

# **Report on a Formative Evaluation of two Canadian Arts and Heritage Sustainability Program Components:**

## **Cultural Capitals of Canada and Networking Initiatives**

FINAL REPORT

JUNE 22, 2005



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>I INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
A. Cultural Capitals of Canada and Networking Initiatives.....	1
B. Evaluation Questions .....	6
C. Methodology.....	6
D. Limitations of the Evaluation Methodology .....	6
<b>II STUDY FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
A. Design .....	8
B. Implementation and Delivery .....	11
C. Progress Towards Expected Outcomes .....	16
D. Performance Measurement Strategy and Practices .....	20
<b>III CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSE ..</b>	<b>22</b>
A. Conclusions.....	22
B. Recommendations and Management Response.....	23

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A – LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

### APPENDIX B – INTERVIEW GUIDES



---

## ***Executive Summary***

---

### **A. Evaluation Objectives**

This report presents findings of a limited-scope formative evaluation of two components of the Canadian Arts and Heritage Sustainability Program (CAHSP): Cultural Capitals of Canada (CCC) and Networking Initiatives. Because these components were introduced a year later than other CAHSP components, they were not covered by the 2003 formative evaluation of CAHSP, Arts Presentation Canada, and Cultural Spaces Canada.

The evaluation assessed the components' design and delivery, likelihood of outcomes achievement, and performance measurement strategy. A summative evaluation in 2007-08 will assess the impact of all CAHSP components.

Research was conducted by Kelly Sears Consulting Group between January 18 and March 31, 2005. It involved a review of documents and project files and 21 key informant interviews.

### **B. The Components**

CAHSP's objective is to strengthen the organizational effectiveness and build capacity of arts and heritage organizations.

Its Cultural Capitals of Canada component contributes to this objective by providing awards to recognize past achievements of communities as well as their ongoing commitment to arts and culture. Awards are up to \$500,000 and must be matched by the applicant and other funders.

Since CCC was introduced, there have been 14 Cultural Capital of Canada awards. There has also been one Innovative Cultural Bridges award for a joint cultural exchange and partnership initiative of five mining communities in BC and Alberta.

The Networking Initiatives component contributes to CAHSP objectives by supporting national networking projects that develop, improve and strengthen the environment for arts and culture in Canada.

Two NI projects have been supported: the Creative City Network, which facilitates knowledge sharing and professional development for municipal cultural workers, and Arts Network for Children and Youth, which promotes the benefits of arts and culture for children and youth.

## C. Findings

The Cultural Capitals of Canada, which is presented as a separate program, and the Networking Initiative component, both have a sound rationale. A key delivery feature of CCC is the application review process: applications are first reviewed by an independent advisory committee and then by a committee of mayors from municipalities that received CCC designations the previous year. Both CCC and the Networking Initiatives component have potential to make a real and positive contribution to achievement of CAHSP program objectives, i.e. strengthening the organizational effectiveness and building the capacity of arts and heritage organizations.

The main design and delivery issues identified were:

- ❑ a decline in the number of applications from municipalities for designation as Cultural Capitals of Canada, despite the large size of awards (up to \$500,000) and what one would expect to be an increasing awareness in municipalities of this program, and relatively few applications for the Innovative Cultural Bridges sub-component of CCC and the Networking Initiatives component;
- ❑ insufficient time between the dates of CCC announcements and the period that municipalities will be featured as cultural capitals, so that communities have too little time for planning and promotion. It was noted that the European program after which this program was modelled gives designated capitals several years to prepare;
- ❑ the need for a fourth category of CCC designation. There are currently three levels: one for communities with a population over 125,000, one for communities with a population between 50,000 and 125,000, and one for communities with a population of less than 50,000. The case was made for a new level, with an increased budget, for communities with a population over 500,000; and
- ❑ concerns about the sustainability of NI projects when federal funding ends.

As for performance measurement, it was found that the performance measurement strategy for CCC and NI needs further development. Performance indicators in the CAHSP Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework-Risk-based Audit Framework are not likely to capture whether CCC projects have strengthened connections between municipalities and local arts and culture organizations and whether they have increased the sustainability of arts and culture organizations.

Since awards from both CCC and NI components are significant, there should be a template for performance reporting by recipients that identifies the information

recipients are expected to collect and, at minimum, includes short- and medium-term project impacts.

## **D. Recommendations and Management Response**

### **Recommendation 1:**

Establish a firm date for annual announcements of CCC designations.

#### Management Response:

#### **Recommendation accepted - completed**

A timetable for application deadlines and award announcements (until 2012) has been developed. This timetable was publicized at the annual conference of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and is posted on the CCC website.

### **Recommendation 2:**

Ensure CCC designations are announced enough in advance of project starting dates that municipalities are able to properly plan their projects and develop partnerships with local arts and culture organizations.

#### Management Response:

#### **Recommendation accepted - completed**

See response to recommendation 1 above.

Past uncertainty regarding budget allocations and renewal of the Tomorrow Starts Today initiative, which provided all the funding for this component, previously precluded timely announcements. The recent five-year renewal has allowed the program to set a timetable as indicated above. Once this cycle is fully implemented, communities will have approximately a year and a half to plan for their year of designation as a Cultural Capital of Canada. With additional lead time, the Arts Policy Branch hopes to be able to target support from its other programs to provide additional support to future winners.

### **Recommendation 3:**

Consider a fourth CCC level, and a higher contribution, for municipalities with more than 500,000 people, to ensure a significant profile and recognition for CCC.

#### Management Response:

#### **Recommendation accepted in principle - partially completed**

Only nine communities have a population of over 500,000, making the field of competition very limited. However, the program will review the most current population data to determine other options for adjustments to population categories. As only nine communities have a population of over 500,000, the program will review the most current population data to determine the feasibility of adjustments to population categories.

The revised T&Cs for CCC approved May 9, 2005 by Treasury Board included an increase in maximum contributions for all population categories, including an increase in the maximum contribution to \$2M for communities over 125,000.

***Implementation Schedule:*** summer 2005

**Recommendation 4:**

Develop and implement a marketing strategy to increase municipalities' awareness of CCC and increase the number of applications.

Management Response:

**Recommendation accepted - underway**

In early 2005, program management initiated, in collaboration with the Department's Communications Services, a strategy to further promote and market the program. A series of initiatives are being undertaken in the context of this strategy. Activities already carried out include:

- published calls for applications for the 2006 awards in several municipal and Aboriginal magazines;
- as well as the announcement of the new contribution maximums, and
- presence as an exhibitor (since 2002) and participation in workshops for municipalities interested in culture at the FCM 2005 Conference (June 3-6).

Other planned measures include:

- a letter from the Minister to Mayors across the country to encourage submission of applications;
- placements in approximately 300 Canadian community newspapers, as well as dailies, weeklies and magazines;
- outreach at more municipal events and conferences, and
- further partnerships with community-based organizations such as the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Creative City Network and Les Arts et la Ville.

Other specific suggestions contained in the evaluation such as holding annual gala dinners, commissioning videos of winning communities and holding workshops for aspirant communities (one held in 2003) will be explored for implementation in the coming year.

***Implementation schedule:*** fall 2005/winter 2006

**Recommendation 5:**

Develop clear, practical guidelines on performance information to be collected by CCC and NI funding recipients and specific indicators.

Management Response:

**Recommendation accepted - partially completed**



Management has thoroughly reviewed and updated the program's RMAF/RBAF. Trackable and concrete outcomes as well as performance indicators have been identified for both CCC and Networking.

Program guidelines have been revised to provide more information on financial accounting. These guidelines include a budget template which will streamline financial reporting. Both financial and results reporting requirements have been strengthened in the contribution agreements that are concluded with recipients.

A results reporting template will be designed to guide recipients on performance reporting. The Branch will also consider contracting evaluators to carry out assessments of winning communities.

***Implementation Schedule:*** summer/fall 2005

**Recommendation 6:**

In keeping with CAHSP's sustainability objective, develop a strategy to ensure Networking Initiatives projects will continue after departmental funding ends.

Management Response:

**Recommendation not accepted**

Networking supports the CAHSP objective of ensuring that arts and heritage organizations operate in communities that value their existence, see them as a key asset and support them. Networking projects which are supported are those operating at a pan-Canadian level in order to promote the development of cultural policies and action plans at the local level and/or the development of strategic partnerships leading to an improved environment for the arts and culture at the local level. These networks are providing the strategic tools needed to build capacity within Canadian communities and foster dialogue on the impact of arts and culture on aspects of community life such as health, well-being, children and youth-at-risk, and economic development. Networks funded under this component are building a solid foundation across Canada for the place of the arts in improving quality of life, and as such require ongoing federal support.

While the initial hope had been that networks would become self-sustaining, it is now obvious that this expectation was not realistic. However, the Program will be working with these organizations to ensure that they develop strategies to further partnerships and diversify sources of funding.



---

## **I Introduction**

---

This report presents findings of a limited-scope formative evaluation of two components of the Canadian Arts and Heritage Sustainability Program (CAHSP): Cultural Capitals of Canada (CCC) and Networking Initiatives (NI).

The evaluation was conducted in the early stages of the two components' life cycle. Its purpose was to test the adequacy of design and delivery, to assess whether the program if implementation continues as planned is likely to achieve its intended results and assess the adequacy of its performance measurement strategy. In short, the evaluation was a "check up" on whether the program is off to a good start and a report on what modifications are required.

Findings are based on research conducted by Kelly Sears Consulting Group between January 18 and March 31, 2005.

### **A. Cultural Capitals of Canada and Networking Initiatives**

In May 2001 the Government of Canada launched *Tomorrow Starts Today* (TST), a three-year \$560M initiative to support arts and heritage in Canada.<sup>1</sup> In summer 2003, funding was confirmed for a fourth year (2004-2005), and in May 2005, funding for a further five years was approved. TST programming will thus be in place until 2009-10.

The *Tomorrow Starts Today* initiative includes the Canadian Arts and Heritage Sustainability Program (CAHSP), a program to provide Canadians with access to high-quality cultural experiences through the improvement and consolidation of the organizational, administrative, and financial situation of arts and heritage organizations<sup>2</sup>.

The program has the following components<sup>3</sup>:

- ❑ Stabilization Funds (grants and contributions)
- ❑ Capacity Building (grants and contributions)
- ❑ Endowments (grants)

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.pch.gc.ca/special/tomorrowstartstoday/en-back-2001-05-25-fs5.html>

<sup>2</sup> Canadian Arts and Heritage Sustainability Program Terms and Conditions, May 2002.

<sup>3</sup> CAHSP Terms and Conditions, the August 28, 2003 CAHSP Results-based Management and Accountability Framework and Risk-based Audit Framework and Plan, and the March 23, 2005 draft CAHSP RMAF-RBAF.

- ❑ Networking Initiatives (contributions)
- ❑ Cultural Capitals of Canada (contributions)<sup>4</sup>, and
- ❑ Limited Support to Endangered Arts Organizations.

A joint formative evaluation of three *Tomorrow Starts Today* programs--CAHSP, Arts Presentation Canada and Cultural Spaces Canada--was completed in 2004. At the time research for that evaluation was being done, the Cultural Capitals of Canada and Networking Initiatives components had only recently been introduced, so their evaluation was postponed until this study.

## 1. Cultural Capitals of Canada

Cultural Capitals of Canada (CCC) was announced May 31, 2002 by the Minister of Canadian Heritage at the annual convention of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities.<sup>5</sup>

CCC, which is publicly presented as a separate program, contributes to CAHSP objectives by providing awards to recognize past achievements of communities as well as their ongoing commitment to arts and culture.

Eligible recipients are Canadian municipalities, i.e. towns, cities, regional municipalities, or districts with a duly constituted government, and incorporated, independent, not-for-profit organizations with activities aimed at fostering sustainable municipal cultural practices.

Four municipalities a year can be designated Cultural Capitals of Canada, as follows:

- ❑ Level 1: awards to municipalities with a total population greater than 125,000: one award per year, maximum \$500,000;
- ❑ Level 2: awards to municipalities with a total population of 50,000 to 125,000: one award per year, maximum \$500,000; and
- ❑ Level 3: awards to municipalities with a total population of fewer than 50,000: two awards per year, maximum \$250,000 per award.

As well, there is a fifth annual CCC designation, the Award for Innovative Cultural Bridges (ICB). This last award goes to two or more municipalities from at least two provinces or territories that will together develop cultural exchanges and partnerships that celebrate each community's identity and build a legacy for arts and culture in each

---

<sup>4</sup> The Cultural Capitals of Canada component is identified as a separate program on the PCH website.

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.canadianheritage.gc.ca/newsroom/news\\_e.cfm?Action=Display&code=2N0059E](http://www.canadianheritage.gc.ca/newsroom/news_e.cfm?Action=Display&code=2N0059E)

community. The maximum award is \$500,000; if it is not awarded a fifth Cultural Capital of Canada award can be made.

Designated communities are required to match CCC funding.

The CCC budget for the three-year period from 2001-02 to 2003-04 was \$5M. In 2004-05 it was \$2.8M, in 2005-06, \$2M, and from 2006-07 to 2009-10, it will increase to \$6.362M per year.<sup>6</sup>

Designations are intended to increase communities' investments in arts and culture, increase and improve their cultural services, and strengthen their connections with other communities.<sup>7</sup>

As for delivery, a not-for-profit organization, Communities-in-Bloom was announced October 3, 2002 as the secretariat for CCC. Each year, an independent advisory committee is established to assess proposals against a scoring template prepared by the Program. Advisory committee members include external arts and cultural policy specialists, who meet two days per year to discuss ratings and develop recommendations. The committee's recommendations are then discussed with an advisory panel comprised of mayors from municipalities that won awards the previous year. Final recommendations are then submitted to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, and the Minister announces CCC designations.

Successful applicants are required to sign contribution agreements, which specify among other things, the financial and reporting requirements for their projects.

Table 1 provides information on applicants for and awards of CCC and Innovative Cultural Bridges awards to date.

---

<sup>6</sup> Department of Canadian Heritage, *Canadian Arts and Sustainability Program, Integrated Results-based Management and Accountability Framework (RMAF) and Risk-based Audit Framework (RBAF)*, draft report, March 23, 2005.

<sup>7</sup> [http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/ccc/index\\_e.cfm](http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/ccc/index_e.cfm)

**Table 1 – CCC and ICB Applications and Designations, 2003-2005**

<b>Year</b>	<b># of CCC applications received</b>	<b>#/names of communities with CCC designations</b>	<b># of Innovative Cultural Bridges applications received</b>	<b>#/names of communities with a Innovative Cultural Bridges designation</b>
2002-03	34	5 designations: Vancouver, BC Red Deer, AB Thunder Bay, ON Caraquet, NB Rivière-du-Loup, QB	1	0
2003-04	32	4 designations: Regina, SK Owen Sound, ON Kelowna, BC Powell River, BC	1	1 award : Lethbridge, Drumheller, Canmore, Crowsnest Pass and Fernie
2004-05	25	5 designations: Toronto, ON Victoria, BC Algonquins of Pikwàkanagàn, ON Annapolis Royal, NS Saint-Jean-Port-Joli, QB	1	0

## **2. Networking Initiatives**

The Networking Initiatives component can provide strategic contributions for national networking projects. Federally-, provincially-, and territorially-incorporated not-for-profit organizations can apply.<sup>8</sup>

Networking projects must involve municipal cultural officials and work towards developing participants’ capacity in at least one of the following areas:

- ❑ Cultural policies and action plans at the municipal level;
- ❑ Sound management practices for arts and heritage organizations; and
- ❑ Private sector involvement at the local level to sustain cultural activities.

---

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/pcapc-cahsp/05\\_e.cfm](http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/pcapc-cahsp/05_e.cfm)

The budget for this component was \$1M for the three years from 2001-02 to 2003-04 and \$0.5M for 2004-05. For 2006-07 to 2009-10, the budget will be approximately \$1M per year.

Networking projects must include one or more of the following:

- ❑ Development of communications forums, e.g., conferences, seminars or workshops, for information-sharing or dialogue;
- ❑ Production of material to guide municipal cultural workers in the development, adoption and integration of policies and action plans to improve the scope and availability of cultural activities in Canadian communities;
- ❑ Development of strategic partnerships among Stabilization Projects<sup>9</sup> in Canada.

Projects must involve participants from at least four Canadian provinces or territories. Priority is given to projects that make a special effort to address the needs of Aboriginal, culturally diverse, minority official language and rural communities.

To date, two Networking Initiative projects have been funded: the Creative City Network project and the Arts Network for Children and Youth project.

**Table 1 – Networking Applications and Funding Recipients, 2002-2005**

Year	# of Networking applications received	Names of funding recipients
2002-03	1	Creative City Network (year 1)
2003-04	2	Creative City Network (year 2) Arts Network for Children and Youth (year 1)
2004-05	1	Arts Network for Children and Youth (year 2) Creative City Network (last 6months of 18 month funding)

CCC and NI funding, which is provided by contribution agreement, cannot exceed the lesser of 50 percent of total eligible project costs and \$250,000 for NI and \$500,000 for CCC.

---

<sup>9</sup> CAHSP's sustainability Project component supports the adoption of sound practices in governance, strategic planning and organizational effectiveness by non-profit arts and heritage organizations. [http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/pcapc-cahsp/01\\_e.cfm](http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/pcapc-cahsp/01_e.cfm)

## **B. Evaluation Questions**

The evaluation examined the following questions:

- ❑ Is the design of the components appropriate to meet components' objectives?
- ❑ Are there issues regarding the implementation and delivery of the component?
- ❑ Is there any early indication of progress towards expected outcomes?
- ❑ Is a performance measurement strategy in place and are practices sound?

## **C. Methodology**

This was a limited-budget evaluation with two data collection methods: a review of documents and key informant interviews.

The document review involved a review of project files and key documents provided by program management (component guidelines, application guidelines and forms, briefing materials for the CCC Advisory Committee, background policy papers, contribution agreements and two CAHSP RMAF/RBAFs<sup>10</sup>). Additional documents obtained during the interview process, for example press clippings, project budget spreadsheets, and project financial and activity reports, were also reviewed.

Key informant interviews involved in-person or telephone conversations with 22 individuals (four departmental staff involved in CAHSP delivery, nine funding recipients, two with unsuccessful CCC applicants, four members of the CCC Project Advisory Committee, two representatives of Communities-in-Bloom, and one representative of the Cities Secretariat at Infrastructure Canada. An interview was sought with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, but the organization declined. Further information about interviewees is provided in Appendix A.

Each interviewee received an interview guide by e-mail in advance of the interview. There was an interview guide for each component. Interview guides are provided in Appendix B.

## **D. Limitations of the Evaluation Methodology**

There were a number of methodological limitations.

---

<sup>10</sup> RMAF-RBAFs reviewed were the August 29, 2003 CAHSP Results-based Management and Accountability Framework and Risk-based Audit Framework and the March 23, 2005 draft Results-based Management and Accountability Framework and Risk-based Audit Framework.



Due to the preliminary stage of the Cultural Capitals of Canada and Networking Initiatives components, there was limited information to be analysed. For example, no final project reports had been completed at the time that research was being done.

Also, because of a limited project budget and tight project timeframe, research was limited to a document review and key informant interviews. There was no survey of municipalities to find out the extent to which CCC is known or public opinion polling to find out Canadians' interest in visiting Cultural Capitals.

Finally, there was no interview with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, as an interview request to the organization was declined. Program documents showed FCM was consulted when CCC was being developed, and the organization has a membership of approximately 1,100 municipalities, suggesting it would have had useful insights on the extent to which CCC is known and its strengths and weaknesses.

---

## **II Study Findings**

---

Findings are presented under the following headings:

- A. Design;
- B. Implementation and delivery;
- C. Progress towards expected outcomes;
- D. Performance measurement strategy and practices.

### **A. Design**

#### **1. Cultural Capitals of Canada Component**

Findings regarding the CCC's design are provided below.

##### **a) Development of the CCC component**

Departmental files and some key informant interviewees indicate that the CCC component was developed by means of consultations with the Canadian Conference of the Arts and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and a review of the European Union's Cities of Culture Program and the American Capital of Culture Initiative.

Several documents were found in departmental files and on the Internet that indicate that the CCC component was under development as far back as 1998<sup>11</sup>. The end result was a component that the Department of Canadian Heritage believed would be most appropriate for Canadian municipalities.

##### **b) The rationale for CCC is well-understood**

Representatives of municipalities that have been Cultural Capitals had a shared understanding of the significance of their CCC designation. Interviewees spoke of the dual dimensions of designation. On one hand, the CCC designation recognizes communities that have shown a commitment to arts and culture, for example by having developed a cultural policy. This was the "reward" aspect.

---

<sup>11</sup> See, for example, *Canadian Conference of the Arts, Cents and Sensibility: Annual Analysis of the Federal Budget by the Canadian Conference of the Arts, June 2003, p. 9, available at: <http://www.ccarts.ca/en/advocacy/publications/policy/documents/CENTS.pdf>*

---

They also noted were also aware of a second dimension, i.e. helping communities to strengthen their local arts and heritage capacity, the “legacy” aspect. Municipalities are encouraged to explore ways of achieving this goal, for example by supporting public art components, developing and implementing cultural policies and plans, and promoting cultural activities to community residents.

Members of the advisory committee noted that to win a designation, municipalities must have partnerships with local arts colleges, universities, museums and/or local arts groups. Interviewees with both successful and unsuccessful proposals reported that the application process had promoted this.

**c) The link between CCC and CAHSP is sometimes unclear**

CAHSP staff say CCC is presented as a discrete program for communications and public information purposes. The target for most CAHSP activities is non-profit arts and heritage organizations, while CCC’s target is the arts and culture departments of municipalities.

**d) CCC objectives are long-term**

A number of municipal representatives said CCC has helped convince local elected officials and their staff of the contribution arts and culture make to quality of life in their communities.

Elected municipal officials still give priority to traditional infrastructure (roads, sewers and recreational facilities) and holding the line on tax increases, so municipal funding for cultural activities is scarce. CCC designations seem designed in a way that will encourage municipalities’ willingness to consider arts and culture expenditures.

**e) Limited Innovative Cultural Bridge (ICB) activity**

There have been just three applications for Innovative Cultural Bridge (ICB) designation and one award. Several interviewees noted the success of the project that received the award, which has helped five coal mining communities in BC and Alberta to share their mining town experiences and their evolution from being resource-based communities.

A municipal representative who worked on an ICB application said it is difficult for municipalities to prepare joint proposals as they have little or no experience with inter-city planning.

There were two suggestions for increasing the number of ICB applications.

1) Broaden the eligibility criteria. The current criteria require cross-provincial applications; the suggestion was to open ICB to cross-cultural applications, even within a single province or territory.

2) Market the program more actively. For example, ICB could be brought to the attention of the Ottawa-Gatineau region in case the two linguistic communities would like to initiate an application.

**f) CCC awards encourage partnership development**

The size of CCC financial contributions to designated communities was considered a major incentive for applications, and also a major incentive for municipalities to forge partnerships with local arts and culture organizations.

CCC awards to smaller Level 1 municipalities (population greater than 125,000) in particular were seen as having a major impact.

Larger Level 1 municipalities had mixed views regarding the \$500,000 awards. Some said the awards are too small for mega-cities to do the necessary promotion. Others said large communities have limited dollars for arts and culture projects so federal dollars are significant.

**g) Matching CCC contributions are beyond the reach of some communities**

Several interviewees said it could be difficult for municipalities to match federal funding awards, particularly smaller municipalities.

At the time of this evaluation, PCH staff was aware of this concern and consideration was being given to increasing PCH's share of the contribution amount. From feedback provided by interviewees, it seems likely there would be support for such a change.

**h) Communities may need help meeting CCC application requirements**

A number of interviewees said many communities need help integrating cultural planning into municipal planning.

They suggested the Department develop a program component that supports capacity building by municipalities; funding could be provided to hire planners to develop and conduct strategic planning. This would help municipalities to develop cultural plans and thus satisfy a key CCC criteria, i.e., having cultural policies and action plans.

**i) Population levels for the CCC awards may need adjustment**

It was suggested that CCC would be improved if there were four rather than three levels for designations, to better match funding to the size of municipalities. The fourth category would be for the largest cities in Canada, i.e., cities with a population greater than 500,000 (of which there are nine). Interviewees suggested the amount of the award also be increased, for example to \$1M, to ensure funding is sufficient to cover promotion costs necessary to generate community interest and recognition.

## **2. Networking Initiatives**

The two projects supported so far by this component are the Creative City Network of Canada (CCN) and the Arts Network for Children and Youth (ANCY).

The Creative City Network is an organization of municipal employees across Canada with responsibilities relating to arts, culture and heritage. The project began in the Greater Vancouver Area. A list serve bulletin board was created so they could share information and experiences, which quickly grew to involve about 50 cities and more than 130 individuals. The exploding interest across Canada generated an increasing workload for the founders such that new technology (a Web-based service) was needed. The founders approached the Department for help, and support for a two-year Networking Initiative project was approved.

The other project, the Arts Network for Children and Youth (ANCY) in Toronto, is at an earlier stage of development. ANCY is a national non-profit organization that was established by a group of arts practitioners to develop sustainable arts programming for children and youth. Research had shown that exposing disadvantaged youth to the arts can help reconnect them to society. ANCY is unlike most youth projects, which generally involve recreational facilities like hockey arenas and soccer fields.

## **B. Implementation and Delivery**

### **1. Cultural Capitals of Canada**

Feedback was obtained from interviewees on the following aspects of component delivery:

- a) Program promotion
- b) Application process
- c) Assessment process
- d) Project reporting and financial accounting
- e) Project visibility
- f) Final project reports

#### **a) Program promotion**

An explanation for the relatively small number of applications, and for declining numbers of applications for Cultural Capital designation, was sought through the interviews.

The general view was that the Cultural Capitals program was not as well-known as it should be to municipalities (although the representative of one community that had been a Cultural Capital said the mayor's office and other officials in her city had several times received information about the program) and evaluators found evidence of promotional work by program staff in the Department's files.

Several suggested ideas for further promotion, for example:

- ❑ Annual gala dinners to honour award winners, perhaps coinciding with annual conferences of a national NGO like the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), including a video presentation about the benefits of past awards for municipalities that had been Cultural Capitals;
- ❑ Annual workshops that bring together past winners and potential new applicants where potential applicants can get help developing project ideas;
- ❑ Promotion of CCC at annual Creative City Networks conferences;
- ❑ Dissemination of annual reports on CCC that highlight benefits of past awards to communities that were Cultural Capitals; and
- ❑ A television documentary about the creative city movement (perhaps developed with assistance from Telefilm Canada) that highlights benefits to communities that were Cultural Capitals.

It was suggested that promotional activities present the possible benefits of CCC designations, for example improved quality of life, new employment and economic growth, making the point that a CCC designation is indeed prestigious. In other words, interviewees suggested that the Department work to establish a CCC "brand."

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities has a membership of approximately 1,100 municipalities, including very small communities in every province and territory. From the perspective of evaluators, it would be logical for the Department to seek a joint initiative with FCM to promote CCC.

Departmental officials said they are already exploring promotional opportunities.

It was suggested that the limited number of applications may be due to the few communities who are able to meet all the eligibility criteria, i.e., matching funds and having a cultural policy or action plan. On the other hand, many communities with vibrant arts and culture sectors have not applied.

Evaluators heard that there was good follow-up work with municipalities whose applications were not accepted. These communities were given feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of their proposals and encouraged to re-apply, and approximately 25 communities had done so. This was considered very positive.

## **b) Application Process**

The CCC component has detailed application guidelines and interviewees stated that they are generally clear and comprehensive, the exception being eligible costs.

Advisory Committee members said the quality of applications has improved every year, reflecting improvements to the application form and the guidance provided to unsuccessful applicants.

A key issue raised by all interviewees was delays associated with the announcement of CCC winners. These delays are likely reducing the impacts on communities that win the award. To take an example, the City of Regina was a 2004 CCC winner. The application was submitted in March 2003; the announcement on the award was not made until October 2003; the contribution agreement was not signed until March 2004; and the project will not be completed until July 31, 2005. Interviewees would have preferred to be informed about the award in July 2003, so that the projects could have been underway at the beginning of 2004<sup>12</sup>.

Similarly in the case of the 2005 awards, winners were only announced in February 2005, which was viewed by previous award winners as too late. Municipalities would like to hear decisions sooner, so activities can begin early in the year that the awards are celebrated. Interviewees said CCC projects generally require considerable lead-time for planning. Tourism-related projects, in particular must be started a year ahead, so that budgets can be confirmed and marketing activities properly scheduled (e.g., advertising in provincial tourism brochures and publications).

Interviewees noted that in Europe, each city has two to three years to plan for the award year.

All interviewees strongly recommended that the CCC schedule needs a complete revamping. For example, applications for the 2008 awards should be received in early 2006, and winners announced by mid-2006. This would provide winning municipalities with a year and a half to properly plan the CCC projects and to consolidate partnerships with local arts and culture organizations and with the private sector.

The other aspect of the application guidelines that attracted feedback was eligible costs. Some interviewees said that they had received different interpretations. They suggested that the Department provide a table in the application form with specific examples of eligible and ineligible costs.

---

<sup>12</sup> Program officials have indicated that confirmation of funding is contingent on program budget decisions. The announcement of 2005 awards was delayed pending renewal of the *Tomorrow Starts Today* initiative, which was announced in mid-December. The announcement for the 2005 awards could only be made after this decision.

**c) Assessment process**

Several members of the advisory committee that reviews and assesses CCC applications were interviewed. Advisory Committee members were highly complimentary on most aspects of the program's work and that of the contractor that summarizes project applications, organizes and convenes the advisory committee). In fact, one advisory committee member who has participated in many government advisory committees over the years stated that the CCC process was the best of all.

Program staff provide strong support throughout the review process. Advisory Committee members said that the process is comprehensive: they first review all applications and score them against detailed guidelines (the scoring system is precise so marks for each criterion must be well justified). Some members suggested that the scoring system could be somewhat simplified (too many detailed remarks required in some sections).

Advisory Committee members commented positively on the project summary provided for each application. They estimated that it takes two to three hours to read and fully understand each application. Because they must send their ratings in advance of the Ottawa meeting and be ready to justify them to other committee members, marks are carefully considered.

Members also meet with a panel of mayors from municipalities that received CCC designations the previous year.

In total, an advisory committee member devotes about ten days to the process. Members who had been involved for more than one year said the process improves each year. They found the first year a "learning process" for all concerned: members of the advisory committee, Program staff and applicants. Members said the Department is open to suggestions for improvements. Members also noted an improvement in the quality of applications, which they attributed to improved guidelines, an improved application form, and feedback from Program staff to municipalities that re-apply.

Advisory Committee members said they had very much enjoyed discussions with mayors, who added an extra dimension of understanding to the review process (e.g., the types of community projects that tend to work). They strongly recommended that a panel of mayors continue.

One specific area where Advisory Committee members suggested more work is on the "legacy" aspect of applications. The application form requires municipalities to say how CCC project results will be maintained after funding ends. This question is difficult for applicants to answer and the committee to assess. It was suggested that legacy should be better defined in the CCC application, perhaps by providing "good" and "bad" examples.



#### **d) Project reporting and financial accounting**

Of all the comments received on CCC, the subject most often raised was budgeting, accounting and reporting. Municipalities find the reporting requirements time-consuming and overly onerous. All were surprised by the amount of accounting-related work required. Each municipality said it had had to develop its own templates. Having to balance revenues from matching contributions with quarterly expenses was particularly challenging, although project coordinators noted that the problems had eventually been resolved, with help from Program staff.

Interviewees recommended that the Department of Canadian Heritage provide budget templates. They said templates are routinely provided by municipal grant programs.

It was clear that Program staff keep a close watch over CCC projects. All the municipal representatives noted an excellent working relationship with Departmental staff, who they found very helpful and responsive. CCC project coordinators said PCH staff are very focused on ensuring the Department receives all the required financial and other project-related information.

Interviewees recognized that federal government contribution programs are operating in an era of heightened emphasis on proper financial accounting and reporting. However, they also pointed out that the CCC projects are carried out under the auspices of local municipalities, which have their own requirements for financial accounting and reporting. The finance department in each municipality works with the arts and culture department to ensure proper records are kept and expenditures are in line with policies. Several interviewees noted that the risk of fraud is very low. Also, the federal government has the authority to conduct a financial audit of the project at any time (several are planned over the coming months).

It was suggested that CCC guidelines encourage municipalities to hire a bookkeeper to maintain the books and prepare financial reports, and this should be an eligible expenses.

#### **e) Project visibility**

Based on interviews with representatives of Cultural Capitals, it appears that communities did their best to ensure CCC's visibility. A Regina representative said that local press coverage of the Regina designation had been considerable and showed several press clippings about the Regina designation and the 2004 Creative City Networks conference in Regina.

Communities were aware that their funding agreements with the Department of Canadian Heritage had specific requirements relating to visibility. A few interviewees thought small Cultural Capitals were more likely to be visible in their communities than large ones, because CCC projects in large cities have to compete for attention with many cultural and recreational activities.

Delays in the announcement of Cultural Capital designations were seen as having reduced CCC's visibility.

**f) Final project reports**

Municipalities designated as Cultural Capitals are required to submit final project reports that include audited financial statement showing total project revenues and expenditures. Interviewees expressed concern about these obligations, because of inconsistencies between report information required by the Department of Canadian Heritage and information collected by designated municipalities. They would like the Department's guidance on the degree of justification required for financial expenditures.

**2. Networking Initiatives**

Some CCC findings also apply to the Networking Initiatives components. NI fund recipients reported that the administrative and reporting burden for projects is very high. They said the Department's funding commitment for CCN had been at the last minute, which meant recipients had to make funding decisions before knowing that financing from PCH would be provided.

Because reporting was also difficult for ANCY, Departmental staff worked closely with the project coordinator to improve the reporting and financial accounting process.

Asked for insights about the low number of Networking Initiative project applications, interviewees suggested that eligibility criteria were perhaps too restrictive, as projects must involve local cultural officials. It was suggested that the component be opened up to other networking communities. At the time of this evaluation, departmental staff were exploring networking projects in other sectors.

**C. Progress Towards Expected Outcomes**

**1. Cultural Capitals Component**

**a) Evidence of impacts information**

The CCC's outputs and short-term outcomes were reviewed.

Outputs were signed contribution agreements with all communities that have received CCC designations in the component's first two years.

Evaluators explored whether the CCC component had improved linkages between municipalities and local arts and culture organizations and whether local citizens had increased their participation in arts and culture activities. Municipalities were asked to describe any higher-order results of CCC projects, for example, whether local elected

officials have changed their views on supporting arts and culture and whether local arts and culture organizations were more financially secure.

None of the three CCC communities that were interviewed had completed its project, so no final project reports had been prepared or submitted to the Department. This was surprising to evaluators since the CCC funding began in 2003. (To put it simply, it was expected that a 2003 award would be celebrated the year of the award, and not for the following one or two years later.) Part of the delay in project completion was due to delays in announcement of CCC winners during the component's first two years. For example, the Kelowna application process began in October 2002; however its CCC project application was only submitted in March 2003. The CCC award was announced in October 2003 and the contribution agreement only signed on March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2004. The project is still underway and will be completed December 31st, 2005. As a result, no report on outcomes is available on the CCC projects to date.

#### **b) Likely results of CCC projects**

Interviewees were asked to comment on the likely results of CCC projects in such areas as:

- ❑ Strengthened relationships between local cultural organizations and municipal officials;
- ❑ Increased integration of cultural activity into municipal planning processes;
- ❑ Demonstrations of ongoing commitment to and greater investment in arts and culture;
- ❑ Increased participation by residents in arts and culture activities.

Interviewees made the following points:

- ❑ **CCC has strengthened relationships between local, municipal and cultural officials and arts and culture organizations** – Interviewees suggested that partnership development, a key objective, is happening. For example, the first step in Kelowna's development of its CCC application was organization of a meeting of 40 stakeholders for a strategic planning process to identify proposed activities.
- ❑ **Improved cultural planning has had positive impacts on the arts and culture sector** – The CCC application process in Thunder Bay helped both the local government and arts and culture organizations to improve their planning processes. Thunder Bay now has an approved cultural policy, and the Thunder Bay Symphony Orchestra, which at one time had been in a deficit situation, has an improved planning process and a balanced budget. Thunder Bay's planning process brought together over 100 citizens representing

various sectors, including business and industry, arts and heritage organizations, Aboriginal organizations and artists, cultural entrepreneurs and tourism. It was suggested that the process had given the cultural community status at the City Council table.

- **CCC designations have had a positive impact on communities** – Several interviewees said that CCC designations had increased municipalities' awareness of the benefits of arts and culture activities, including improved quality of life, economic impacts and retention of young people.
- **Delays in the announcement of CCC designations have reduced project impacts** -- Particularly in the first two years, the time between the application deadline and the date when designations were announced had negatively affected the quality of CCC projects and reduced benefits.

For example, the 2003 designation of the City of Vancouver was announced in June 2003. It was suggested that partnership development and implementation of the project had to be rushed, which detracted from its effectiveness.

A similar point was made for Thunder Bay. Because the announcement date was delayed, the communication plan had been scaled back and public relations opportunities missed. For example, a highway sign announcing the project had arrived late and therefore had not been erected.

Several interviewees suggested that more lead time is needed for successful municipalities to properly plan and execute their CCC projects. Ideally, they said municipalities should know about designations two to three years in advance. They noted the EU program gives Cultural Capitals several years to prepare.

- **Little interaction between CCC communities** – The interviews conducted show limited interaction and information exchange among CCC communities, although a background paper on CCC suggested this was desirable. Each municipality is apparently developing its own approach to contracting with local arts and culture groups and financial reporting. It was suggested that the Creative City Network might be able to spread the word about best practices and positive impacts of CCC projects.

**c) An unintended benefit**

It was suggested that municipalities whose applications were not accepted still benefited from CCC because the process of developing applications strengthened their relationship with arts and culture sectors.

**2. Networking Initiatives**

The Creative Cities Network (CCN) project generated favourable comments from almost every interviewee; the project seems to have struck a positive chord with municipal cultural officials across Canada.

CCN was seen to have helped municipal cultural officials exchange information and best practices. If a municipality decides to start a public art program, it can quickly get suggestions and best practices from municipalities that already have put such programs in place. The network was credited with having greatly reduced “reinvention of the wheel.”

Large municipalities said they are playing a mentoring role with smaller municipalities, since they tend to have more developed cultural plans and more experience organizing cultural activities. Smaller communities expressed gratitude for the help they received, having found that participating in the network saved them project development time.

The professional development aspect of the Network was also valued. For example, CCN’s annual conference had provided a forum for municipal officials to learn from leading international advocates of cultural planning. CCN’s regular on-line publication (*Creative City News*), which is also distributed in hard copy format, was also noted.

CCN’s final report, when prepared, is expected to include a project evaluation, with performance indicators and an evaluation methodology. The evaluation will seek to measure impacts of increasing the level of municipal funding for arts and culture and enabling governments to better implement cultural development strategies. Some impact information has been collected, e.g., surveys from participants at annual conference.

The Arts Network for Children and Youth (ANCY) is at the end of the first year of a two-year timeframe. Its emphasis to date has been on raising awareness of the benefits of the arts to the health and well-being of children and youth and the need for arts programming at the local level. The project has relied heavily on Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC) funding for its matching contribution, as finding matching funding was a challenge. Project sustainability after NI funding ends appeared to be an issue.

The project was not familiar to municipal officials interviewed, nor was it mentioned in a recent special edition of *Creative City News*, published by the Creative City Network, which devoted space to arts and youth issues.<sup>13</sup>

It was suggested that the project might have benefited from developmental funding to help develop capacity prior to the start of this project.

Some interviewees thought, because of its focus on well-being and employment of youth, this project might have been better led by HRSDC, with the Department of Canadian Heritage as a partner (other partners might include Justice, Health Canada and the Canada Council).

#### **D. Performance Measurement Strategy and Practices**

As CCC and NI projects have not yet been completed, it was not possible to review final project reports. However, CAHSP RMAF-RBAFs were reviewed, and the subject of performance measurement was covered in interviews.

The RMAF-RBAFs' performance measurement strategy was found to need further development, as it covered all CAHSP components, with relatively little that applied specifically to CCC and NI. There were no indicators that would capture whether CCC projects had strengthened connections between municipalities and local arts and culture organizations, or whether they had increased the sustainability of the arts and culture organizations.

As part of their CCC applications, applicants are required to describe the goals and expected outcomes of proposed activities, and how they will be measured.

Key informant interviewees said they needed more guidance from Program staff on how they should measure and report on project outcomes. It was generally thought that having completed proposed activities meant the project had been successful. In other words, project recipients tended to be output- rather than outcome-focused.

A number of program risks were identified in the framework, two of which seem to evaluators to be particularly real:

- **A continuing dependence of Networking Initiative recipients on federal funding** – It was not clear to evaluators that Networking Initiative recipients will be able to sustain their activities without continued federal support, and the Program's mitigation strategy is not clear. The CAHSP objective of creating sustainable arts and culture organizations may not be achieved in the case of these projects.

---

<sup>13</sup> *Creative City Network, "Creative City News", Special Edition, 2004.*

- **Outcomes data (key performance indicators) lacking** – Evaluators found that no pre- or post-data has been collected for CCC projects, so municipalities have little evidence of the effectiveness of their project, i.e., are they increasing the sustainability of local arts and culture organizations? It is expected that some outcome information will be provided in final project reports (reports on 2003 projects are due soon), but without clearly specified performance indicators, recipients will likely have different approaches to measuring success, and it will be difficult for the department to assess overall impacts.
- Key informants reported different plans for evaluating their projects. One plans to summarize project outputs and report on financial expenditures. Another plans a survey of community residents to learn their response to major CCC activities. This latter approach was found to be more consistent with requirements of the contribution agreement and more useful for an eventual summative evaluation by the department.
- Until information requirements are clarified, project reports are likely to be anecdotal and subjective and lacking in consistency or rigour. Performance indicators that can be used by all recipients are needed. These should be provided to organizations that have received funding already, and incorporated into CCC/NI guidelines and contribution agreements with future recipients.
- Some suggestions were proposed on information that should be covered by project reports:
  - Funding from other sources for CCC and NI projects, including matching funding;
  - Whether the municipality has developed and the municipal council has formally approved a cultural development;
  - Whether the municipality's financial support to local arts and culture organizations has changed, and if yes, by what amount (pre- and post-CCC);
  - Whether public attitudes have changed towards municipal funding for local arts and culture organizations, and if yes, how (pre- and post-CCC); and
  - Community feedback on CCC designation.

---

### **III Conclusions, Recommendations and Management Response**

---

#### **A. Conclusions**

Each of the two CAHSP components – Cultural Capitals of Canada and Networking Initiatives – has potential to make a real and positive contribution to achievement of the program’s objectives, i.e., strengthening the organizational effectiveness and building capacity of arts and heritage organizations.

CCC links to arts and heritage organizations are indirect. By providing financial support to communities designated “Cultural Capitals” for a year, the component supports development and implementation of cultural policies, as well as action, cultural tourism and marketing plans. Research results are very positive on the benefits, suggesting that such initiatives create connections between municipalities and local arts and culture organizations that could continue long after CCC activities are completed.

Since there have been just two Networking Initiative projects funded since its introduction, evidence on this component is less conclusive. The response to the first of the two projects, the Creative City Network (a national network that municipal arts and culture officials can use to exchange information and lessons learned) has been very positive. However, sustainability is an issue. It is unclear where the resources will come from to maintain the networks after PCH funding ends.

There are two design and delivery issues in particular that require immediate attention.

First, a decline in the number of applications from municipalities for designation as Cultural Capitals of Canada, despite the large size (up to \$500,000) of potential awards and what one would expect to be an increasing awareness in municipalities of this program component. There were 34 applications in 2003, 32 in 2004 and 25 in 2005.

Interest in the Innovative Cultural Bridges sub-component (of CCC) and the Networking Initiatives component has also been limited. There have been three applications for Innovative Cultural Bridges funding in the three years that the sub-component has existed, of which one was funded, and two organizations have received Networking Initiatives funding (each for two-three years).

A second design/delivery issue is the very limited time between the dates of CCC designation announcements and the year in which municipalities will be featured as cultural capitals.



Where cultural capitals in Europe have several years to prepare to be a cultural capital, Canadian municipalities are sometimes receiving news that their applications have been approved the same year that they are to be featured, leaving far too little time to develop effective promotional materials.

A question that emerged from research is whether a fourth category of applications for Cultural Capital designations is needed. There are currently three categories: one for municipalities with a population greater than 125,000, one for municipalities with a population between 50,000 and 125,000, and a third for municipalities with a population less than 50,000. The first category is very broad and would more appropriately be divided in two, so there could be a separate category for municipalities with populations greater than 500,000.

As for performance measurement, the strategy for CCC and NI needs further development. Performance indicators in the CAHSP Results-based Management and Accountability Framework-Risk-based Audit Framework are not likely to capture whether CCC projects have strengthened connections between municipalities and local arts and culture organizations and whether they have increased the sustainability of the arts and culture organizations. Since awards from both CCC and NI components are significant, there should be a template for recipients that identifies the information they are expected to collect, and at minimum, should include short- and medium-term project impacts.

## **B. Recommendations and Management Response**

### **Recommendation 1:**

Establish a firm date for annual announcements of CCC designations.

#### Management Response:

**Recommendation accepted - completed**

A timetable for application deadlines and award announcements (until 2012) has been developed. This timetable was publicized at the annual conference of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and is posted on the CCC website.

### **Recommendation 2:**

Ensure CCC designations are announced enough in advance of project starting dates that municipalities are able to properly plan their projects and develop partnerships with local arts and culture organizations.

#### Management Response:

**Recommendation accepted - completed**

See response to recommendation 1 above.

Past uncertainty regarding budget allocations and renewal of the Tomorrow Starts Today initiative, which provided all the funding for this component, previously precluded timely announcements. The recent five-year renewal has allowed the program to set a timetable as indicated above. Once this cycle is fully implemented, communities will have approximately a year and a half to plan for their year of designation as a Cultural Capital of Canada. With additional lead time, the Arts Policy Branch hopes to be able to target support from its other programs to provide additional support to future winners.

**Recommendation 3:**

Consider a fourth CCC level, and a higher contribution, for municipalities with more than 500,000 people, to ensure a significant profile and recognition for CCC.

Management Response:

**Recommendation accepted in principle - partially completed**

Only nine communities have a population of over 500,000, making the field of competition very limited. However, the program will review the most current population data to determine other options for adjustments to population categories. As only nine communities have a population of over 500,000, the program will review the most current population data to determine the feasibility of adjustments to population categories.

The revised T&Cs for CCC approved May 9, 2005 by Treasury Board included an increase in maximum contributions for all population categories, including an increase in the maximum contribution to \$2M for communities over 125,000.

*Implementation Schedule:* summer 2005

**Recommendation 4:**

Develop and implement a marketing strategy to increase municipalities' awareness of CCC and increase the number of applications.

Management Response:

**Recommendation accepted - underway**

In early 2005, program management initiated, in collaboration with the Department's Communications Services, a strategy to further promote and market the program. A series of initiatives are being undertaken in the context of this strategy. Activities already carried out include:

- published calls for applications for the 2006 awards in several municipal and Aboriginal magazines;
- as well as the announcement of the new contribution maximums, and
- presence as an exhibitor (since 2002) and participation in workshops for municipalities interested in culture at the FCM 2005 Conference (June 3-6).

Other planned measures include:

- a letter from the Minister to Mayors across the country to encourage submission of applications;
- placements in approximately 300 Canadian community newspapers, as well as dailies, weeklies and magazines;
- outreach at more municipal events and conferences, and
- further partnerships with community-based organizations such as the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Creative City Network and Les Arts et la Ville.

Other specific suggestions contained in the evaluation such as holding annual gala dinners, commissioning videos of winning communities and holding workshops for aspirant communities (one held in 2003) will be explored for implementation in the coming year.

*Implementation schedule:* fall 2005/winter 2006

**Recommendation 5:**

Develop clear, practical guidelines on performance information to be collected by CCC and NI funding recipients and specific indicators.

Management Response:

**Recommendation accepted - partially completed**

Management has thoroughly reviewed and updated the program's RMAF/RBAF. Trackable and concrete outcomes as well as performance indicators have been identified for both CCC and Networking.

Program guidelines have been revised to provide more information on financial accounting. These guidelines include a budget template which will streamline financial reporting. Both financial and results reporting requirements have been strengthened in the contribution agreements that are concluded with recipients.

A results reporting template will be designed to guide recipients on performance reporting. The Branch will also consider contracting evaluators to carry out assessments of winning communities.

*Implementation Schedule:* summer/fall 2005

**Recommendation 6:**

In keeping with CAHSP's sustainability objective, develop a strategy to ensure Networking Initiatives projects will continue after departmental funding ends.

Management Response:

**Recommendation not accepted**

Networking supports the CAHSP objective of ensuring that arts and heritage organizations operate in communities that value their existence, see them as a key asset and support them. Networking projects which are supported are those operating at a pan-Canadian level in order to promote the development of cultural policies and action plans at the local level and/or the development of strategic partnerships leading to an improved environment for the arts and culture at the local level. These networks are providing the strategic tools needed to build capacity within Canadian communities and foster dialogue on the impact of arts and culture on aspects of community life such as health, well-being, children and youth-at-risk, and economic development. Networks funded under this component are building a solid foundation across Canada for the place of the arts in improving quality of life, and as such require ongoing federal support.

While the initial hope had been that networks would become self-sustaining, it is now obvious that this expectation was not realistic. However, the Program will be working with these organizations to ensure that they develop strategies to further partnerships and diversify sources of funding.

---

## ***Appendix A***

### ***List of Interviewees***

---

---

## ***List of Interviewees***

---

### **Department of Canadian Heritage**

Cynthia White-Thornley  
Director General, Arts Policy Branch

Robert Hunter  
Director, Strategic Arts Support  
Arts Policy Branch

Louise Morrison  
National Program Manager  
Arts Policy Branch

Marlene Chan  
Senior Policy Advisor, Policy and Planning  
Arts Policy Branch

### **Infrastructure Canada**

Kathleen Owens  
Senior Analyst  
Infrastructure Canada

### **Networking Initiatives Project Recipients**

Arts Network for Children and Youth

Creative City Network (also interviewed on behalf of the City of Vancouver)

Creative City Network

### **Cultural Capitals of Canada Project Recipients**

City of Thunder Bay

City of Regina

Kelowna City Hall

---

***Appendix B***

***Interview Guides***

---

---

# ***Interview Guide – Formative Evaluation of Cultural Capitals of Canada***

---

## **A. Background**

Kelly Sears Consulting Group has been engaged by the Corporate Review Branch, Department of Canadian Heritage to carry out a Formative Evaluation of Cultural Capitals of Canada. The objectives of the study are to:

- Assess the design of the component, in terms of the likelihood that the component will achieve its objectives.
- Identify any issues pertaining to the implementation and delivery of the component.
- Assess whether there is any early indication of progress towards the component's objectives.

We are conducting interviews with departmental officials, component recipients and other stakeholders to obtain feedback on the above topics. Below is a list of questions we would like to cover during our interview with you. The interview will not last more than one hour. Your views will be kept confidential and will be aggregated with all of the responses we receive. We thank you for your time and input.

## **B. Questions**

- 1. Your involvement.** Please describe your relationship/involvement with your municipality's Cultural Capitals of Canada project.
- 2. Your project.** Please describe the history of your municipality's Cultural Capitals project, e.g., how you found out about the component, how your application was developed, etc.
- 3. Component objectives.** In your view, what do you think the Cultural Capitals component and Innovative Cultural Bridges are attempting to accomplish? Do you think the objectives of the component are well matched to the needs of municipalities in Canada?
- 4. Design of Cultural Capitals of Canada and Award for Innovative Cultural Bridges.** Do you have any comments on the overall design of the component, e.g., the three levels of Cultural Capitals awards, the level of funding available for your municipality's category, the concept of matching funding, etc?
- 5. Status of project and accomplishments to date.** What have been the major accomplishments/successes of your project to date?



**6. Operation of the component.** Do you have any comments on any of the following aspects of the component design and operation:

- a. Component marketing and advertising.
- b. Clarity and appropriateness of component guidelines: eligibility criteria, eligible activities, eligible costs, and expected results.
- c. Application process.
- d. Assessment process by the department.
- e. Contribution agreement (e.g., clarity of rules, eligible/non-eligible expenditures, reporting requirements).
- f. Financial process (e.g., project budgeting, invoicing, progress/final payments, monitoring budgets and expenditures, level of support required to support costs).
- g. Communications with the Department of Canadian Heritage.
- h. Press coverage of your project.
- i. The final project report.
- j. The final financial audit.

**7. Measuring success.** How has (or will) your municipality measure the success and impacts of your project in the following areas:

- a. Increasing the level of involvement of people in your community in the arts and culture.
- b. Integrating cultural activity into the municipal planning process.
- c. Demonstrating an ongoing commitment and greater investment in arts and culture.
- d. Improving the quantity and variety of cultural activities in your community.
- e. Strengthening the relationships between local cultural organizations and municipal officials.
- f. Improving the quality of life for residents.

**8. Visibility of the component.** What has been the level of visibility of the component and your project in your community? Do you happen to know whether the Cultural Capitals component is well known throughout other municipalities across Canada?

- 9. Is the component still needed?** Overall, do you think that Cultural Capitals and Award for Innovative Bridges is a useful component? Is there still a need for the Cultural Capitals and Award for Innovative Bridges components across Canada?
- 10. The way ahead.** Do you have any suggestions to improve the effectiveness of the Cultural Capitals of Canada/Award for Innovative Bridges component?

---

# ***Interview Guide – Formative Evaluation of Networking Initiatives, Department of Canadian Heritage***

---

## **A. Background**

Kelly Sears Consulting Group has been engaged by the Corporate Review Branch, Department of Canadian Heritage, to carry out a Formative Evaluation of Networking Initiatives. The objectives of the study are to:

- ❑ Assess the design of the component, in terms of the likelihood that the component will achieve its objectives.
- ❑ Identify any issues pertaining to the implementation and delivery of the component.
- ❑ Assess whether there is any early indication of progress towards the component's objectives.

We are conducting interviews with departmental officials, component recipients and other stakeholders to obtain feedback on the above topics. Below is a list of questions we would like to cover during our interview with you. The interview will not last more than one hour. Your views will be kept confidential and will be aggregated with all of the responses we receive. We thank you for your time and input.

## **B. Questions**

- 1. Your involvement.** Please describe your relationship/involvement with your organization's Networking Initiative project.
- 2. Your project.** Please describe the history of your organization's Networking Initiative's project, e.g., how you found out about the component, how your application was developed, etc.
- 3. Component objectives.** In your view, what do you think the Networking Initiatives component is attempting to accomplish? Do you think the objectives of the component are well matched to the needs arts and heritage organizations?
- 4. Design of the Networking Initiatives component.** Do you have any comments on the overall design of the component, e.g., the level of funding, eligibility criteria, etc? In your view, is the Networking Initiatives component distinct and different from the other components of the Canadian Arts and Heritage Sustainability Component (i.e., Stabilization Projects, Capacity Building, and Endowment Incentives for Arts Organizations)?

- 5. Status of project and accomplishments to date.** What have been the major accomplishments/successes of your project to date?
- 6. Operation of the component.** Do you have any comments on any of the following aspects of the component design and operation:
- k. Component marketing and advertising.
  - l. Clarity and appropriateness of component guidelines: eligibility criteria, eligible activities, eligible costs, and expected results.
  - m. Application process.
  - n. Assessment process by the department.
  - o. Contribution agreement (e.g., clarity of rules, eligible/non-eligible expenditures, reporting requirements).
  - p. Financial process (e.g., project budgeting, invoicing, progress/final payments, monitoring budgets and expenditures, level of support required to support costs).
  - q. Communications with the Department of Canadian Heritage.
  - r. Press coverage of your project.
  - s. The final project report.
  - t. The final financial audit.
- 7. Measuring success.** How will your organization be able to demonstrate and measure the success of the component in terms of developing the capacity of networking participants in the following areas:
- a. Cultural policies and action plans at the municipal level?
  - b. Sound management practices for arts and heritage organizations?
  - c. Private sector involvement at the local level to sustain cultural activities?
- 8. Visibility of the component.** What has been the level of visibility of the component and your project? Do you happen to know whether the Networking Initiatives component is well known across Canada?
- 9. Is the component still needed?** Overall, do you think that Networking Initiatives is a useful component? Is there still a need for this component?
- 10. The way ahead.** Do you have any suggestions to improve the effectiveness of the Networking Initiatives component?