

**A WME Consulting Associates Report
to
Corporate Review Branch
Department of Canadian Heritage**

**Evaluation of the Multiculturalism Program's
March 21 Campaign for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination
School and Youth Targeted Campaign Efforts**

Report of Findings

November 28, 2001

WME Consulting Associates
1300 - 55 Metcalfe Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 6L5
613-786-9941

Eric Wilner, MBA

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Objectives of the Study	4
Methodology	4
Findings	5
Relevance	5
Campaign Goals	6
School Kit Awareness	9
Headquarters and Regional Issues	10
Management Information	12
Youth and School Targeted Campaign Alternatives	12
Redesign School Kit Materials	13
Improve the Distribution of School Kit Materials	14
Develop A Concerted School Usage Strategy	14
Emphasize Year-Round Anti-Racism Activity	15
Refocus on Youth Directed Efforts Outside Schools	16
Expand Efforts to Clearly Define and Heighten Some Awareness Issues	16
Appendix 1: List of Reports Consulted	18
Appendix 2: List of Interviewees	19
Appendix 3: Interview Guide for Headquarter Campaign Managers and Personnel	20
Appendix 4: Interview Guide for Regional Executives	21
Appendix 5: Interview Guide for Regional Coordinators	22
Appendix 6: Interview Guide for External Organizations	23
Management Response.....	24

Introduction

A number of evaluation exercises have been conducted in recent years on the March 21 Campaign for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (March 21 Campaign)¹. To a large extent, these previous studies have focused on the social marketing aspects of the Campaign, and have provided cases studies, best practices, and a March 21 Campaign interpretive case history. The evaluation project that has resulted in this present report focused on an aspect of the Campaign that has been examined in less detail to date – the Campaign efforts to reach youth through schools.

A major activity of the Campaign is the development and distribution of educational kits for teachers and students to approximately 14,000 primary and high schools across Canada. In March 2001, 15 focus groups in five Canadian cities were conducted with students and teachers from schools that had received the educational kits. A separate report that includes the detailed findings of those focus groups has been produced.²

For this report, the detailed focus group findings were reviewed in light of the results of the previous social marketing-oriented studies. In addition, a series of interviews with the Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH) Multiculturalism Program staff and managers involved in delivering the 2000 Campaign, and in designing and delivering the current Campaign were conducted with staff at Headquarters and in the Regions. Also, the educational efforts directed to youth by a number of selected non-federal government organizations involved in anti-racism, diversity or promotion of human rights activity were reviewed. Website information was examined and a number of individual interviews were conducted. The organizations interviewed are included in the list of interviewees in Appendix 2.

The evaluation results demonstrate that there is broad agreement among analysts and authors of previous studies, Campaign deliverers, and students and teachers, that a need for anti-racism activity directed at youth continues to exist. Nevertheless, there exist many reservations concerning the effectiveness of current March 21 Campaign school-directed efforts. The rationale for continuing the resource intensive, mass distribution of Campaign school kits and materials as has been done for a number of years, is seriously questioned. Furthermore, the focus group discussions revealed poor results of the Campaign in the areas of school kit usage that is intended to heighten awareness of the effects of racism and increase involvement in anti-racism activities

1 These include the November 2000, Interpretive Case History by the Centre for Policy and Program Assessment, School of Public Administration, Carleton University, and the 1999 Evaluation of March 21 Campaign for the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Best Practices for Social Marketing Campaigns (Volume 1), and Summary Report (Volume 2) by PCH Corporate Review.

2 See *Environics Focus Group Evaluation March 2001*

among youth aged 12 to 18 in the longer term. A number of alternative anti-racism activity delivery options are presented in this report.

A departmental contextual analysis, based on interviews with PCH personnel involved in the Campaign, reveals that important issues of Campaign relevance and goal setting remain unresolved and that this is an important contributing factor to the lack of effectiveness of the Campaign. This is discussed further in the body of this report.

Objectives of the Study

This evaluation study was proposed by the Regional Executive Director of the Western Region and the Director General responsible for the Multicultural Program's March 21 National Campaign, and approved by Senior Management. The broad purpose of this study is to evaluate the delivery and impact of the March 21 National Campaign for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, as it relates to materials sent to schools. Previous reports have indicated some evidence that public awareness has been raised by the March 21 Campaign. However, there has been a critical absence of any evidence regarding the effectiveness of the March 21 activity in the schools. The focus groups and this study were designed to fill that gap. A study on the Campaign video competition for youth is still to be conducted.

As per the terms of reference, the study explored the Campaign's relevance, success and cost-effectiveness.

Methodology

The project employed the following methodologies:

- Document review, including previous March 21 evaluation reports, evaluation reports on related programs, statistics and planning statements, others (a list of reports consulted is included as appendix 1);
- Review of the results of teacher and student focus groups conducted in March 2001 by Environics;
- Interviews with PCH March 21 Campaign managers and staff at in the NCR;
- Interviews with March 21 Campaign regional managers and staff;
- Review of selected websites of organizations with a youth education and/or anti-racism focus;
- Interviews with a selected number of individuals from the above-mentioned organizations; and
- Analysis of all of the above, in the context of Headquarters and regional March 21 Campaign delivery efforts directed at schools.

A list of individuals consulted for this project is included as Appendix 2 of this report. The interview guides employed for these consultations are included as Appendices 3 to 6.

Findings

The findings discussed below are grouped around the issues and themes that were identified in the focus groups with students and teachers, that emerged during the conduct of the interviews for this evaluation, and that correspond to the evaluation issues. As mentioned above, we point out that the detailed focus group findings can be found in a separate report. We refer to and quote specific focus group findings that are of particular importance to the evaluation issues, in the context of the interview results and the strategic challenges facing the Campaign deliverers.

The discussions that follow provide the contextual analyses for the formulation of recommendations for program improvement. These recommendations appear following the text, where appropriate.

Relevance

On the whole, teachers, students, regional and headquarters Campaign personnel, as well as representatives of outside organizations felt that anti-racism activities are relevant, needed in Canadian society and a suitable activity for the federal government to be engaged in. This is consistent with the views of Canadians in general, as observed in a 1998 survey conducted for a previous evaluation.³ Indeed, some individuals, in particular a number of PCH regional and Headquarters March 21 Campaign deliverers, express passionate support for strong, sustained, anti-racism programming.

However, a review of the focus group results and the interviews revealed that in the minds of many people there exists some confusion between the idea of the “March 21 Campaign” as an entity, and “anti-racism activity” in general. This was less the case with Campaign administrators, where nevertheless, the distinction between on-going Campaign elements and the Campaign’s *Action 2000* components (the special millennium year program of anti-racism activities that included the Tour Canada Youth Challenge and the International Stop Racism Youth Forum) for the year 2000, is sometimes unclear.

For most focus group participants and interviewees, once the “idea” of anti-racism activity and elements of the Campaign itself were separated out, and when the focus of the evaluation was understood to be squarely placed on school-based Campaign efforts, we observe that expressions in support of relevance of the Campaign dropped off considerably. Important issues arose from many different individuals that questioned the practical relevance of the campaign and the appropriateness of some of its activities. Major questions that arose were as follows:

³ Survey of a representative sample of Canadian adults conducted for the PCH 1999 Campaign Evaluation

- Should youth be the primary target of the Campaign if expressions of racism are found primarily in other population segments?
- If youth is the suitable primary target, is the route to them through the schools the most effective and efficient for a federal government initiative, or only what seems to be the “easiest” because the audience is a captive one in that setting?
- As racism expresses itself differently in the various regions of the country, is it relevant to conduct a “national” campaign? If so, what should the role of the national presence be, and can the national campaign be made flexible enough to remain relevant in regional settings?
- Is the Campaign meant to operate as a starting point for year-round, sustained anti-racism activity at the community level across the country, or is it meant to operate as a national, “events –based” initiative on March 21 of each year, centred in Ottawa? Are these compatible, and are there sufficient resources to sustain both?
- In any of the above scenarios, how do school kits contribute to the effort?

These issues remain unresolved in the minds of many respondents and participants in this evaluation. The relevance of the Campaign is seriously called into question the longer a lack of consensus exists concerning these issues. As will be discussed below, Campaign delivery is somewhat fragmented throughout the country, and will remain so if Campaign deliverers are not convinced of its relevance.

Recommendation 1: March 21 Campaign managers should assure and communicate to stakeholders that the elements of the Campaign are both distinct and relevant to overall anti-racism activity. Resolving the issue of relevance is clearly related to developing a consensus on the Campaign goals, and should be done in concert with such an effort, as described in Recommendation 2 (page 9).

Campaign Goals

The Campaign lacks a basic statement of the goals and objectives to which Campaign deliverers agree, and a mechanism for periodic review and debate of such a statement.

The study entitled *March 21 Campaign and Action 2000 An Interpretive Case Study*, conducted in 2000 by Carleton University’s Centre for Policy and Program Assessment, School of Public Administration, provided an overview of the evolution of the Campaign since its inception in 1988. It pointed out an overall absence of Campaign strategic plans and strategic planning exercises over the years, while noting that some campaign activity choices (and in particular those chosen as part of Action 2000) indicated the existence of explicit goals, objectives and targets.

We point out that during the course of this evaluation, Campaign managers and staff were unable to provide an approved Campaign policy statement, or statement of goals or objectives. We note that for the purposes of the Statement of Work for this evaluation, the Campaign objectives were outlined, and indicated as having been “provided by the manager of the March 21 Secretariat”. These objectives, as stated, are to:

- heighten the awareness of the effects of racism;
- engage the youth population in anti-racism dialogue/activities, particularly but not exclusively, through schools and the video competition;
- elicit corporate buy-in and support; and
- promote the values of respect, equality and acceptance.

In 1998, the Department’s Corporate Review Branch conducted an evaluation of the March 21 Campaign and an assessment of best practices in social marketing of potential importance to the Campaign. One finding of that study was that *the Campaign’s orientation was more toward being a social communications tool to promote awareness rather than a tool for promoting behavioural change*. The results of the focus groups conducted for this present study confirm that in practice, this is indeed the case. Both students and teachers reported relatively high levels of awareness and usage of the Campaign broad-based communications vehicles (posters, stickers), yet low levels of involvement in anti-racism activity or changes in behaviour as a result of that awareness.

The 1998 report states, “The key question for the campaign is whether it wishes to continue to focus on awareness building or rather to more actively promote attitude and behavioural change. A change to the latter approach would involve focussing more directly on specific instances of racially discriminatory attitudes and behaviours and promoting alternative attitudes and behaviours. The level of awareness of racism and a widespread belief among Canadians that they can personally do something about this issue suggest that it may be feasible to progressively evolve the campaign away from a focus on general social communication toward promotion of more specific ways to combat racism”.⁴ This remains a key “theoretical” question for the Campaign. Nevertheless, we note that “actively promoting attitude and behavioural change” is not clearly stated as a Campaign goal above, and that although this idea is much discussed among

Campaign deliverers, the absence of fundamental agreement on Campaign goals and the matching of Campaign activities to stated goals hinders the Campaign’s effectiveness.

The results of interviews conducted in particular with regional Campaign coordinators and PCH managers demonstrate that the issue of determining and defining Campaign goals is of considerable importance. Aside from a general goal expressed for example, as “combatting racism”, there appears to be no consensus among regional Campaign deliverers on what the specific Campaign goals are, nor on what the Campaign is expressly trying to achieve in schools.

⁴ Evaluation of March 21 Campaign of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination Summary Report (Vol. 2); Corporate Review Branch July 1999, p. iii.

Yet as was pointed out in several regional interviews, the vast majority of the country's youth population and schools are found in the regions and not in the National Capital Region. A number of regions expressed the desire to receive explicit instructions from Headquarters on what Campaign activity and monitoring was expected of them, and indeed, refused to devote Multiculturalism funding and resources to the Campaign in the absence of such information. Others appeared to be quite satisfied with the apparent lack of direction, as this afforded them the opportunity to take considerable regional initiative, without the constraints of formal accountability. A number suggested that a debate on Campaign goals must take place among the Campaign deliverers. The present situation in the regions is that considerable variation in regional Campaign focus, action and activity delivery exists. Other regional issues will be discussed further under "Headquarters and Regional Considerations" below.

The situation concerning "goals" is somewhat different at Headquarters. The Action 2000 Campaign international youth participation component for the year 2000 Campaign was labour intensive, high profile, and centred around the commemorative date of March 21st. The associated tight deadlines lent themselves to a focus on successful and timely project and event delivery. Headquarters staff was less concerned with how this NCR activity contributed to longer-term regional goals.

It is generally accepted that the intense Action 2000 Campaign activity in Ottawa will not be repeated. Nevertheless, a high profile March 21 "event" held on the date of March 21st may be required every year, and considerable Headquarters focus remains on this successful event delivery. During the course of this evaluation, present and past Headquarters Campaign managers and other staff expressed less concern than regional personnel about competing directions the Campaign has taken, and the need to match those directions to long-term goals. This may be explained in part by the absence of corporate continuity for Campaign delivery at Headquarters – virtually all Campaign deliverers since 1999 have since moved to other positions. Nevertheless, the differences between the regional and Headquarters view of appropriate Campaign goals and activities is significant.

Even for what appears to be a relatively straightforward notion for all Campaign deliverers - "awareness", there seems to be no clear consensus on goals in the context of the Campaign. Therefore, appropriate national campaign "activity" cannot be decided on. Questions were raised on the "object" of awareness building activity in the Campaign such as "What 'awareness' are (should) we be talking about?... is it awareness of the existence of racism in general?... is it awareness of the negative effects of racism on individuals and societies?... is it awareness of racist behaviour and history in Canada?... is it awareness of what an individual personally can do about racism?... or is it awareness that the Campaign refers to March 21 as the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination?.....Is this a Campaign about awareness of racism or about a commemorative day about racism?...."

We point out that the lack of an agreed-upon, specific statement of goals and objectives is not a program delivery effectiveness hindrance in all circumstances, and we are cognizant of the time

and effort that effective strategic planning exercises require. However, the lack of consensus on Campaign goals has limited the Campaign's capacity to take concerted, clear direction in a number of areas, and to maintain relevancy in the minds of some Campaign deliverers. Hence we make the following Recommendation.

*Recommendation 2: The March 21 Campaign Secretariat should engage all Campaign deliverers in a lively and structured debate on the fundamental goals of the Campaign, and how these relate to specific school-targeted Campaign activity. This may require iterative and periodic exercises, the aim of which will be to develop a medium and long-term consensus on the vision for the Campaign. The Multiculturalism Program Performance Framework could be used as a basis for assuring that the resulting consensus on Campaign goals is consistent with the Program's strategic objectives and planned results.*⁵

School Kit Awareness

The focus group exercise conducted for this study involved 15 sessions conducted with separate groups of students 12 to 15 years of age, students 16 to 18 years of age, and teachers, in five major Canadian cities. All participants were recruited from schools that had received Campaign school kits.

The focus group report states: "The initial recruitment criteria for the focus groups sessions included familiarity with the campaign. However, due to the low level of familiarity among both students and teachers, having half the respondents at least somewhat familiar with the campaign quickly became problematic as the recruiting process was implemented. In all cases, an attempt was made to recruit at least one-half of participants per session who were somewhat familiar with the campaign materials."⁶

All participants completed a short written survey questionnaire immediately before the focus group sessions. Results of this survey, as reported in the focus group report, indicate that 44% of student focus group participants and 45% of teachers were either "not very familiar" or "not at all familiar" with the March 21 Campaign. We note that these participants were from the pool already recruited for whom the recruitment criteria was "familiarity with the campaign". It is likely therefore, that as much as 75% of the target audience of the kit distribution effort is not being reached, or if it is being reached, it has made so little usage of the kit materials that it was unfamiliar with the Campaign at the time of the focus group. We note as well that in some teacher focus groups, participants had to be provided with sample kit materials and time to review them before being able to discuss them with the moderator because they had had very little or no previous knowledge of the kit contents.

⁵ see Multiculturalism Program Performance Framework prepared by Results Management Team Multiculturalism Program Canadian Identity Sector and Corporate Review Branch Portfolio and Corporate Affairs Sector, November, 2000.

⁶ Environics Focus Group Evaluation March 2001.

The observations above are perhaps as important as the actual feedback on the quality of the materials that were reviewed, because in light of these observations most of the reaction to the kits can be understood as “hypothetical”, i.e. as a response to a question of “how I would have reacted had I known about the materials”, and not as feedback based on past experience with the materials. It is therefore highly likely that any evidence of changes in levels of awareness of racism and its effects among school youth, or any evidence of attitudinal or behavioural changes can be attributed to the kit itself.

We note that a third party has been distributing the kit to schools across Canada for about ten years, yet awareness and usage of it among the target audience remains very low. Some serious deficiencies with the kit materials were expressed in the teacher focus groups, some of which are discussed below in this report and details of which are available in the Environics focus group report. We point out however, that correcting these deficiencies will be of little use unless improvements are made to kit awareness and familiarity levels particularly among teachers in schools.

Furthermore, the low familiarity and usage rates among the target groups as demonstrated in the focus group results above indicate that the kit development, production and distribution efforts are likely not cost-effective. Although a detailed analysis of kit costs was beyond the scope of this study, we note that the considerable resources used in those efforts have relatively low impact on users and outcomes. Spending additional resources to correct kit deficiencies without addressing kit usage and awareness issues at the same time, would likely contribute to a further decrease in cost-effectiveness.

Recommendation 3: March 21 Campaign managers should explore options and “lessons learned” from other organizations for improving the distribution of federal government materials into schools.

Headquarters and Regional Issues

The Multiculturalism Program at Headquarters is responsible for the overall Campaign administration. A staff of six is assigned to work on the Campaign at Headquarters including four officers, a support staff and a manager. Each departmental Regional Executive Director assigns a March 21 coordinator who is responsible for liaison with Headquarters and coordination with the Multiculturalism Program’s Campaign. Regional coordinators do not report to the Campaign Secretariat at Headquarters, but rather through their regional organizational structure.

Regional issues are of particular importance to the school directed efforts of the Campaign, because the vast majority of schools that receive the kits are found in the regions.

As mentioned above, there exists considerable variation among individuals in the regions on appropriate goals and objectives for the Campaign, and some of the repercussions of this situation have been discussed. Other important regional issues are discussed below.

The effort expended on, and the conduct of anti-racism and March 21 Campaign-related activity is extremely variable from region to region. Little or no effort is expended regionally to distribute, encourage the use of, or evaluate Campaign school kits distributed by the Campaign Secretariat.

In some regions or parts of regions, a very high level of community collaboration revolving around the Campaign and other anti-racism, diversity-building, rights-based, and other similar activity has been achieved by regional coordinators and other regional PCH staff. This collaboration involves the regional PCH office as “community facilitator” and NGOs, other federal government departments, provincial ministries and crown agencies/corporations, municipalities, utilities, private sector firms, school board, and others. Campaign efforts are always collaborative. “Stand-alone” usage of the Campaign or campaign school kits is not specifically encouraged, and has not proven to be successful. In these instances, the Campaign regional coordinator plays the role of anti-racism facilitator, and uses the Campaign as one available tool, the principle useful elements of which are the posters, stickers, buttons and credibility and endorsement of the federal government.

In other regions, little or no community involvement anti-racism activity anchored in the Campaign takes. None of the regions pro-actively promote the school kits.

Campaign materials, including school kits, are often viewed as not properly adapted to regional contexts by Campaign coordinators. It was emphasized and re-emphasised in interviews with regional staff and managers that different regional demographics and history result in very different regional contexts that, in the minds of these regional staff, must be taken into account in a redesign of Campaign materials if they are to be used successfully by schools or other organizations. Each region had explanations of a different nature for what was needed, and what would work best in their regional context. All felt that their opinions were important because they reflected the situation “on the ground”. None of them felt that centrally developed school kit materials were properly adapted. One regional office had produced its own educational kits on human rights and on intercultural relations for teachers and students aged nine to 15, and was distributing them through its regionally developed distribution channels.

Little or no sharing of success stories, lessons learned, attempted approaches, etc. on Campaign-related activity appears to take place among regions and with Headquarters. Regional coordinators were mostly unaware of what Campaign-related activity was being conducted in other regions. None of the regions were aware of levels of Campaign materials usage in other regions or in their own, either in or out of schools. There exists a significant lack of discussion on the commonalities and dissimilarities of regional approaches that could be of potential use for the development of effective national-level Campaign “tools”.

Staff in the Regions experience a considerable “disconnect” from what they perceive as Ottawa-based Campaign ‘events’. They see little relevance in these events for their regional residents,

and express some resentment that these events use the Campaign resources that they feel could be better used with youth regionally. The annual March 21 events in Ottawa that centre around the date of March 21, particularly those of Action 2000 but also including those of the 2001 Campaign, are generally perceived to have very little impact in the regions, and the perceived lack of Headquarters concern for regional Campaign contexts, including the appropriate adaptation of school kit materials, is viewed as a direct consequence of placing too much priority on these “Ottawa-driven” events. There exists considerable regional cynicism concerning this issue.

Recommendation 4: An on-going, periodic mechanism for raising and addressing regional concerns and sharing experiences on Campaign delivery both in the regions and in Ottawa should be developed and implemented. Participation should be encouraged from all regions and Headquarters staff.

Management Information

It was pointed out in a number of Headquarter interviews that there exists a continuing absence of on-going national-level feedback mechanisms on the effectiveness of regional Campaign activities with youth or others. Furthermore, no specific information on usage levels, satisfaction, etc. on the Campaign school kits has been collected since 1998. The absence of periodically collected evaluative information was confirmed in all the regional interviews conducted. Regions are not doing any independent data collection, monitoring or evaluation of school kits.

It appears that a number of factors have contributed to a delay in the development and implementation of management monitoring and feedback mechanisms and associated indicators on school kit usage. These factors include: an absence of clearly defined Campaign goals and a performance measurement and data collection framework; a lack of direction in the evolution of the Campaign during recent years; a lack of corporate continuity; and, significant differences in Campaign activity and approaches among the regions and Headquarters. However, the development and distribution of school kits consumes considerable human and financial resources, and on the basis of materiality alone, on-going monitoring and evaluation is needed. In addition, the lack of annual, evaluative information on school and youth targeted campaign efforts results in an absence of objective data on which management decisions can be based.

Recommendation 5: The March 21 Campaign Secretariat in collaboration with PCH regional offices should develop a small number of performance indicators, and associated on-going data collection methods on the usage and effectiveness of Campaign school kits and materials that will provide useful information to Campaign managers for accountability and management decision purposes.

Youth and School Targeted Campaign Alternatives

The following options are presented as potential strategic alternatives for Campaign delivery, dependent in part, on the results of a “goals review exercise”, as outlined above. We emphasize

that the “goals review exercise” should be used a precursor to the discussions on changes and alternatives. Doing so would help resolve the present situation where of lack of consensus on the goals and objectives for the March 21 Campaign has resulted in a variety of expectations, activity and results. We recognize that some of the options below may not be entirely compatible with each other. They are presented as choices to be considered in the context of this evaluation, and as expressed by some interviewees and/or focus group members.

Redesign School Kit Materials

The focus groups with teachers and students have provided a wealth of information that can be used to modify the contents of the school kits to adapt them better to school environments. In particular we point out that:

Teachers reacted strongly to kit materials and said that much of the information provided in the present kit was not readily useable. The focus group report states: “Teachers were emphatic that the kits need to be more user-friendly. They said they would appreciate a ready-to-use kit requiring minimal or no preparation. Currently, they feel they are required to do too much to make the activities worthwhile and they resent the additional burden that the current campaign places on their time. The kits do not contain all the resources that the kits recommend that teachers use. This requires teachers to either not include that activity or somehow find the time to track down the information or resources necessary for the recommended activity.”⁷ A number of practical suggestions were made and some examples of well-designed materials (in the view of some teachers) were cited. These could provide valuable guidance to Campaign staff involved in modifying kit materials or developing new materials, so that items could be available for students and teachers to work with immediately.

Students desire more interactive “in-your-face” activities that underline the consequences of racial discrimination. The focus group report states: “Students stated that they have an awareness of what racism is but they could be better equipped to confront racist behaviour. Students spoke of other programs that are aimed at changing behaviours and noted the effectiveness of the in-your-face approach used in these campaigns. These sorts of campaigns focus on the negative consequences of the behaviour that the campaign is addressing. Students want to have a better understanding of the consequences of racism. Having a greater understanding of the negative impact of racism on its victims would have a positive impact on a student’s motivation learn about racism prevention techniques and implement these techniques when they encounter it.”⁸ When probed, students requested such things as plays, videos and in particular speakers who could talk from personal experience e.g. victims or “reformed racists”.

The results of the focus groups indicate clearly that a redesign of the school kit materials along the lines mentioned above would be required in order to increase the probability that teachers would make more use of kit materials. If they were designed with the needs of youth in mind as

⁷ Environics Focus Group Evaluation March 2001.

⁸ Environics Focus Group Evaluation March 2001.

well, they would likely be well-received in the classroom setting. In such a scenario, where both user party experiences with the materials are enhanced, usage could be expected to improve considerably.

However, both the focus group teacher discussions and interviews with Campaign deliverers and other organizations revealed important underlying problems that cannot be remedied by better adapted kits. These problems involve issues of distribution and penetration into the user milieu. Both of these are discussed below.

Improve the Distribution of School Kit Materials

As the report on the focus group clearly states, teachers feel that a better distribution vehicle needs to be found to ensure that the teachers who can actually make good use of the school kit, receive the kit. Teachers reported that distribution through the school principal is generally ineffective. (In a teacher survey conducted in 1998 by PCH, teachers recommended that of the choices provided, writing to school principals was the preferred channel for making them aware of new materials⁹. However, even this “route” is proving to be ineffective). One region suggested that they were in a better position than an Ottawa based distribution firm to get the kits into the proper hands. They reported that they had developed their own effective school distribution channel for other materials, based on their detailed familiarity of the region and knowledge of local contacts, and they suggested “get us good materials and we will get it into the schools”.

Timing was the other important distribution issue. Teachers stated quite emphatically that they need lead time to plan for the usage of any materials, and unless they consider materials during the lesson planning stage, the likelihood of inclusion later on is very low. It is likely that the effectiveness of distribution to teachers through school principals would improve if kits were sent out in late summer, in time for lesson planning. Teachers noted that addressing kits to the user party and having them arrive in a timely fashion go hand in hand.

Develop A Concerted School Usage Strategy

Timely distribution of well-adapted materials to the potential users at the teacher level appears to be a reasonable goal that would improve school kit usage. However, various individuals, including teachers, Campaign administrators, outside parties and PCH individuals involved in both the distribution and evaluation of other school materials by the department, have pointed out that PCH as a federal government Department faces considerable challenges and constraints in this regard.

⁹ See Teacher Survey Re: The Need for New Educational Materials About Canada, Corporate Review Branch, 1998. 50 % of respondents (70% in Quebec) suggested that the best way to inform them about the availability of new materials was through the principal; next best suggestion (15%) was through school librarians.

A number of individuals interviewed felt that to maximize their impact, school kits should include teaching materials developed in accordance with school curricula criteria. Indeed, some outside organizations, such as the BC Human Rights Commission, are developing school materials on themes similar to those of the March 21 Campaign, and are doing so in a rigorous manner to assure their conformity with provincial ministries of education criteria for specific grades and in specific courses, and their eventual approval of these materials for curriculum inclusion by the provincial ministry of education authorities. In addition, marketing and lobbying efforts are being made with provincial teacher federations, principals associations, school boards, home-and-school associations, and others.

At a minimum, to ensure that March 21 Campaign kits have pedagogical value and ease of use, they should be reviewed (once redesigned) by curriculum development experts.

For PCH, jurisdictional issues likely limit its ability to attempt the above route. In addition and more basically, the jurisdictional issue appears to severely curtail Departmental efforts to determine the best party to whom the kits should be sent, and to implement and evaluate such delivery. Experience with the distribution of other educational kits by the Department has been done primarily by invitation through school principals.

We suggest that in the absence of a mechanism for more effective school penetration, and possibly in conjunction with efforts to make the kits compatible with school curricula, even the best redesign of the kits may be wasted if little usage gain is realized. Learning from regional experience, and adapting to regional realities to develop specific regional school penetration strategies may help solve the problem. Exploring third-party delivery arrangements with organizations that do not experience the same constraints as PCH, including examining mechanisms available to assure that the Department's goals are met and its monitoring requirements fulfilled, could also be undertaken.

This issue must be considered seriously if large-scale distribution of kits to schools is to continue.

Emphasize Year-Round Anti-Racism Activity

Most parties consulted for this evaluation felt that the emphasis placed on "one day" was not of much assistance in developing sustained anti-racism awareness-raising or educational activity. The best usage of March 21st (as a specific date) was to develop as much sustainable activity as possible before March 21st that would peak on the day itself. It was reported by regional coordinators that this was most effectively done in the community, and not exclusively in the schools.

Some individuals suggested that a fundamental revisiting of this question should take place, and that consideration should be given to redefining the Department's anti-racism approach. This would include developing a national anti-racism program of sustainable year-round activity, of which one component would be the March 21 Campaign, with its focus on commemoration of

that date, and the continuation of the production of the associated event in Ottawa. The Canadian Race Relations Foundation is a PCH portfolio agency that reports to Parliament through the Minister of Canadian Heritage that could be considered a partner in the development of such an approach and delivery of some program components.

Refocus on Youth Directed Efforts Outside Schools

The above-mentioned scenario that emphasizes year-round anti-racism activity would imply a refocusing of efforts outside schools. These efforts could still be directed at youth. A good reason for giving this option consideration comes from an important observation in the focus groups. The focus groups demonstrated that students do not necessarily see racism as one of the most pressing problems in their schools, and both teachers and students feel that the impact of the Campaign in schools is limited.

The focus group report states: “Upon probing, students saw violence in the school, bullying, drugs and crime as the top negative issues that students are faced with... “Students spontaneously mentioned racism only a few times as one of the problems facing them in their school environment. Given that racism was raised in the recruitment process for the focus groups and that students completed a pre-focus group session questionnaire on the subject of racism, this topic should have been front and centre on their minds as the focus groups began.”

The report goes on to say “participants do not feel that this issue should take precedence over other issues of concern, such as violence in the schools or substance abuse issues.”

Finally, the report states “Based on focus group feedback, anti-racism activities surrounding the March 21st date have had the impact of raising awareness about racism, however, students and teachers alike do not see these activities as having had a direct or immediate impact on attitudes or behaviours.”¹⁰

It was pointed out in several interviews and in the focus groups that many students feel that anti-racism activity should be addressed to parties and environments where racism exists, and that schools and school-aged youth should be secondary targets. One outside organization has recently curtailed its race relations activity with school-aged children, citing their observation that these children see other issues e.g., relationships, drugs, parental authority, as more relevant to their lives, and that race relations issues come to the fore for these youth when they enter the workplace. Their efforts are being refocused to this audience.

The Campaign should consider the experience of its regional coordinators and multicultural staff to determine to what degree community-based anti-racism efforts targeted at youth outside schools should be undertaken, and to what extent these should be considered part of the March 21 Campaign.

¹⁰ Environics Focus Group Evaluation March 2001.

Expand Efforts to Clearly Define and Heighten Some Awareness Issues

Although focus group participants were selected from schools that all had received kits, the results of the focus groups showed that fewer than one-half of teachers and just over one-half of students were either very or somewhat familiar with the March 21 Campaign.

The report stated: “In the focus group sessions, students expressed high degrees of awareness of the posters and stickers associated with the March 21st Campaign, and a moderate level of familiarity with the television advertisements. However they expressed very low levels of awareness for the other items in the kit and activities associated specifically with the campaign....

Students often equated programs or activities that promote multicultural awareness, such as Black History Month, or initiatives such as International Women’s Day (both relatively recent occurrences given the timing of the focus groups) with the March 21st Campaign. Teachers also share this view.

The slogan of “Racism. Stop it!” is seen by both teachers and students as blunt and forthright. A few participants stated that they didn’t like the negative tone. Others said that the slogan is not aimed at them but at people who are racist. Some students see the statement as being aimed solely at those committing racist acts versus the slogan being a call to them to take action when they witness or experience a racist situation.”

We point out also that considerable confusion is expressed in the use of the name of the Campaign. One name often used is *March 21 Campaign for the International Day Elimination of Racial Discrimination*. However, it is now more often referred to as the *March 21 Campaign for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination* (i.e. the reference to “International” and “Day” are dropped), or simply as *March 21 Campaign*.

As was discussed above in the section on *Campaign Goals*, issues of Campaign awareness are not always clear, particularly in the context of the diversity of regional and Headquarters environments. The Campaign may wish to consider some refocusing on clearly defining some basic awareness issues, and revisiting various kinds of effort required to heighten awareness.

Recommendation 6: All options described above should be carefully considered by the Campaign staff and managers in the context of the efforts to clearly determine and agree upon Campaign goals, in light of the available resources. In the event that mass distribution of school kits is maintained, special attention should be paid not only to the kit content and improvement, but also to developing an effective and timely distribution plan.

Appendix 1: List of Reports Consulted

March 21 Campaign Interpretive Case History by the Centre for Policy and Program Assessment, School of Public Administration, Carleton University November 2000

Evaluation of March 21 Campaign for the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Best Practices for Social Marketing Campaigns (Vol.1), PCH 1999

Evaluation of March 21 Campaign for the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Summary Report (Vol. 2), PCH 1999

Results of Focus Groups with Teachers and Students, March 21 Campaign for the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Environics 2001

March 21 Surveys of Youth: Comparison of Pre-Launch and Post Launch Impact Measures, 1999 PCH

Segmentation Analysis of the Young Audience of the March 21 Campaign, PCH 1999

“Glorious and Free”: Results of a Teacher’s Survey, PCH 1999

Evaluation of With *Flying Colours*” Education Kit, PCH 1997

Review of Canada Day/Celebrate Canada Program and Other Related Activities, PCH 1999

Teacher Survey Re: The Need for New Educational Materials About Canada, PCH 1998

Appendix 2: List of Interviewees

PCH Headquarters Personnel

Karen Ellis
Barbara Levine
Kate McGregor
Lisa Hari
Monty Pittson
Michelle Pilon-Santilli

PCH Regional Personnel

Orest Kruhlak
Riita Katajamaki
Bob Friedrich
Christine Pinto
Heidi Jurisic
Isabelle Dahan
Luc Paquette
Louise Mascolla
Alain Maltais
Gilbert Daye

Other Stakeholders

Canadian Race Relations Foundation
BC Human Rights Commission
Canadian Teachers Federation
Canadian Race and Action Research Centre

Appendix 3: Interview Guide for NCR Campaign Managers and Personnel

March - April 2001

Note: interviews will be semi-directed to allow for full exploration of relevant issues from the perspective of the interviewee; questions will be used to stimulate discussion.

1. In your view, in general is the March 21 Campaign having an impact, and is it achieving its awareness and educational goals? Please discuss.
2. What are some of the strengths and weaknesses of the current Campaign design?
3. What feedback do you get from stakeholders?
4. In your view, how would you rate the campaign on a scale of 1-10, if you were to evaluate its relevance, success and cost-effectiveness? Please discuss.
5. Do you have any suggestions for improvement for the Campaign?

Appendix 4: Interview Guide for Regional Executives

March - April 2001

Note: interviews will be semi-directed to allow for full exploration of relevant issues from the perspective of the interviewee; questions will be used to stimulate discussion

1. In your view, what impact does the March 21 Campaign have in the broad context of your region?
2. What are some of the strengths and weaknesses of the current Campaign design?
3. What are the regional resources implications for you in the delivery of the March 21 campaign?
4. What feedback do you get from stakeholders?
5. In your view, how would you rate the campaign on a scale of 1-10, if you were to evaluate its relevance, success and cost-effectiveness? Please discuss.

Appendix 5: Interview Guide for Regional Coordinators

March 2001

Note: interviews will be semi-directed to allow for full exploration of relevant issues from the perspective of the interviewee; questions will be used to stimulate discussion

1. Please briefly describe your regional context and what effect this has on the March 21 Campaign? What are some of the challenges you experience with the Campaign?
2. In general, over the time that you have been involved in the Campaign, what aspects of the Campaign have worked well and what have not? How has the Campaign evolved based on the initial objectives of public education, using schools and youth as its education target?
3. Do you have ideas on how the Campaign could better achieve its educational objectives i.e. to facilitate attitude changes in youth and influence behaviour? Is this an important aspect of the Campaign, in your view? Should the Campaign have as an objective to change attitudes and influence behaviour? If yes, is the current campaign capable of achieving this?
4. Was the 2000 Campaign different from other years? If so how?
5. To what extent do you think the school kit has contributed to heightened awareness of racism? What part(s) of the kits are of greater pedagogical value or more useful than others? Why or why not?
6. To what extent do you think the kit has contributed to the educational objectives of the Campaign? What part(s) of the kits contribute? What parts don't? Why?
7. Based on your experience, to whom should the kit be sent in the schools? Is it to the principal, a particular "subject matter" teacher, a general resource person, other? What do you see as a strategy for integrating March 21 Campaign education materials into the schools using the kit?
8. Do you have any ideas on better alternatives to the kits or parts of the kits? Are you aware of any problems in the logistics/ material distribution process of March 21 Campaign materials? Please discuss.
9. Are you aware of any other anti-racism campaigns in your region? Which ones? Have you had any feedback from March 21 Campaign materials users on the usage in schools of other anti-racism materials from other sources? If so, what?
10. Is there anything else you would like to add to this discussion?

Appendix 6: Interview Guide for External Organizations

March - April 2001

Note: interviews will be semi-directed to allow for full exploration of relevant issues from the perspective of the interviewee; questions will be used to stimulate discussion

1. Please describe what anti-racism initiatives your organization engages in, specifically with school-aged youth. What are the specific goals of these initiatives? (note: probe on issue awareness-building vs. educational goals.)
2. How important are these youth focussed initiatives in the context of your overall anti-racism activity? (if applicable)
3. Are your youth focussed initiatives having an impact? What are some of their strengths and weaknesses?
4. If you run school programs, please describe what they are, and what your strategies are for having them adopted by school authorities/teachers.
5. Are you aware of the March 21 Campaign of the Department of Canadian Heritage? What do you know about it?
6. If you have seen the March 21 materials how would you compare them to materials you may have developed for schools?

Management Response

In response to the 2001 Evaluation Report of the March 21 Campaign, the Multiculturalism Program of the Department of Canadian Heritage is undertaking a fundamental re-orientation of the campaign which will be integrated into the broader renewal and rethinking of the Multiculturalism Program which is underway as part of the social cohesion agenda of the Department and of the Government of Canada. The Program has been engaged in a number of national and regional consultations and focus tests in 2001 which produced recommendations which are being factored into our thinking in this area. Our thinking about the future role of the Multiculturalism Program in the area of race relations will be done in conjunction with our ongoing review of the relative roles and responsibilities of the program and the Canadian Race Relations Foundation.