Canadians to learn and understand more about each other through better access to their diverse heritage, identity, history, and symbols | 61 |
| MAP funding assists museums in the professional development (staff/volunteers/trustees) | 53 |

⁸⁰ Percentages are based on 154-157 museums responding to the MAP Applicant Survey, Question 10: *From your organization's perspective, to what extent has MAP achieved its objectives as regards each of the following?* Percentage choosing "4" and "5" on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = "Not at All" and 5 = "To a Great Extent." Excludes "Don't Know" responses.

Display G.8
Level of Success of Projects Funded by MAP
 (based on the museum survey)

| | Fully Successful | Partially Successful | Not Successful At All | Don't Know |
|--|------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Access and National Outreach Projects (including projects of transitional fund), N=117 | 57% | 35% | 3% | 4% |
| - National Outreach Initiative Projects, N=70 | 60 | 32 | 4 | 4 |
| - Exhibition Circulation Fund Projects, N=22 | 50 | 44 | 6 | 0 |
| Aboriginal Museum Development Projects, N=17 | 73 | 18 | 9 | 0 |
| Organizational Development Projects, N=79 | 57 | 40 | 3 | 0 |
| ALL MAP PROJECTS, N=221 | 58 | 36 | 2 | 4 |

Display G.9
Visitors' Ratings of Travelling Exhibits⁸¹

| Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements: | % Positive ratings ⁸² |
|--|----------------------------------|
| I appreciated/enjoyed the exhibit | 84% |
| I enjoyed the selection of objects presented in this exhibit | 82 |
| I would recommend this exhibit to a friend | 80 |
| I gained increased understanding about the subject, culture or region presented in the exhibit | 75 |
| I enjoyed the variety of presentations used in this exhibit (e.g. films, sounds, photography, computers) | 70 |
| I gained better understanding or knowledge about Canada's history or heritage | 63 |

⁸¹ Percentages are based on 677-690 responses to the MAP Visitor Survey, Question 2: *Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements.*

⁸² Percentage choosing "4" and "5" on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = "Do Not Agree at All" and 5 = "Strongly Agree." Excludes "Don't Know" responses.

Display G.10 Museums' Satisfaction With Design/Delivery Aspects of MAP⁸³

| Are you satisfied with: | % Satisfied ⁸⁴ |
|--|---------------------------|
| Assistance provided by Department of Canadian Heritage staff | 79% |
| Peer review process | 65 |
| The Department's regional review process | 53 |
| Application process in general | 47 |
| Length of time for approvals, timeliness of decisions | 12 |

Display G.11 Museums' Satisfaction with Various Features of MAP⁸⁵

| | Percentage Satisfied With MAP Component | | | |
|---|--|-----|-----|-----|
| | AMD | EC | NO | OD |
| Satisfaction with application process ⁸⁶ | 32% | 29% | 21% | 21% |
| Satisfaction with funding level ⁸⁷ | 42 | 35 | 33 | 27 |
| The types of eligible projects (eligibility criteria) | 68 | 39 | 39 | 43 |
| The evaluation criteria for this option | 57 | 36 | 38 | 42 |
| The level of funding available to individual projects | 42 | 33 | 35 | 27 |
| The cost to museums of preparing proposals | 32 | 29 | 21 | 21 |

⁸³ Percentages are based on 133-167 museums responding to the MAP Applicant Survey, Question 4: "Please indicate your satisfaction with each of the following aspects of MAP."

⁸⁴ Percentage choosing "4" and "5" on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = "Not Satisfied at All" and 5 = "Very Satisfied." Excludes "Don't Know" and "Not Applicable" responses.

⁸⁵ Percentage choosing "4" and "5" on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = "Not Satisfied at All" and 5 = "Very Satisfied." Excludes "Don't Know" and "Not Applicable" responses.

⁸⁶ Percentages are based on 133-167 museums responding to the MAP Applicant Survey, Question 4: "Please indicate your satisfaction with each of the following aspects of MAP."

⁸⁷ Percentages are based on 133-167 museums responding to the MAP Applicant Survey, Question 4: "Please indicate your satisfaction with each of the following aspects of MAP."

Appendix H: International Comparisons of Museums Assistance Programs

Overview: In consultation with various museum associations and government agencies, the evaluators prepared a comparison of MAP with programs of a similar nature offered internationally. MAP activities were compared with those of similar grants programs in the United Kingdom, Australia, France, and the United States via the Internet, E-mail and telephone conversations.

United Kingdom: The Department of Culture, Media and Sport established the *Designation Challenge Fund* in April 1999, to provide qualifying museums with a total of £15 million in grants over a three-year period. The principle goals of the fund are to promote excellence; raise standards; facilitate partnerships; and encourage investment.⁸⁸ This program has some similarities to MAP as they both provide for the amelioration of multimedia services, professional development and museum access to the community.

A professional development program was previously offered in the UK under the supervision of the Millennium Commission. With a budget of £828,000, this program operated for three years with its final closing date for applications in September 2001. As of November 2001, 246 grants were awarded to individuals. The program's goal was to provide staff and volunteers working at museums, archives, special collections to learn, share and apply new skills through paid professional development courses and seminars. This program closely mirrors goals of MAP's OD component. Both programs provide qualifying institutions with the ability to maximize the human resource potential of staff, volunteers and trustees.

Australia: A program similar to MAP in terms of certain key goals exists in Western Australia, at the State level. This state-run program is facilitated by the Western Australian Museum. Its main focus is to provide advisory, and training services to local communities and institutions falling under the broad definition of museum as outlined by the International Council for Museums. The program's advisory services are tailored to cover the following areas: Collection Management; Exhibitions; Conservation; Public Relations; and Management.

The Australian version of MAP fails to compare fully with the Canadian version as it does not provide direct grants. It does, however, aid museums in the area of Organizational Development, which is a key component of MAP in Canada. Interestingly, in Australia, MAP can assist museums in preparing grant applications such as those offered by the Lotteries Commission.

⁸⁸ Source: <http://www.resource.gov.uk/information/funding/00grants.asp#dcf>.

Similar to Canada, the Ministry for the Arts in New South Wales offers a grants program whose policy objective is to encourage the development of Aboriginal keeping places and museums. In addition, the program provides funds for travelling exhibitions, subsidizing up to 50% of costs. Level of funding is determinant on the applicant organization's size and budget. The Ministry will generally provide 50% of the yearly funding for a three-year period, and the remaining funding is achieved through local government support.

The Heritage Collections Council is a federal program that was established in December 1996. Council membership comprises representatives from all three tiers of government and the museum sector, under the chairmanship of the Commonwealth. The jointly-funded council has an annual budget of \$800,000. Its primary emphasis is on developing multimedia applications for museums, such as placing 80% of Australia's heritage collections on the Australian Museums On-line Internet site. The council is also charged with broadening community access to the nations diverse museum collections and Aboriginal keeping places. This program is comparable to the ANO component of MAP as it encourages dialogue between museums as well as extending the reach of the museums in ways that reflect national diversity.

United States: In the United States, primary federal funding for museums is provided through the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). Their annual budget of \$29 million is currently up for review by Congress. IMLS offers support to qualifying institutions through a number of programs namely through, General Operating Support, National Leadership Grants and the Conservation Assessment Program. This funding is similar to that provided under MAP in Canada as they both provide for professional development of staff, Aboriginal or Native American collection support and national outreach of museum programs. The major difference between the two programs is that in the U.S., library services are also included in funding plans, a service which is separate in the MAP initiative. No attempt was made to identify state-level programs in the U.S.

France: In consultation with the office of *l'association générale des conservateurs des collections publiques de France* and in discussion with Mme Reinier from the associations head office, the evaluators determined that, to the best of our knowledge at this time, there are no programs comparable to MAP that are currently in place in France.

Evaluations: No evaluations were uncovered by this international comparison.

Conclusions: The evaluators determined that a number of Canada's "peer nations" offer programs similar to MAP – a fact which suggests the relevance of MAP. However, very different practices which were noted in some cases – such as the prominence of consultative and advisory services in Australia -- which may warrant further investigation in the future.

Appendix I: Glossary⁸⁹

Heritage: In this evaluation report, the term *heritage* is understood in its broadest sense. It is inclusive of cultural diversity and of elements of nature, science and technology, history and the arts. Canadian heritage is seen to include the cultural heritage of all component regions and cultures within Canada.

Inputs/Resources: The resources and authorities given to an organization to carry out activities, produce outputs and accomplish results. Resources include such items as tax dollars, user fees, transfers, human resources, capital and information.

Museums: The term *museums* is used throughout to include all types of cultural heritage organizations utilizing MAP (e.g. art galleries, historic sites, as well as museums as typically understood).

Key informants: The term *key informants* includes both Departmental and museum key informants unless specified otherwise.

Performance Management Framework: The foundation of integrated performance monitoring and reporting. This is a simplified logic model developed through stakeholder consensus which describes at a corporate level, down through business lines, the results that a program/service/policy aims to achieve in terms of outputs or outcomes; the reach of the program or the beneficiaries of a program/service/policy; and resources (inputs) being utilized or the resources required to deliver or support program services/policies (including financial, capital, technological, and human resources).

Performance Measures: A group of statements that clearly specify a desired event, output, or impact that a policy, program or initiative intends to achieve. They normally encompass a number of performance indicators and are used as a basis for measuring performance and are sometimes referred to as "results."

Reach: The beneficiaries of a program/service/policy: (a) at output level, reach is generally specific and can be enumerated (e.g. E.I.); and (b) at the outcome level, reach refers to the ultimate beneficiaries (e.g. the economy or all Canadians).

Results: The consequences of a policy, program or initiative that can be plausibly attributed to the program. Results or outcomes can be distinguished in many ways - intermediate or ultimate, short-term or long-term, expected or unexpected, and intended or unintended. Also referred to as impacts and effects.

⁸⁹ Adapted in part from the MAP RMAF.