

Evaluation Services

**EVALUATION OF THE
IMPLEMENTATION
OF SECTION 42 OF THE
*OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ACT***

**Corporate Review Branch
Department of Canadian Heritage**

October 19, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Objective of the evaluation	1
1.2 Structure of the report	2
2.0 Methodology	3
2.1 Evaluation questions	3
2.2 Research methods	3
2.3 Constraints	7
3.0 Profile of section 42 of the OLA	8
3.1 Interpretation of sections 41 and 42 of the OLA	8
3.2 Principal measures adopted and results targeted by PCH	9
3.3 Other organizations involved in coordination	11
3.4 Resources allocated	12
4.0 Results of the evaluation	13
4.1 Relevance	13
4.2 Successes and achievements	16
4.3 Cost-effectiveness / Design and delivery	27
5.0 Conclusions, Observations and Management Response	33
APPENDIX A	Evaluation Framework
APPENDIX B	Research Tools
APPENDIX C	Logic model

List of Acronyms	
ADM	Assistant Deputy Minister
CIC	Citizenship and Immigration Canada
DG	Director General
HRSDC	Human Resources and Skills Development Canada
ICD	Interdepartmental Coordination Directorate
IPOLC	Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities
MINOLC	Manitoba Interdepartmental Network of Official Languages Coordinators
OLA	Official Languages Act
OLMC	Official-language minority community
OLSPB	Official Languages Support Programs Branch
PCH	Department of Canadian Heritage
PCO	Privy Council Office
TBS	Treasury Board Secretariat

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1969 the Government of Canada passed the first *Official Languages Act* (OLA), recognizing English and French as the country's two official languages. The OLA was amended in 1988 and Part VII (sections 41 to 45) was added. Section 41 of the OLA commits all federal institutions to enhancing the vitality of the official-language communities and to fostering the recognition and use of English and French in Canadian society. Section 42 mandates the Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH) to encourage and promote a coordinated approach to federal institutions' implementation of section 41.

To strengthen the commitment of federal departments and agencies and to better support PCH in its section 42 role, in 1994 the Government of Canada approved the establishment of an accountability framework for the application of sections 41 and 42 of the OLA. The Department of Canadian Heritage undertook this evaluation to identify the results attained or progress achieved since 1994 by its efforts in implementing Section 42 of the OLA. This report is based on research conducted by PRA Inc.

Methodology

The evaluation questions examine the themes of the relevance of section 42 of the OLA, the successes and achievements of PCH in implementing the section, and the cost-effectiveness of the design and delivery of implementation of this section. The research methods followed fall into four main categories:

- ▶ *Review of the documentation* - We reviewed numerous documents provided by PCH, including research and evaluation reports, the annual reports of PCH, minutes of meetings of various coordinating committees, and the terms and conditions of ten PCH programs.
- ▶ *Discussion groups* - In July 2004, two discussion groups with section 41 national coordinators (n=14) and one focus group with PCH sectoral coordinators (n=3) were organized. One interview was also held with a sectoral coordinator who did not participate in the group.
- ▶ *Regional consultations* - In July and August 2004, a field visit was organized in each of the five PCH regions to conduct interviews with representatives from the regional/provincial offices, as well as representatives of the official-language communities. A total of 20 interviews were held with 30 stakeholders.
- ▶ *Interviews with key stakeholders* - From July to December 2004, 40 interviews involving 51 persons from various key stakeholder groups were held. The groups represented were: national community organizations, central agencies, the Official Languages Support Programs Branch (OLSPB), section 41 regional coordinators, co-chairs of the four joint committees, project managers in federal

departments and agencies, and assistant deputy ministers and directors general at PCH.

The methodology utilized entails three main constraints:

- ▶ First, the documentation review allowed us to collect only limited quantitative data on the activities undertaken by PCH in implementing section 42 of the OLA, given the qualitative aspect of the work.
- ▶ Second, as research methods, the consultations are limited by the possibility of bias among respondents and the fact that the stakeholders consulted can respond only on the basis of their own knowledge and experiences. We therefore consulted various groups of persons and used different research methods to ensure a variety of information sources.
- ▶ Finally, the results attained cannot be attributed in their entirety to the activities carried out by PCH. While the actions of PCH may contribute to achievements and progress made in terms of coordinating section 41 implementation, there are also other factors that have an impact in this area.

Interpretation of section 42 of the OLA

The legislative mandate of PCH does not force federal departments and agencies to meet their responsibilities under section 41; in other words, the Act does not require PCH to be the federal government's watchdog on section 41 implementation. The role of PCH is rather to bring together federal departments and agencies, provide them with tools and develop mechanisms that will help them to take a coordinated action.

In that sense, for PCH to be able to play its role under section 42, of coordinating actions of federal departments and agencies, it is necessary first of all for the departments and agencies to take action, and also to recognize and accept the role of PCH with regard to section 42. As a result, as shown in this report, PCH engages in awareness activities directed at governmental and community stakeholders to ensure that it has the capacity to implement section 42 of the OLA.

Relevance

Sections 41 and 42 of the OLA continue to be relevant in the present context.¹ The federal Action Plan for Official Languages and its Accountability and Coordination Framework strengthen the federal government's commitment to Canada's linguistic duality and support for the official-language communities.

Section 41 also draws its relevance from the fact that the development of the OLMCs is an ongoing process. What is more, within the multitude of governmental and departmental priorities, this commitment must be well supported and remain in the forefront. Support for the OLMCs is not integrated in the organizational culture of all the federal departments and agencies, and the importance of meeting this commitment has to be constantly emphasized.

The legislative mandate that section 42 confers upon PCH remains just as relevant in light of the role that has more recently emerged for PCO and the minister responsible for Official Languages. The roles and responsibilities of each of these organizations lie at different levels. While PCO and the minister responsible for Official Languages have to promote the implementation of section 41 and the entire official languages program at the highest levels of management, the primary role of the Department of Canadian Heritage, although it does contribute to raising the awareness of federal managers, is to promote a coordinated approach to actions taken at the more operational level.

Observation 1. **The complementarity of the roles of PCO / minister responsible for Official Languages and of PCH is not clearly understood by all the stakeholders involved in the implementation of sections 41 and 42. It is important for PCH to accurately describe this complementarity and clarify its meaning to federal managers and community representatives.**

The recent involvement of PCO and the minister responsible for Official Languages will surely facilitate the task of PCH, so that it can focus more on the role conferred under section 42.

Observation accepted. The Official Languages Accountability and Coordination Framework contained in the Action Plan for Official Languages released in March 2003 describes the roles of the various stakeholders with respect to official languages issues. It preserves intact the statutory responsibilities of each federal institution, including those of the Department of Canadian Heritage pertaining to Part VII (sections 41 and 42). The Framework also gives the Minister responsible for Official Languages an horizontal coordination role to enable the Government of Canada to maintain an overall approach. The Privy Council Office therefore plays a more strategic role on issues that may affect official languages, while Canadian Heritage

1. We felt it was also important to examine the relevance of section 41, as it is linked to the relevance of section 42. Indeed, perceptions of the commitment set out in section 41 are part of the present context in which section 42 is being implemented.

works continuously with a network of 34 designated departments and agencies to coordinate activities and encourage the sharing of best practices.

In its communications, the Interdepartmental Coordination Directorate will clearly describe the respective roles of PCH and PCO as set out in the Official Languages Accountability and Coordination Framework. The Directorate will proactively provide this information to federal and community officials.

Time frame: ongoing

Successes and achievements

At first glance, the evaluation results show that PCH's section 42 role is interpreted in different ways. Under the OLA, the Department has the mandate to encourage and promote *a coordinated approach* to the implementation of section 41. However, it is commonly thought that the Department of Canadian Heritage is entrusted with ensuring that federal departments and agencies assume their responsibilities under section 41. As a result, expectations of the role of PCH, on the part of federal managers and communities alike, have largely exceeded what PCH is actually capable of achieving. What is more, high expectations have led many people to take a very critical and even excessively severe view of the work done by PCH.

Observation 2. **The interpretation of the mandate of PCH, as set forth in section 42 of the OLA, must be brought closer to the actual letter of the Act. PCH must formulate its mandate clearly and promote a common and accurate understanding of it and the activities that follow from it.**

The objectives that PCH has set for itself, as well as the measures it has adopted to achieve those objectives, necessarily stem from the interpretation of its role. Consequently, a revision of that interpretation will result in a revision of the objectives and the measures taken.

In addition, the documentation review shows that the Department of Canadian Heritage reports on its activities to implement section 42 of the OLA on an annual basis in its reports on achievements. The model used for its 2003-2004 report, compared with that used in 2002-2003, allows for a more systematic profile of activities implemented and a clearer establishment of the links between those activities and the results obtained. All the same, the results attained through the activities are generally difficult to measure and quantify, because numerous players other than PCH and numerous factors contribute to the changes observed in this regard. The evaluation nonetheless shows that the main accomplishments to date arising from PCH's activities are increased awareness by federal managers of their section 41 responsibilities and participation of departments and agencies in the IPOLC. It also shows that PCH's awareness activities have served to make federal managers more open to supporting the development of the OLMCs. PCH has in fact laid the foundations upon which the departments and agencies can take action.

Observation accepted. Together with the regional offices, the Interdepartmental Coordination Directorate will develop a common understanding of the coordination mandate arising from section 42 to be carried out both regionally and nationally. Headquarters and the regions will work together to define their respective roles and responsibilities in carrying out this mandate and to develop clear messages in this regard. PCH staff responsible for official languages will then be able to work continuously with clients to promote a common understanding of PCH's coordination mandate and will then be able to better manage expectations.

Time frame: Document describing the mandate: December 31, 2005

Observation **3. The Department of Canadian Heritage must continue its awareness activities. Because federal departments and agencies are in a state of constant change, awareness raising is an ongoing task.**

Now that section 41 and its resulting responsibilities are better known and understood by federal managers, PCH can focus more on coordinating the actions taken by the different departments under section 41 of the OLA.

Observation accepted. Interdepartmental coordination officials will continue to raise awareness among federal departments and agencies of the realities of official-language minority communities, provide them with tools to support their efforts at the national and regional levels and to help them fully assume their responsibilities.

Time frame (day/month/year): ongoing

Observation **4. While maintaining its awareness activities, PCH must put more emphasis on the activities that encourage cooperation and coordination among federal departments, at both the national and regional levels.**

The IPOLC is an important mechanism for encouraging the federal departments and agencies to commit to supporting the development of the OLMCs. The smaller agencies have particular need of this funding so that they can set up projects to support this development. However, this evaluation demonstrates that the centralized management of the program is detrimental to the formulation of projects that meet the communities' needs, and that IPOLC funds are not allocated in sufficiently strategic fashion.

Observation accepted. The Interdepartmental Coordination Directorate has begun to set up an internal network of national and regional PCH interdepartmental coordination officials. Their goal is to develop an understanding of the coordination effort aimed at further promoting a coordinated approach among federal agencies at the national and regional levels. To accomplish this, the network will foster exchange activities among federal departments and agencies on

various national and regional topics of interest to official-language communities (culture, early childhood, immigration, etc.).

Time frame (day/month/year): ongoing (Network launch: September 2005)

Observation 5. More involvement by the regional offices in decisions related to partnerships established and initiatives developed under the IPOLC would make the mechanism more effective by helping to better target IPOLC funds so as to meet needs identified by the OLMCs as priorities.

The evaluation confirms that PCH is not the only organization involved in coordinating the implementation of section 41. Other structures have been put in place to provide support for the OLMCs on the one hand, and a coordinated approach to that support on the other. At the national level, the joint committees, set up in collaboration with PCH, are excellent methods of bringing managers and community representatives together within specific sectors. At the regional level, the federal councils, through official languages committees, are the primary mechanisms of coordination on official languages issues. The Department of Canadian Heritage cooperates with the stakeholders in these structures and participates in the various activities carried out.

Observation accepted. This observation is consistent with the observation made in the IPOLC's formative evaluation. An IPOLC steering committee made up of regional and national representatives was formed in March 29, 2004, to address this recommendation. The committee's efforts to date have helped PCH officials (regional and from Operations) to review the project proposals presented under the IPOLC, recommend courses of action and take part in the implementation strategy. The steering committee will continue its work and will consider other possible avenues for improvement.

Time frame (day/month/year): in progress since March 2004

Observation 6. Coordination of the implementation of section 41 requires PCH to maintain close ties with the joint committees and official languages committees of the federal councils in the regions.

The reporting process is not being applied in sufficiently rigorous fashion. PCH's role in applying this process consists in analysing the action plans, conveying the results of the analysis to deputy ministers and coordinators, and reporting to Parliament on the results obtained in implementing section 41. In this regard, the evaluation shows that analysis of the action plans and the follow-up they are given are not extensive enough to promote useful reporting.

Observation accepted. PCH interdepartmental coordination officials will maintain their ties with the joint committees at both the national and regional levels. Furthermore, the regional official languages or interdepartmental coordination officials will work to develop ongoing

relationships with federal councils where such relationships do not yet exist and to strengthen already existing ones.

Time frame: ongoing

Observation **7. The follow-up that PCH provides for the action plans and reports on achievements should incorporate more in-depth analysis so as to permit federal departments and agencies to make relevant, useful changes to their action plans.**

Observation accepted. A performance measurement tool was recently developed to measure the progress made in implementing section 41 within federal departments and agencies. Interdepartmental coordination officials will use the tool to conduct a more in-depth analysis of departmental and agency action plans and annual reviews in order to give them feedback and suggest new courses of action at both the regional and national levels. Departments will also be able to use the tool to conduct self-evaluations, prepare their reports and identify areas for improvement.

Time frame: implemented in 2005-2006

Cost-effectiveness / Design and delivery

Their differing interpretations of section 42 leave stakeholders with different perspectives on which is the best organization to coordinate implementation of section 41. The evaluation suggests that the Department of Canadian Heritage is the organization in the best position to encourage a *coordinated approach* to the implementation of section 41, in light, among other things, of its expertise in the area and its capacity to take action in the field.

The activities undertaken by PCH to implement section 42 of the OLA may all be relevant, but their effectiveness is more uneven. The evaluation shows that the biggest issue surrounding the implementation of section 42 and achievement of its objectives is the absence of linkages, at various levels, between the various coordination and management structures, including those that are the responsibility of PCH. Communications and exchanges among the key players are in fact inadequate, with the result that PCH's capacity to coordinate the actions taken by federal departments and agencies is weakened.

At the national level: Certainly, linkages have been established at the national level; the ICD collaborates with the national coordinators, who work together. It is in this way that the ICD encourages coordination. However, the national coordinators have not established relations with key stakeholders in their respective departments and agencies, especially at the senior management level.

Observation **8. The official languages champions are natural partners of the national coordinators. The introduction of communication**

mechanisms between these two groups could facilitate collaboration among these key stakeholders and permit the coordinators' work to reach the senior management level.

At the regional level: In the regions, solid ties have been created between the PCH offices and the regional managers/coordinators, by means of the federal councils' official languages committees. What is more, these ties extend into the OLMCs. In most regions, however, the regional coordinators of the different departments and agencies have set up no infrastructure for communicating with each other.

Between the regional and national levels: There are obvious deficiencies in communications and exchanges between the ICD and the PCH regional offices. It is difficult for an organization to promote a coordinated approach when the two levels responsible for coordination are not in regular communication with each other. Furthermore, the same phenomenon exists between the national coordinators and regional coordinators in the other federal departments and agencies. However, we recognize that, while PCH can encourage the national coordinators to set up communication mechanisms, it is the responsibility of each department and agency to take the measures necessary to improve this situation.

Observation accepted. Interdepartmental coordination officials will work with representatives from the official languages champions' network to organize exchange activities between the champions and the national coordinators in order to promote actual working relations among the champions and the coordinators from every federal institution.

Time frame (day/month/year): March 31, 2006

Observation 9. Mechanisms for bringing the regional coordinators in the same region together are important for coordinating the regional action of federal departments and agencies. Furthermore, these types of coordination mechanisms must establish liaison between the national and regional levels within PCH and in the other federal departments and agencies.

Finally, with regard to results achieved relative to level of investment, the evaluation can draw no definite conclusions because it is next to impossible, in the present context, to identify, quantify and measure all of the results obtained. Another difficulty in this connection is that the evaluation is not in a position to identify all of the resources allocated to achieve the objectives. The majority of stakeholders consulted did not know how much investment was being granted for the implementation of section 42. As a result, they could make no judgments on the adequacy of the results relative to resources allocated for that purpose. What is more, even knowing the resources granted to the ICD for the implementation of section 42, a judgement cannot be made on this subject because the regional offices of PCH are also engaged in numerous activities to fulfil the mandate conferred by section 42 of the OLA, partly with the support of certain resources granted for that purpose by PCH headquarters. The activities of the PCH regional

offices, as well as those of other departments, the OLMCs and other structures (such as the federal councils) have also contributed to the results. Finally, a third difficulty is that, even knowing the results obtained and the level of investment, it is difficult to determine what level of results is sufficient relative to resources allocated. This is a subjective question, to which there may be as many responses as there are respondents.

Observation accepted. Some regions already have coordination groups composed of officials from various federal departments. Often these are program coordinators rather than regional coordinators. As stated in observation 5, PCH interdepartmental coordinators will set up an internal network of interdepartmental coordinators to discuss a common understanding of the coordination mandate. The group will work on an approach to organize a network of coordinators or key stakeholders from a given region and ensure that information from the national coordinators network is shared with the regions.

Time frame (day/month/year): March 31, 2006

1.0 Introduction

Following recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, in 1969 the Government of Canada passed the first *Official Languages Act* (OLA), recognizing English and French as the country's two official languages. The OLA was amended in 1988 and Part VII (sections 41 to 45) was added. Section 41 of the OLA commits all federal institutions to enhancing the vitality of official-language communities, and to fostering the recognition and use of English and French in Canadian society. Section 42 mandates the Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH) to encourage and promote a coordinated approach to federal institutions' implementation of section 41.

To strengthen the commitment of federal departments and agencies and to better support PCH in its section 42 role, in 1994 the Government of Canada approved the establishment of an accountability framework for the application of sections 41 and 42 of the OLA. Among other things, the framework designated 27 federal departments and agencies² having a lead role to play with respect to linguistic minorities.

1.1 Objective of the evaluation

In April 2004, at the request of its Official Languages Support Programs Branch (OLSPB), the Department of Canadian Heritage undertook an evaluation of implementation of section 42. The primary objective of the evaluation is to take stock of results attained or progress achieved since 1994 by Canadian Heritage in its efforts to coordinate the implementation of section 41 of the OLA, within PCH as well as the designated federal departments and agencies. This is not a matter of evaluating the performance of the federal departments/agencies in implementing section 41, but rather evaluating the *coordination* of implementation of this section — that is, the task given to PCH under section 42.

The results of this evaluation will inform the OLSPB about changes and improvements required to make PCH more effective in implementing section 42. This report is based on research conducted by PRA Inc.

2. As of June 2005, this number stands 34.

1.2 Structure of the report

This final evaluation report has five sections — this introduction, plus:

- ▶ Section 2.0, describing the methodology used for this summative evaluation;
- ▶ Section 3.0, profiling section 42 of the OLA;
- ▶ Section 4.0, presenting the results obtained for the three main evaluation issues;
and
- ▶ Section 5.0, presenting the conclusions and principal observations.

2.0 Methodology

This section presents the evaluation questions, research methods used and research constraints.

2.1 Evaluation questions

The evaluation of section 42 implementation examines the following three major evaluation issues:

- ▶ *Relevance.* To what extent is the coordination of the federal commitment set out in section 41 of the OLA essential? To what extent does it meet an ongoing need?
- ▶ *Successes and achievements.* To what extent have the coordination activities undertaken by PCH since 1994 to fulfill its obligations pursuant to section 42 of the OLA produced the intended results within the Department itself and in other designated federal departments and agencies?
- ▶ *Cost-effectiveness / Design and delivery.* To what extent are the activities to implement section 42 appropriate and effective for achieving the intended results? Should other design and delivery methods be considered?

For the evaluation framework guiding this study, including the evaluation questions, indicators and data sources, see Appendix A.

2.2 Research methods

The research methods followed for the evaluation fall into four main categories: review of the documentation; discussion groups with coordinators; regional consultations; and interviews with key stakeholders.

Among the research methods initially proposed were a telephone survey of managers at PCH and other designated departments/agencies, and interviews with Francophone affairs officers in provincial and territorial governments. However, in the end the two methods were not used. There were three reasons for the decision not to proceed with the survey as a data collection activity. First, it did not seem appropriate to evaluate managers' knowledge of section 41 of the OLA. Second, it would have been difficult to attribute their knowledge of this subject to the efforts of PCH. Finally, the first consultations conducted for the evaluation indicated that, in general, managers are aware of section 41 only when they are assigned to work on an initiative or project that deals specifically with official languages. In light of these findings, it became clear that a survey would be of limited use. It was therefore deemed more relevant and useful to

try to better understand PCH's coordination role with the designated departments/agencies by conducting interviews with the co-chairs of the joint committees and with project managers in different federal departments and agencies.

Interviews were not conducted with Francophone affairs officers in provincial and territorial governments for the simple reason that they had no direct connection with section 42 activities. The PCH evaluation section therefore decided not to pursue this data collection activity.

Most of the documents reviewed were provided to us by the Department of Canadian Heritage. PCH also supplied lists of persons for the discussion groups and the various interviews. First of all, PCH sent a letter to all the persons identified to inform them about the evaluation. Next, we contacted them by telephone to request their participation and confirm the dates of the discussion groups or interviews. All these individuals received the interview/discussion questions in advance (see Appendix B). With the consent of the participants, we recorded their discussions to ensure the quality and accuracy of the information gathered.

Table 1 provides more detail on each of the research methods used.

Table 1: Research methods	
Method	Description
Review of documentation	<p>Objective: Obtain information about section 42 of the OLA and its implementation, and respond to certain evaluation questions.</p> <p>Documents consulted: The <i>Official Languages Act</i>; Web sites of Treasury Board Secretariat and PCH; annual reports of PCH (1994 to 2004); inserts on interdepartmental coordination; analyses of action plans and reports on achievements; minutes of meetings of national coordinators, various interdepartmental committees, joint committees and coordinating committees; promotional documents; recent section 41 evaluations performed by designated departments (Industry Canada and HRDC); evaluation of the Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities (IPOLC); list of IPOLC MOUs; section 41 coordinators' guide; <i>Bulletin 41-42</i> (1997 to 2004); terms and conditions of 10 PCH programs; PCH reports on achievements for 2002–03 and 2003–04; performance measurement tool recently developed by PCH.</p> <p>We also consulted existing research reports and studies on the official languages and the OLA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Study of the relevance of the action plans ▶ “Implementing Part VII of the Official Languages Act, 1988 — A Blueprint for Action,” February 1996 (Commissioner of Official Languages) ▶ “Official Language Minority Communities: Promoting a Government Objective,” October 1998 (Donald J. Savoie) ▶ “No Turning Back: Official Languages in the Face of Government Transformations,” January 1999 (Fontaine report) ▶ “Implementation of sections 41 and 42 of the <i>Official Languages Act</i>,” May 1997 (Ronald Bisson and Associates) ▶ “Evaluation Framework for the Implementation of Sections 41 and 42 of the <i>Official Languages Act</i> — Review of the relevant documentation,” June 2000 (PCH) <p>and various other strategic documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Document summarizing the accountability framework (1994) for implementation of sections 41 and 42 of the <i>Official Languages Act</i> ▶ Memorandum of Understanding with Treasury Board on the implementation of section 41 ▶ Federal Action Plan for Official Languages ▶ Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework of the Official Languages Support Programs ▶ Risk-Based Audit Framework of the Official Languages Support Programs ▶ Treasury Board presentation for the renewal of the Official Languages Support Programs
Discussion groups	<p>Objective: Obtain the views of the national and sectoral coordinators on the three main evaluation issues</p> <p>Participation: In July 2004, two discussion groups were held with the section 41 national coordinators of different designated departments/agencies, and one discussion group was held with PCH sectoral coordinators. A total of 14 national and 3 sectoral coordinators were consulted.*</p>
Regional consultations	<p>Objective: Obtain the views of regional stakeholders on the three main evaluation issues</p> <p>Participation: In July and August 2004, a field visit was organized in each of the five regions (Prairies and North, Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario, and West) to conduct interviews with representatives from PCH regional/provincial offices, as well as representatives of official-language minority</p>

Table 1: Research methods	
Method	Description
	communities (OLMCs). The cities visited were Winnipeg, St. John's (Nfld. & Labrador), Montréal, Ottawa and Vancouver. In addition, telephone interviews were conducted with representatives of PCH and OLMCs in provinces and territories not visited. A total of 20 interviews were conducted with 30 regional stakeholders.
Interviews with key stakeholders	<p>Objective: Obtain the views of various stakeholders on the three main evaluation issues and determine how the role of PCH is articulated at the national and regional levels. The interviews with PCH assistant deputy ministers (ADMs) and directors general (DGs) were specifically designed to examine the impact of section 42 implementation within PCH itself.</p> <p>Participation: From July to December 2004, 40 interviews were conducted involving 51 people from different key stakeholder groups: spokespersons of two organizations representing OLMCs nationally,[†] representatives of central agencies (Privy Council Office, Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, and the Public Service Human Resources Management Agency of Canada), managers in the Official Languages Support Programs Branch, section 41 regional coordinators, co-chairs of the four joint committees, project managers in federal departments and agencies (Telefilm Canada, Status of Women Canada and Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions), and ADMs and DGs at PCH.</p>
<p>* One of the sectoral coordinators who could not take part in the discussion group was interviewed individually.</p> <p>† The names of the organizations representing OLMCs at the national level are not given so as to safeguard the privacy of the officials consulted.</p>	

2.3 Constraints

The constraints imposed by the methodology used are not unique to this evaluation; they pertain to access to quantitative data, limitations of qualitative methods, and attribution of results.

First of all, the documentation review permitted us to collect only limited quantitative data on the activities undertaken by PCH in implementing section 42 of the OLA. Generally speaking, PCH's activities, especially in the regions, are informal in nature and difficult to quantify. Hence it is difficult to provide concrete illustration of the work done by the Department or of respondents' observations on results achieved and progress made as a result of the work of PCH.

In addition, while the consultations with key stakeholders give an overview of PCH's role and how it is perceived at different levels and by different persons, they are not without their limitations. First, there is always the possibility of bias among the respondents. Second, those consulted can respond only on the basis of their knowledge and experiences; it may be that they are not aware of certain activities or certain results achieved. In an effort to offset these limitations, we consulted various groups of persons and used different research methods to ensure a variety of information sources.

Finally, it is important to note that the very objective of the evaluation — namely, to determine the progress made or results achieved by PCH in its efforts to coordinate section 41 implementation — imposes a major constraint since the results achieved cannot definitively be attributed to activities undertaken. While the actions of PCH may contribute to achievements and progress made in coordinating section 41 implementation, other factors have an influence; examples include engagement of senior management, personal commitment, work of the regional federal councils, work of the official languages champions, and efforts of official-language minority communities (OLMCs). Consequently, the results of the evaluation are based in large part on individuals' perceptions of the contribution made by PCH activities and the extent to which PCH has met its mandate pursuant to section 42 of the OLA.

3.0 Profile of section 42 of the OLA

3.1 Interpretation of sections 41 and 42 of the OLA

The *Official Languages Act* of 1988 is based on the principle of institutional bilingualism. However, the addition of Part VII has broadened its scope and given concrete form to the commitment set forth in the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* to promote the equality of official languages. Not only is the federal government obliged to offer its services in both official languages, but it must now commit itself to the development and vitality of the official-language minority communities.

This evaluation must focus first on the wording of sections 41 and 42 to understand what the Act requires of Canadian Heritage. Section 41 of the OLA states:

The Government of Canada is committed to
(a) enhancing the vitality of the English and French linguistic minority communities in Canada and supporting and assisting their development; and
(b) fostering the full recognition and use of both English and French in Canadian society.³

This section is of particular importance to the official-language communities because it requires all federal departments and agencies to commit to enhancing the vitality of OLMCs and to fostering linguistic duality in Canada. Formerly, this was a responsibility assigned largely and de facto to PCH only; section 41 makes the commitment apply across the entire federal government, turning it into a horizontal responsibility.

Section 42 states:

The Minister of Canadian Heritage, in consultation with other federal ministers of the Crown, shall encourage and promote a coordinated approach to the implementation by federal institutions of the commitments set out in section 41.⁴

A close reading of section 42 is required to fully understand its true meaning, because it can in fact be understood and interpreted in different ways. The mandate of PCH, within the strict meaning of section 42, is not to encourage and promote the implementation of section 41 by federal institutions, but rather to encourage *a coordinated approach* to implementation of that section. In other words, the Department of Canadian Heritage must ensure that the actions of federal departments and agencies are coordinated. With this section, the federal government acknowledges the importance of coordinating actions so as to avoid duplication and overlap.

3. *Official Languages Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 31 (4th Supp.).

4. *Ibid.*

The French text of section 42 is less clear and direct in expressing this mandate:

Le ministre du Patrimoine canadien, en consultation avec les autres ministres fédéraux, suscite et encourage la coordination de la mise en œuvre par les institutions fédérales de cet engagement.⁵ [our underlining]

This is an important distinction that has major repercussions on the role to be played by Canadian Heritage and the interpretation of that role within the government and OLMCs. The legislative mandate of PCH is therefore not to force federal departments and agencies to meet their responsibilities under section 41; in other words, the Act does not require PCH to be the federal government's watchdog on section 41 implementation. The role of PCH is rather to bring together federal departments and agencies, provide them with tools and develop mechanisms that will help them take coordinated action.

In that sense, for PCH to be able to play its role under section 42 — namely, the role of coordinating actions of federal departments and agencies — it is necessary first of all for the departments and agencies to take action, and also to recognize and accept the role of PCH with regard to section 42. As a result, as shown in this report, PCH engages in awareness activities directed at governmental and community stakeholders to ensure that it has the capacity to implement section 42 of the OLA.

3.2 Principal measures adopted and results targeted by PCH

As demonstrated in this report, certain activities undertaken and results targeted by PCH to fulfill its section 42 responsibilities can be interpreted as exceeding the strict terms of the mandate conferred by the OLA. Just as there is ambiguity in interpreting the meaning of section 42, there is some ambiguity about the role that PCH is to play under the Act and the measures it must take to play that role. Nonetheless, PCH has had to exercise its role according to its understanding and interpretation of section 42. The logic model for section 42 implementation, developed a few years ago in preparation for the present evaluation, is included in Appendix C.

Responsibility for implementing section 42 is shared between PCH headquarters and its regional offices, with each playing a complementary role. At the national level, responsibility lies chiefly with the Interdepartmental Coordination Directorate (ICD), created in 1994 following the launch of the federal government's accountability framework for the implementation of sections 41 and 42. In addition, Canadian Heritage has grouped activities for coordinating section 41 implementation in four categories: coordination and liaison; communications, promotion, awareness and training; consultation; and planning, development and research.⁶

5. *Official Languages Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 31 (4th Supp.).

6. The logic model in Appendix C presents the full range of activities and expected results.

Coordination and liaison activities include the network of section 41 national coordinators, set up by ICD in 1995. Each of the designated federal departments and agencies has appointed a national coordinator to oversee the proper implementation of section 41; some have also appointed regional coordinators, working in their regional offices. At PCH, a coordinator works in each of the Department's five sectors and each of its five regions. Canadian Heritage — more specifically, the ICD — coordinates the network, offering the coordinators a forum for coordination and consultation. In addition, as required by the 1994 accountability framework, the federal departments and agencies each submit their action plan and report on their achievements in implementing section 41 to PCH. The Department in turn reports on their achievements to Parliament in its annual report on official languages. Finally, in the category of coordination and liaison we find the Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities (IPOLC), created by PCH in June 2000. This is a support fund for encouraging federal departments and agencies to develop with the OLMCs initiatives that will help them.

The communications/awareness/promotion/training activities include *Bulletin 41-42*, published quarterly by ICD since 1995. This is an information tool targeting OLMCs and federal officials responsible for section 41 implementation. Further, PCH has developed a coordinators' guide, maintains a Web site, and publishes promotional material on sections 41 and 42 of the OLA.

In the third category of activities, PCH has established and participates in various consultation mechanisms. PCH headquarters has direct contacts with the network of national organizations representing OLMCs; in addition, sectoral committees and coordinating committees have been formed linking PCH and the OLMCs. The sectoral committees (e.g. the arts committee) bring together key stakeholders in the sector to foster the development of useful projects and the coordination of activities. In 2002 Canadian Heritage created a coordination committee for Francophone communities, followed in 2003 by a committee for the Anglophone community. Sitting on these committees are senior PCH officials in each sector and representatives of the OLMCs.

PCH regional offices are also very much involved in section 42 implementation . They deal directly with OLMCs and organize numerous activities that serve to bring community representatives and regional federal officials together. They work closely with the federal councils' official languages committees and with other committees to coordinate federal action in implementing section 41.

Finally, with regard to planning and development, PCH has funded studies and used existing studies on OLMCs and government objectives for them. The aim is to better understand the OLMCs' circumstances/needs and better tailor PCH actions.

PCH targets specific results through its various activities. Table 2 offers an overview of those results, based on the logic model established for the purposes of this evaluation (see Appendix C).

Table 2: Results targeted by implementation of section 42 of the OLA				
Activities	Coordination	Communications	Consultation	Planning
Direct results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Cooperation framework ▸ Clear roles and responsibilities ▸ Influence on federal policies and programs ▸ Partnerships to support OLMCs ▸ Reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Coordinators, interest groups, OLMCs, departments/agencies and the public are informed about section 41 ▸ High profile for issues relating to section 41 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ OLMCs have increased knowledge of federal policies and programs ▸ Increased knowledge of OLMCs' needs, and of horizontal and sectoral issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ New tools or initiatives ▸ Deeper understanding of OLMCs' needs
Medium-term results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Effective and more targeted cooperation among partners working for OLMCs' development and vitality ▸ Increased access for OLMCs to programs and services in their own language 			
Long-term result	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Sustainability of OLMCs in Canada 			

3.3 Other organizations involved in coordination

The Department of Canadian Heritage works together with the other organizations involved in implementation of the OLA and the federal Action Plan for Official Languages, launched in 2003. While these organizations have their own roles and responsibilities in connection with the federal official languages program, their activities often complement those of PCH in the implementation of section 42.

The post of Minister responsible for Official Languages was created some time before the federal Action Plan for Official Languages was formulated. The Minister is charged with ensuring proper implementation of the Action Plan and the OLA as a whole. Supporting the Minister in carrying out this mandate is the Official Languages Branch, Intergovernmental Affairs, Privy Council Office (PCO). The Minister responsible for Official Languages and PCO coordinate the entire official languages program, which includes Part VII of the OLA. In addition, PCO analyzes all memorandums to Cabinet in terms of their impact on OLMCs.

The Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) provides PCH with support in implementing section 42 by encouraging federal departments and agencies to integrate the federal commitment under section 41 into their strategic planning; this essentially involves verifying submissions to Treasury Board. Other TBS responsibilities with respect to the OLA were transferred in 2003 to the new Public Service Human Resources Management Agency of Canada. Although these responsibilities are more specifically concerned with Parts IV to VI of the OLA, certain activities

of the official languages champions⁷ and regional federal councils⁸ concern Part VII of the OLA and support PCH in coordinating section 41 implementation. The official languages champions promote the use of both official languages and raise the profile of official languages issues; in addition, they promote the importance of supporting the development of OLMCs within their home departments/agencies. As for the regional federal councils, most have set up official languages committees. These cooperate with PCH regional offices to coordinate measures taken by federal departments and agencies for the implementation of section 41.

Finally, certain departments were identified in the federal Action Plan for Official Languages since they play key roles in supporting OLMCs by virtue of their areas of activity. Some, such as the departments of Justice, Citizenship and Immigration (CIC), Human Resources and Skills Development (HRSDC), and Health, are also involved in coordinating the implementation of section 41. Their joint committees bring together representatives of these departments, PCH, other departments and the communities to discuss methods and measures for implementing section 41 of the OLA and for better responding to community needs in a coordinated fashion.

3.4 Resources allocated

At ICD, about 12 full-time person-years are assigned to responsibilities related to implementation of section 42 of the OLA. The goods and services budget of this directorate is approximately \$285,000 a year, or close to \$3 million for the 10 years under study (1994–2004).

Through their work in targeted sectors such as culture and research, as well as in ad hoc activities, other directorates of the OLSPB contribute to section 42 implementation. Moreover, PCH regional offices play a lead role in section 42 implementation. The OLSPB transfers approximately \$200,000 to each regional office for Official Languages Support Programs delivery, including implementation of section 42 of the OLA. However, given that the Department's regional offices as well as other OLSPB directorates have other duties than those pertaining to section 42, it is difficult to isolate the resources allocated for this particular purpose.

7. In response to a request from TBS in 1998, the federal departments and agencies have each appointed a senior official to act as official languages champion.

8. The regional federal councils are composed of senior officials of federal departments and agencies in the regions. They discuss horizontal issues.

4.0 Results of the evaluation

This section reports on the results obtained for each of the main evaluation issues.

4.1 Relevance

The relevance of sections 41 and 42 of the OLA is confirmed by law; that is, the responsibilities flowing from these sections are statutory obligations. Accordingly, this evaluation makes no attempt to challenge the objectives of these two sections. The evaluation questions relating to relevance seek instead to determine, in light of the current context, the importance ascribed to support for the development of OLMCs, as well as the importance ascribed to coordination of measures designed to support that development.

4.1.1 Relevance of the commitment

According to the majority of stakeholders consulted, the commitment set out in section 41 of the OLA continues to be relevant today. First of all, many stakeholders note that support for OLMCs by the entire federal government is altogether appropriate given that linguistic duality and official languages issues remain a government priority. The Action Plan for Official Languages is a demonstration of the government's ongoing commitment to linguistic minorities. Indeed, the last Speech from the Throne indicated the federal government's commitment to implementing the Action Plan and to continuing work to support the vitality of official-language minority communities in Canada.⁹

Second, many of the stakeholders consulted, in all groups, indicated that this commitment has to remain visible since support for OLMCs is not integrated into the practices of all federal departments/agencies, which are at different stages of progress on this issue. Generally speaking, the organizational culture of a department or agency is difficult to change. These organizations face ongoing changes to their personnel and priorities, with the result that the commitment to support OLMCs has to be continually renewed. Within PCH, the majority of managers are aware of their section 41 responsibilities. However, our consultations indicate¹⁰ that there are still certain managers who see no direct connection between the commitment set out in section 41 and their own sector of activity.

Finally, the majority of stakeholders consulted consider that the commitment contained in section 41 continues to be relevant because support for OLMCs is an ongoing process. To some

9. Speech from the Throne, October 5, 2004.

10. To facilitate the reading of this report, expressions of this sort identify the group consulted only when it is relevant to draw a distinction in order to demonstrate that an observation is current within a particular group or that opinions diverge between groups.

extent, the responsibilities that section 41 imposes on federal departments and agencies guarantee sustained support for OLMCs.

4.1.2 Relevance of coordination

The strategic objectives of PCH recognize section 42 of the OLA, as well as the importance of coordinating the implementation of section 41 for the development of OLMCs. In fact, as described in its *2005-2006 Estimates*, the Department of Canadian Heritage is committed to supporting “the development of official language minority communities by enhancing their participation in different sectors of society, and by working to ensure their vitality in all parts of the country.” Of course, its coordination role enables PCH to foster the participation of OLMCs in various sectors (economy, health, industry, justice, etc.). Further, according to its strategic objectives, PCH is obliged to “guide other affected departments and agencies in establishing their own action plan in order to broaden and consolidate the participation of various federal authorities in community development.”

The majority of the stakeholders consulted feel that the coordination of section 41 implementation continues to be relevant and essential. Many say that, since the federal government as a whole is responsible for fostering support for OLMCs, it is important to have a leader to coordinate actions taken to that end. Coordination serves to bring key stakeholders together and to promote the creation of linkages between departments and agencies so that they can combine their efforts and act more strategically. Our consultations also demonstrate the importance of encouraging an approach that is coordinated horizontally as well as vertically. That is, there must be coordination not only among the different federal departments and agencies (horizontally), but also within each department and agency (vertically).

Our consultations also highlight the fact that coordination has to involve the two levels of management within federal departments and agencies — that is, headquarters and regional offices. Federal officials in the regions are in the field and can get directly involved with OLMCs; their actions affect the communities directly. Therefore, links have to be established between measures taken at the regional and national levels.

Many stakeholders consulted in the different groups said that coordination lends a degree of visibility to the commitment set out in section 41, and serves to remind federal departments and agencies of their responsibilities in this regard. Through coordination, PCH is able to help departments and agencies develop initiatives that are relevant to them, while responding to the needs of OLMCs. As many managers do not always draw the connection between their fields of activity and support for OLMCs, coordination is seen as beneficial.

Even given the role of PCO and the Minister responsible for Official Languages, most of the stakeholders consulted believe that it is still relevant to have a department such as PCH in charge of coordinating the implementation of section 41 of the OLA. As already mentioned, the official languages portfolio is complex and multi-faceted; it cannot be managed by one department or

agency alone. While the Minister responsible for Official Languages is in charge of ensuring proper overall implementation of the Action Plan and the OLA, the Minister works together with various agencies and departments in performing this task. Responsibilities are shared.

Our consultations show that the involvement of PCO and the Minister responsible for Official Languages has changed the nature of the relationship between PCH and other federal departments/agencies. For the first time, a minister is mandated to coordinate measures taken by the government to implement the provisions of the OLA overall. The Minister's involvement could serve to strengthen the role of PCH, chiefly on the administrative and operational levels, thus allowing PCO to assume a stronger policy role in the implementation of sections 41 and 42 of the OLA. In this regard, the federal Action Plan for Official Languages and the role of the Minister responsible for Official Languages enable PCH to take on a role that is closer to the letter of the Act. In other words, while PCH can contribute to raising the awareness of federal managers about their responsibilities under section 41 of the OLA, its primary role under section 42 is to promote a coordinated approach to the implementation of section 41 in the field. In that sense, the Action Plan for Official Languages serves to better support PCH in its role by raising the profile of Part VII of the OLA as much as possible. As noted earlier, PCH cannot perform its coordinating role unless there is action for it to coordinate by federal departments and agencies, and that action has to be driven by senior managers' commitment and understanding.

The roles of PCO and PCH with respect to implementation of sections 41 and 42 of the OLA have yet to be clearly and formally defined. Accordingly, it is normal that certain federal managers and community representatives might not clearly see how the two departments' roles complement each other. However, for their roles to be beneficial for implementation of sections 41 and 42, that complementarity must necessarily be highlighted.

4.2 Successes and achievements

The successes and achievements of the Department of Canadian Heritage in its coordinating role are central to this summative evaluation. The questions on this issue, drawn from the expected results identified in the logic model (see Appendix C), sought to determine the extent to which activities undertaken by the Department have contributed to:

- ▶ raising federal managers' awareness of their responsibilities;
- ▶ raising the visibility of section 41;
- ▶ increasing OLMCs' knowledge of federal policies and programs;
- ▶ increasing federal managers' knowledge of OLMCs' needs;
- ▶ encouraging concrete action to be taken;
- ▶ fostering a coordinated approach and partnership creation; and
- ▶ encouraging useful reporting.

This section of the report presents results obtained on each of these questions. As mentioned earlier, it is difficult to directly attribute a specific result to an action by PCH. Therefore, the evaluation results explore first and foremost the extent to which the activities undertaken by PCH have made the achievement of results more likely. As illustrated by the logic model (Appendix C), as a long-term result PCH expects that its efforts pursuant to section 42 of the OLA will contribute to OLMCs' sustainability. This evaluation is not in a position to identify or measure PCH's contribution in this regard. First, it is not possible to isolate the impact of PCH in this area; second, the sustainability of OLMCs is a long-term objective, to be measured and evaluated using a completely different methodological approach.

Finally, this section also presents a description of the impact of section 42 implementation, specifically in the Department of Canadian Heritage. Following that is a discussion of the challenges and issues encountered by PCH in section 42 implementation.

4.2.1 Raise federal managers' awareness and the visibility of section 41

As stated earlier, under section 42 of the OLA, PCH has a mandate to encourage and promote a coordinated approach to section 41 implementation. The mandate depends on federal departments and agencies to undertake activities so as to meet their responsibilities under section 41. However, our consultations indicate that between the passage of the OLA in 1988 and the launch of the accountability framework in 1994, few activities of this nature were undertaken by federal departments and agencies. They did not clearly understand the federal commitment set out in section 41. Most federal departments and agencies thought they were meeting their responsibilities under the OLA simply by offering their services in both official languages.

In light of this finding, PCH wanted to ensure that federal departments and agencies were fully aware of their obligations. It therefore focused more on awareness activities. Our consultations

show that enormous progress has been made in this regard over the past 10 years. The efforts of PCH have helped ensure that federal managers better understand their responsibilities and recognize the fact that supporting OLMCs is a responsibility of all federal departments and agencies, not only PCH.

Overall, the consultations suggest that numerous activities undertaken by Canadian Heritage have served to raise federal managers' awareness and increase the visibility of section 41. For example, many government stakeholders noted that in the first years after the 1994 launch of the accountability framework, PCH organized and delivered presentations on section 41 in federal departments and agencies. According to the Department's annual reports, in 1995–96 seven presentations of this type were made by senior management and ICD representatives to other federal employees, and many were also offered in the regions. Without giving an exact number, the PCH annual reports for 1996–97 and 1997–98 indicate that numerous presentations were delivered to federal managers. Many of the government officials consulted said that the frequency and number of presentations decreased in subsequent years. Even so, such presentations are perceived as excellent tools for informing managers about their responsibilities, and many federal stakeholders have stressed the importance of continuing the presentations given the continual staff turnover in federal departments and agencies.

Our review of PCH annual reports also indicates that other activities were undertaken in the years following introduction of the accountability framework, including: community development retreats involving OLMC representatives, national coordinators and PCH officers (1995 and 1996); meetings on specific themes in federal departments and agencies (two were held in 1995–96); preparation of activities involving numerous federal departments and agencies for the Year of La Francophonie (1999); and coordination work to prepare the federal government's participation in the *Dialogue en direct* initiative (2000). These activities served to raise federal managers' awareness and increase the visibility of section 41 in federal departments and agencies, including Canadian Heritage, and in OLMCs.

In addition, the consultation mechanisms set up by PCH (notably, the PCH-community coordinating committees and the working groups on culture) help to make managers aware of section 41 on an ongoing basis. Our consultations indicate that these mechanisms serve to communicate information about section 41.

The coordinators' network is also perceived as an effective mechanism for raising the visibility of section 41 and making federal managers more aware of their responsibilities. The Department has equipped coordinators to undertake awareness raising within their home departments and agencies; for example, it has organized information workshops and meetings for coordinators (about four per year), and distributed a guide designed for them which offers information on the context and history of official languages in Canada, the OLA, implementation of sections 41 and 42, and their role. All the same, many federal managers consulted were of the opinion that the national coordinators' network has been less active in the last few years, with the result that today the national coordinators are less visible and have less influence in their home departments

and agencies. The decrease in activities might also be due to the creation of other coordination structures, such as the joint committees; but even with these, the coordinators' role is unchanged.

The IPOLC — an initiative well known to managers and community representatives, with objectives other than awareness raising — has served to raise the profile of section 41 in federal departments/agencies and in OLMCs.¹¹ Similarly, *Bulletin 41-42* (published three times a year) and the PCH Web site have made it possible to increase the visibility of section 41 to some extent in the communities and federal departments/agencies. Our consultations indicate that the majority of key government and community stakeholders are familiar with these communications tools.

The activities mentioned thus far are measures adopted primarily by PCH headquarters. However, the regional offices undertake other activities that enable PCH to make regional managers more aware, and to raise the visibility of section 41 in regional offices of departments/agencies, as well as in OLMCs and the organizations representing them.

The regional and provincial/territorial offices of PCH organize numerous consultations, both formal and informal, involving community representatives and federal managers. They also contribute to raising awareness in the regions by participating in the consultation and coordination activities of the federal councils' official languages committees. In addition, PCH offices in certain regions organize conferences/symposiums for the purpose of making section 41 visible in the OLMCs and in federal departments/agencies in those regions. Examples are the Atlantic Symposium on Official Languages (2001) and the conference on official languages in Ontario (2002).

The PCH offices in the West also helped organize "Forum 4-2-1: 4 Provinces, 2 Languages, 1 Plan" (2003), together with the official languages committees of the federal councils for the four provinces. The regional stakeholders consulted describe this as an initiative that served to involve managers in federal departments/agencies in the development of a strategic plan for section 41 implementation. This process of developing a plan helped to make managers and senior executives more aware of their responsibilities.

Finally, our consultations show that PCH regional offices have also participated in setting up various networks, such as the Manitoba Interdepartmental Network of Official Languages Coordinators (MINOLC), which brings together section 41 regional coordinators as well as coordinators who have responsibilities under Part IV of the OLA. This interdepartmental network provides a permanent structure for coordination and cooperation; it allows all the regional coordinators to meet and share information so that they can be better equipped to raise awareness among the managers in their home departments/agencies.

11. The IPOLC is discussed in greater detail in Section 4.2.4 of this report.

Our consultations indicate that enormous progress has been made since 1994 in raising federal managers' awareness of sections 41 and 42, and that PCH activities have played a key role in that progress. Of course, many other activities have contributed to raising managers' awareness and increasing the visibility of section 41. The stakeholders consulted stressed the importance of the activities organized by the official languages committees of the regional federal councils (sometimes jointly with PCH offices) in increasing the awareness of managers and OLMCs. Many stakeholders consulted also noted that the work of the official languages champions and joint committees has promoted awareness. Finally, many wanted to say that the OLMCs' efforts to increase awareness of their communities and to make federal managers aware of their own responsibilities have been significant and have borne fruit.

The evaluation results show that awareness raising is an ongoing activity; section 41 must remain prominent among the many other governmental and departmental priorities. Further, continual staff turnover in federal departments and agencies means that the task of awareness raising is never done.

4.2.2 Increase knowledge of federal policies and programs

This objective is not directly specified in PCH's mandate under section 42, that is, the work of ensuring that OLMCs have better knowledge of federal policies and programs can be seen as a means by which departments and agencies can meet the federal commitment set out in section 41. As mentioned in Section 3.1 of this report, PCH is not technically responsible for ensuring that federal departments and agencies meet their responsibilities; instead, its responsibility is to ensure that they act in a coordinated fashion. But for action to be coordinated, OLMCs have to be made aware that the federal government as a whole is responsible for supporting their development.

As indicated earlier, the activities undertaken by the Department of Canadian Heritage to implement section 42 of the OLA target both national and regional action. At the national level, PCH engages in liaison activities with federal departments and agencies, notably through the network of section 41 national coordinators, to encourage them to promote their policies and programs to OLMCs. Our consultations show that the joint committees are also excellent tools for ensuring dialogue between OLMCs and departments. While these are not consultation initiatives directly set up by PCH, the awareness efforts of Canadian Heritage have doubtless influenced the decisions made by these departments to set up such committees.

PCH also works with organizations representing OLMCs nationally. Its annual reports indicate that from 1995 to 1999 the Department organized and held six consultation meetings on action plans with national organizations representing OLMCs. The meetings brought together OLMCs' national representatives and managers from PCH and other federal departments/agencies; they helped the community organizations learn more about federal policies and programs. In addition, the PCH coordinating committees for the Anglophone/Francophone communities and the

working groups on culture enable the Department to inform community representatives about various federal policies and programs.

The national coordinators' network also holds one of its four annual meetings in the regions. This enables regional representatives of OLMCs to take part and learn more about the policies and programs of all the departments/agencies represented by a coordinator; and it enables coordinators to learn more about the particular circumstances of OLMCs in a given region. This approach helps to achieve the objective. However, while fostering the creation of ties over the years, it is limited because it involves only one meeting, once a year, in a single region. Further, many government stakeholders have noted that in most regions there are no mechanisms for consultation between the national and regional coordinators. They say that such mechanisms might serve to develop strategies for informing OLMCs about policies and programs in each coordinator's home department/agency. While it is the responsibility of the federal departments and agencies to develop these networks, PCH can encourage and equip the national and regional coordinators to undertake such initiatives.

Finally, on the subject of *Bulletin 41-42*, many regional stakeholders (from government and the communities) have noted that it offers only very general and rather cursory information about federal policies and programs. Our consultations suggest that, although the OLMCs receive the *Bulletin*, they do not have the time or the resources to study it systematically.

According to our consultations with OLMCs, the activities undertaken by PCH regional offices have done more to increase the communities' knowledge of federal policies and programs. The various activities organized by the PCH offices and the federal councils' official languages committees help the OLMCs to learn about federal policies and programs. As indicated earlier, meetings are organized where federal departments/agencies can inform OLMC representatives about their policies and programs. Initiatives such as the symposiums and conferences on official languages, as well as forums such as MINOLC and Forum 4-2-1, serve to build that knowledge as well.

4.2.3 Increase knowledge of OLMCs' needs

Seeing that federal managers have better knowledge of OLMCs' needs is a third objective of the Department of Canadian Heritage. Such knowledge is perceived as necessary to ensure that action is taken by federal departments and agencies. According to our consultations, the activities undertaken by PCH to increase this knowledge among federal managers have more impact when they take place in the regions.

Contributing to this objective were consultation meetings with national organizations representing OLMCs, organized between 1995 and 1999. In addition, regional meetings of the coordinators' network enabled coordinators to familiarize themselves with the needs of a community and to convey that information to managers in their home departments/agencies. However, our consultations indicate that coordinators' meetings are not particularly effective, given the limited influence of the coordinators in their departments or agencies. National

coordinators can transmit information about OLMCs to managers and make recommendations, but they do not have decision-making authority and do not always have a significant impact on the policies and programs of their home department or agency. In addition, this activity is the only one offered by PCH headquarters that gives national coordinators the opportunity to deal directly with OLMCs.

Finally, a few stakeholders mentioned PCH's expertise in research to identify the needs of the different official-language minority communities across the country. They say that PCH-conducted studies and research are indispensable tools, and should be promoted more in federal departments and agencies if they are to serve to enhance understanding of the needs of the communities.

In the regions, numerous activities undertaken by PCH offices help to build federal managers' knowledge of the needs of OLMCs. The activities vary from region to region, but they generally include all presentations, meetings and consultations organized between OLMCs and federal managers. For example, the OLMCs are invited to present their development needs and priorities to members of the federal councils. PCH offices participate actively in organizing activities undertaken by the various committees.

Our consultations with federal managers and OLMC representatives in the regions also show that, in some regions, OLMC strategic action plans are formulated in collaboration with the regional PCH offices. These action plans identify the communities' development needs and priorities. In addition to helping them prepare their plan, PCH regional managers organize sessions at which communities can present their plan to federal managers in other departments and agencies in the region.

4.2.4 Encourage concrete action to be taken

The Department of Canadian Heritage wishes to encourage federal departments and agencies to take concrete action to implement section 41 of the OLA. However, while its awareness activities to some extent can help to encourage them to act, the Department has no authority to require other departments and agencies to take the measures necessary for providing concrete support to OLMCs. Admittedly, it is hard to assign credit for results, but PCH successes in this area appear to be limited.

Our consultations indicate that concrete action depends largely on federal managers' commitment to supporting OLMCs' development. In addition, the communities put much effort into promoting their needs to managers, leading to the launch of many projects. All the same, certain activities undertaken by Canadian Heritage nationally and regionally have helped to foster concrete action. PCH's national and regional awareness efforts have probably encouraged federal departments and agencies to adopt concrete measures and commit to supporting OLMCs' development. As a result, OLMCs have greater access to programs and services designed to enhance their vitality.

Nationally, PCH launched the IPOLC, an important vehicle for the Department to contribute directly to concrete action by federal departments and agencies. Our consultations show that the IPOLC has contributed to achieving this objective. It is an additional source of funding that is appreciated by federal departments and agencies. Among other things, this funding permits smaller departments or agencies, such as the Canada Council for the Arts or Fisheries and Oceans Canada, to be more active in supporting official-language minority communities. Some government officials say that these organizations might not have the resources to take action in the field and to participate in projects without the assistance of PCH through the IPOLC. As a financial incentive, the IPOLC also encourages many other departments and agencies to get involved in projects to support OLMCs. Since its launch, the IPOLC has generated more than \$65 million in benefits for official-language communities.

However, our consultations indicate that the IPOLC has its limitations as a mechanism for encouraging concrete action, for three main reasons:

- ▶ First, many stakeholders consulted say that funds accessible through the IPOLC do not represent substantial amounts on an annual basis, considering that they have to be shared among various applicants.

Table 3 presents the funds committed per year, from 2000–01 to 2004–05, under the IPOLC.

Table 3: IPOLC funding, 2000–01 to 2004–05			
Year	Amount		
	PCH	Others	Total
2000–01	\$922,000	\$903,000	\$1,825,000
2001–02	\$5,321,257	\$7,619,130	\$12,940,387
2002–03	\$6,316,864	\$13,040,280	\$19,357,144
2003–04	\$5,329,721	\$10,070,101	\$15,399,822
2004–05	\$4,821,380	\$11,910,041	\$16,731,421
Total	\$22,711,222	\$43,542,552	\$66,253,774
Source: Department of Canadian Heritage			

- ▶ Second, many stakeholders commented on the red tape associated with the IPOLC. They say that the application process is long and complex, discouraging some regional managers from applying.
- ▶ Third, our consultations indicate that the program’s centralized approach is a limitation in itself. It makes the process particularly complex for regional managers, and is perceived as a barrier to organizing projects that meet OLMCs’ real needs and priorities. Although guidelines require applicants to obtain a supporting letter from the community, many stakeholders consulted feel that the projects funded under the IPOLC are only rarely developed in consultation with

the communities. The result, they say, is that IPOLC projects do not always meet community expectations.

At the regional level, PCH offices are engaged in numerous activities that encourage concrete action by departments and agencies in the regions targeting OLMCs' development. Through the meetings organized and the various groups formed, the key stakeholders come to deal with each other, and the results are ties and interest in setting up projects or initiatives for the development of OLMCs. For example, Canadian Heritage and the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency collaborated in organizing the 400th anniversary of Acadia.

4.2.5 Foster a coordinated approach and partnership creation

This objective is central to the role of PCH under section 42 of the OLA. Our consultations indicate that, to date, the Department's success in this regard is somewhat modest, partly because of the context in which PCH had to assume its coordination role. From 1994 to 2004, PCH had to focus its efforts on raising the awareness of federal departments and agencies about their section 41 responsibilities. Our consultations show that those efforts have borne fruit, and the many measures taken by federal departments and agencies (e.g. the establishment of joint committees, their participation in the IPOLC, and the support offered through the funding of initiatives and projects) demonstrate that they now have a better understanding of their responsibilities. On the other hand, the mechanisms introduced to foster a coordinated approach, such as the coordinators' network and the IPOLC, have serious limitations.

Certainly, the coordinators' network affords PCH an overview of the situation in federal departments and agencies, at the national level, concerning section 41 implementation. This gives PCH the capacity to promote a coordinated approach and the creation of partnerships among federal departments and agencies. However, our consultations show that the coordination does not extend to the regional coordinators. Given that a large part of OLMC support activities take place in the regions, where the communities are located, the absence of a mechanism for consultation and coordination between national and regional coordinators undermines PCH's ability to foster a coordinated approach. The regional coordinators are not in fact sufficiently supervised by their national coordinators to ensure coordination of the activities of their departments and agencies.

Our consultations also indicate that PCH facilitates the establishment of linkages between the different stakeholders at the national and regional levels. PCH brings the key stakeholders together and offers the exchange opportunities required to develop joint projects. As for the creation of partnerships between departments/agencies and communities, important links have been established at the national level (joint committees, PCH coordinating committees for the Anglophone/Francophone communities, etc.), as well as in the regions. The presence of the federal councils' official languages committees in the regions is definitely a major asset in fostering partnerships and a coordinated approach.

Our consultations suggest that the IPOLC itself has a limited capacity to promote the creation of partnerships between departments/agencies and communities. The partnerships generated by this initiative tend more to be between PCH and another department or agency. What's more, they are ad hoc in nature and often entirely dependent on the ongoing funding offered by PCH.

Finally, mechanisms such as teleconferences and the IPOLC steering committee permit the regional PCH offices and the ICD to communicate. All the same, most of the managers consulted feel that communications between the ICD and regions are not regular and systematic. They say there are difficulties in this area, with the result that the Department is limited in its capacity to foster a coordinated regional-national approach across the federal government. Some PCH managers also say that the communications difficulties are compounded by the fact that the regions and the ICD are not in the same sector of the Department (the regions are part of the Public Affairs and Communications sector, while the ICD is part of the Citizenship and Heritage sector).

4.2.6 Encourage useful reporting

Through its coordination role, the Department of Canadian Heritage aims to encourage useful and effective reporting. As indicated in the federal government's accountability framework, designated federal departments and agencies must submit their action plans to PCH. They must also report annually to PCH on results obtained so that PCH can report to Parliament on implementation of section 41 of the OLA. Assigning this task to PCH is a means of ensuring systematic and uniform reporting. However, our consultations have identified certain weaknesses in the reporting process.

For example, action plans generally do not reflect the objectives set by federal departments and agencies, nor OLMCs' needs and priorities. It is true that certain departments (such as HRDC, CIC, Industry, Justice and Health) consult the communities to identify their needs and priorities, and to develop with them effective strategies for meeting those needs. Moreover, in some regions the OLMC submits its strategic plan to federal managers. However, the evaluation results indicate that these consultations do not necessarily serve to develop action plans.

In fact, our consultations with federal managers suggest that, in most cases, action plans are developed without any consultation with the communities or systematic internal consultations for the purpose; and limited resources are provided for this task. Further, the documentation review and our consultations with federal managers indicate that the call letter that PCH sends to deputy ministers is generally sent very late, leaving little time to work out the action plan and incorporate PCH recommendations. It is true that an unofficial call is made to coordinators in advance, and the departments and agencies are aware that they are required to deliver their action plan and report on achievements to PCH — a requirement they have a responsibility to fulfill. However, given the multitude of demands and requirements they must fulfill, one can assume that few actions are taken before the call letter is sent. Note as well that this is not a responsibility of PCH, and there are no consequences of not complying with the accountability framework.

Finally, our consultations indicate that, while PCH analyzes the action plans and follows up on them (in the form of recommendations accompanying the call letter), at present it does no auditing to ensure that achievements correspond to objectives set. However, it has developed a tool, to be tested shortly, for assessing progress in implementing section 41 of the OLA in federal departments and agencies. The tool will assist departments and agencies in reporting on their achievements in this regard. It will also make the link to the action plan, facilitating identification of the strengths and weaknesses of the department/agency and the measures that should be taken to achieve the target results.

PCH cannot force federal departments and agencies to prepare their action plans as required by the accountability framework. However, it could improve its guidance of departments/agencies.

4.2.7 Impact of section 42 implementation at PCH

PCH sectoral coordinators take part in certain activities of the ICD, such as the national coordinators' network; they also sit on certain working groups, such as on culture. However, our consultations reveal that the ICD's activities make little impression on senior management in the various sectors of the Department. Most of the stakeholders consulted noted that the steps taken to implement section 41 of the OLA at PCH most often originate with managers and DGs, and said they have observed no special initiatives by the ICD.

The issue of official languages and support for OLMCs is generally well integrated into the practices of Canadian Heritage; our consultations indicate that this is a priority that is part of the organizational culture of the Department. However, the commitment set out in section 41 does not have the same visibility in every sector and branch of the Department, or in every region of Canada. Our consultations indicate that there are still certain sectors or branches that have a poor understanding of their role and responsibilities under section 41 of the OLA; not all managers and DGs make concrete connections between their sphere of activity and support for OLMCs. Our consultations also indicate that in regions without a sizeable linguistic minority, managers are less aware of questions relating to section 41 implementation than in regions with a large minority population.

Promotion of section 41 in the Department is generally done informally by senior executives, managers and coordinators. The sectoral and regional coordinators are responsible for raising the awareness of managers, and give some visibility to section 41. At the same time, to communicate the importance of implementing section 41 of the OLA, senior management in certain sectors has adopted concrete measures such as incorporating the official languages requirements — including those under Part VII of the OLA — in senior managers' performance agreements, and including section 41 objectives in the business plan. As with other federal departments and agencies, awareness raising has to continue at PCH. To that end, we note the recent establishment of a working group on official languages within the Department. While the exact mandate of the group is still to be defined, certain persons involved in setting it up, who were consulted for this evaluation, say that its main objective will be to encourage compliance with and promotion of Parts IV to VII of the OLA within the Department, including support for

OLMCs.

Apart from the PCH coordinating committees for the Anglophone/Francophone communities and the working groups on culture, the stakeholders consulted note that the main steps taken to implement section 41 in the Department involve establishing programs specifically aimed at supporting the development of official-language minority communities, offering financial support for forums/symposiums organized by official-language communities in various sectors of activity, and ensuring that sector/branch practices are non-discriminatory and that there are no language barriers to accessing the programs and services offered. Some sectors or branches are also taking part in studies or initiatives designed to identify the needs of official-language minority communities. Other than establishment of the coordinating committees and working groups on culture, however, it is difficult to see the steps being taken as necessarily attributable to section 42 implementation.

As for development of action plans, the situation differs little from that in other federal departments and agencies. In other words, plans are generally drawn up to satisfy an administrative requirement, not for planning purposes. In some cases, however, the action plans are used as intended. The stakeholders consulted also note the absence of effective tools for measuring results achievement. This shortcoming will be remedied by the tool recently developed by PCH for evaluating progress in implementing section 41 (mentioned earlier in Section 4.2.6).

4.2.8 Challenges and issues

The Department of Canadian Heritage faces numerous challenges and issues in implementing section 42 of the OLA, with the result that its successes and achievements in this regard can be perceived as limited. Certainly they are difficult to measure. We have been referring to this throughout Section 4.2 of this report, and we now summarize as follows:

- ▶ The OLA is not explicit about the role of PCH and the measures it must take in order to play that role. Consequently, many of the objectives that PCH has adopted seem to exceed its mandate under section 42. Further, the Action Plan for Official Languages and PCO's recent involvement in the official languages portfolio have created some confusion; many key stakeholders, PCH included, are not sure about the roles of the different players.
- ▶ In 1994 the great majority of federal managers were still unaware of their section 41 responsibilities. As a result, Canadian Heritage had to focus more on raising their awareness than on promoting a coordinated approach.
- ▶ PCH offices in the regions and at headquarters often work in isolation. There is very little communication between the regions and headquarters, and so it is difficult to foster a coordinated approach between the two management levels. In addition, PCH regional managers have little decision-making authority on

departmental policies and programs. Therefore, with no mechanism of communications between headquarters and the regions, the impact of PCH activities is diminished.

- ▶ While the coordinators' network gives PCH an overview of the designated federal departments and agencies, the work of the network has had little impact on departments and agencies. This is because national coordinators have little influence in their home departments or agencies, and also because of the large number of horizontal issues in the federal government.
- ▶ Reporting is not systematically applied. The accountability framework is not sufficiently convincing for federal departments and agencies to take seriously the task of developing an action plan.
- ▶ It is important to remember that the impact of PCH efforts is difficult to measure. The evaluation results show that activities undertaken by PCH have certainly contributed to the expected results, but numerous other factors have also to be considered, such as political commitment, the commitment of federal managers, the activities of the joint committees, the federal councils' official languages committees and other committees/groups, and the efforts of OLMCs.

4.3 Cost-effectiveness / Design and delivery

The questions on this third major evaluation issue examine the degree to which the Department of Canadian Heritage is the best organization to coordinate section 41 implementation, the relevance and effectiveness of coordination activities undertaken by PCH, and the extent to which the results obtained are commensurate with the funding invested.

4.3.1 Best organization to coordinate section 41 implementation

On the question of which is the best organization to coordinate section 41 implementation, the stakeholders we consulted are split almost down the middle, regardless of the group they belong to, between two views:

- 1) The Department of Canadian Heritage is the best organization to coordinate section 41 implementation.
- 2) A central agency, particularly the Privy Council Office, would be better equipped to coordinate section 41 implementation.

The stakeholders who take the first view feel that Canadian Heritage is the best option because of its capacity to act in the field. PCH has good regional networks that allow it to deal directly with the communities. PCH's regional offices have solid, long-standing ties with OLMCs. For

many years, the Department has been involved in the official languages sector and in supporting OLMCs; this lengthy experience has given it close familiarity with the portfolio and expertise in the field.

These stakeholders say that effective coordination of section 41 implementation requires expertise and capacity to act in the field, directly with the OLMCs. They do not consider a central agency to have such capacities; a central agency would not be able to coordinate the federal commitment because it is heavily centralized and detached from the regions and communities. Certain stakeholders consulted also point out that the central agencies, particularly PCO, are too close to the politicians; as a result, their coordination activities and efforts could be influenced by the “flavour of the day.”

Other stakeholders consulted believe that coordination should be the responsibility of a central agency, particularly PCO. They say that the primary concern of a central agency is capacity to demonstrate achievement of results; this is because of the nature of its mandate, which (unlike a departmental mandate) is not based chiefly on the implementation of programs and initiatives. These stakeholders say that a central agency would be able to ensure better control over the actions of federal departments and agencies because it has some authority over them — unlike PCH, which (they say) does not have enough authority, with the result that it is unable to influence what departments and agencies do. The consulted stakeholders also say that a central agency is in a position to intervene at the senior management level (a capacity that PCH does not have) in order to influence senior executives and ensure that federal departments/agencies meet their section 41 responsibilities.

These views follow from two different interpretations of the mandate conferred on PCH by section 42. If section 42 is interpreted as meaning that the Department has to encourage a *coordinated approach* to the implementation of section 41, PCH is probably the organization that is best suited to the task. PCH can ensure a coordinated approach among federal departments and agencies because it maintains regional networks and has recognized expertise in the field. In contrast, the view that a central agency is in the best position to implement section 42 follows from an interpretation that goes beyond the strict meaning of the Act. PCH is certainly not in a position to force federal departments and agencies to implement section 41 because it has no authority over them. But this does not appear to be the role that is assigned to PCH by section 42.

4.3.2 Relevance and effectiveness of coordination activities

As mentioned previously, the chief coordination activities of PCH include activities related to the coordinators’ network, awareness and information activities, the consultation mechanisms, the IPOLC, coordination of action plans and reports on achievements, and the annual submission of results to Parliament. According to our consultations, all of these activities are relevant. However, while they permit PCH to attain some of the target objectives, they do not permit it to fully discharge its mandate under section 42 of the OLA in sufficiently effective fashion.

Coordinators' network

Most of the stakeholders consulted regard a coordinators' network as essential for securing an overview of federal departments and agencies at the national level, and for creating ties between the different stakeholders concerned by section 41. The network permits information exchanges, offers of support for section 41 implementation, and the development of joint projects. The network is an effective mechanism in certain respects, to the extent that it offers a point of contact and support for all the national coordinators. However, not all national coordinators are in a position to exert influence on decisions taken in their home departments and agencies. Their classification level has an impact on their visibility in their department or agency, their access to managers capable of making decisions, and the weight given to their recommendations or suggestions. In addition, most of the coordinators have established no concrete ties with the official languages champions or the regional coordinators, if any, in their department or agency. As a result, the coordinators are not supported in their efforts to promote section 41 of the OLA in their department or agency, and the measures taken by each of them are not systematically coordinated. Finally, the coordination effected through the network has few ramifications in the regions; with certain exceptions (Health, Justice, HRDC and Industry), relations between the national and regional coordinators are limited.

Awareness, promotional and information activities

According to the consultations, awareness and promotional activities have made up most of the work done by PCH over the last 10 years to coordinate section 41 implementation. These activities are also said to have contributed to the fact that, today, more federal managers are aware of their section 41 responsibilities, and community representatives are more alert to the fact that other federal departments and agencies have obligations relating to the development of OLMCs. Still, it is difficult to determine the extent to which the Department's activities have contributed to the achievement of the results observed. In addition, most of the stakeholders consulted note that PCH awareness activities have not always been effective in reaching senior management. This group should therefore be targeted more by the awareness activities of the Department; senior managers have to become aware of section 41 so that it is given due importance within the department or agency. Our consultations indicate that awareness and promotional activities have to be continued at all levels.

Consultation mechanisms

The evaluation results show that any consultation mechanism is relevant because consultation is one of the key components of coordination. Excellent mechanisms have been introduced in the regions, enabling federal managers to get together and meet with community representatives. At the national level, the consultation mechanisms put in place by PCH, such as the sectoral tables and coordinating committees, are also relevant and effective. These mechanisms offer good opportunities for cooperation and allow key stakeholders to better understand their own needs, priorities and assets.

The main shortcoming in this regard is the fact that there are few mechanisms for consultation between the regions and the national level. For the coordination of section 41 implementation, it is important to ensure that the two levels consult with each other, both within PCH and within other federal departments and agencies.

Planning tools

To better identify OLMCs' needs and priorities and the actual circumstances of minority communities, Canadian Heritage conducts research and studies on official languages and official-language minority communities. For example, as part of the "New Canadian Perspectives" research series, research has been conducted on issues of the vitality of Francophone minority communities, official language teaching, and the socio-economic vitality of OLMCs.¹² The Department also analyzes census data on language.

Our consultations indicate that the studies conducted by PCH are relevant and have helped to build expertise within the Department. Studies also further understanding of official-language minority communities and their needs. However, they contribute to the achievement of these objectives only if managers read and use them. It would appear that the strategic plans developed by OLMCs, often in collaboration with federal managers, and submitted to the federal councils, are more effective as planning and information tools, and could therefore be used by federal departments and agencies in drawing up their action plans.

Action plans and reports on achievements

In principle, the development of action plans, as required by the federal government's accountability framework, is a sound planning mechanism. However, the general verdict of our consultations is that, at present, this exercise is not effective. As mentioned earlier, it is not taken seriously enough by the majority of federal managers. As a result, the plans are not developed or used in a strategic fashion. In general, the action plans reflect neither the objectives of the departments/agencies nor the needs of OLMCs. Hence the reports on achievements submitted to PCH by federal departments and agencies are not always consistent with the action plans.

Regarding PCH's responsibilities with respect to the action plans and reports on achievements, our consultations indicate that PCH activities in this connection are largely ineffective. First of all, in its analysis of the action plans, PCH draws no direct links between results obtained and objectives set by each department/agency. Also, the process used by PCH to transmit its recommendations to the departments/agencies, based on the action plans, is not effective; according to our consultations, the recommendations are sent with the call letter only a few weeks before the deadline for delivery of new action plans.

12. See the Web site of the Department of Canadian Heritage:
www.pch.gc.ca/progs/lo-ol/pubs/index_e.cfm

The preparation of the insert in the annual report on official languages, presenting the achievements of each designated department and agency, is a relevant activity. This is an effective way of highlighting the successes and progress of departments/agencies in implementing section 41.

The IPOLC

All of our consultations indicate that the IPOLC is a relevant initiative that serves to encourage federal departments and agencies to take concrete action to implement section 41. This is an important and necessary financial lever, which has led to the creation of various projects of value to OLMCs.

However, the IPOLC has had limited effectiveness in coordinating section 41 implementation, given the constraints described earlier in Section 4.2.4. In addition, the IPOLC management structure lessens the effectiveness of the mechanism; although PCH is involved in each of the memorandums of understanding, allowing it to obtain an overview of IPOLC projects, IPOLC funding is not administered or allocated strategically. First, PCH conducts no analysis to determine where the priority needs are, in terms of region and activity sector, so as to properly target available funding. Second, the results of the 2003 program evaluation indicate that many of the departments/agencies that receive IPOLC funding are already involved in the communities.¹³ This perception persists today to the extent that certain of the persons we consulted said that many of the departments/agencies that participate in the IPOLC are not necessarily among those most in need of encouragement to put mechanisms and projects in place supporting OLMC development. In addition, many departments that are IPOLC beneficiaries have substantial mandates and budgets, and do not necessarily require this sort of financial assistance to support communities' development. In that sense, PCH could be more proactive in systematically targeting priority fields and regions, as well as departments/agencies with few resources that are not systematically involved in supporting OLMCs.

4.3.3 Results by level of investment

The evaluation sought to determine the extent to which the results achieved by the Department of Canadian Heritage for section 42 implementation are commensurate with the resources allocated. However, this sort of question faces some major challenges:

- ▶ Logically, to respond to the question of whether results are commensurate with the level of investment, it is first necessary to be able to identify, quantify and measure all of the results obtained — something that in present circumstances is

13. Svoboda, Mira, ARC Applied Research Consultants (2003), *Formative Evaluation of the "Interdepartmental Partnership with Official Language Communities" (IPOLC) Component of the Promotion of Official Languages Program*, study prepared for the Department of Canadian Heritage, October 6, 2003.

virtually impossible to do.

- ▶ Second, responding to this question requires knowledge of the resources allocated for achievement of the objectives. Most of the stakeholders consulted did not know how much funding had been set aside for section 42 implementation. As a result, they could make no judgment on whether results were commensurate with resources allocated for this purpose. And even with a knowledge of the resources granted to the ICD for section 42 implementation, a judgment still could not be reached because PCH regional offices are also engaged in numerous activities to fulfill the mandate conferred by section 42 of the OLA, partly through the use of certain resources allocated for that purpose by PCH headquarters. The activities of PCH regional offices, as well as those of other departments, OLMCs and other bodies (such as the federal councils) have also contributed to the results.
- ▶ Finally, even if we knew the results obtained and the level of investment, it would be difficult to determine what level of result is appropriate for the resources allocated. This is a subjective question to which there may be as many responses as there are respondents.

Given these constraints, the evaluation has been unable to collect relevant information on the question. Nonetheless, our consultations show that the coordination activities of PCH have made a significant contribution to raising the awareness of federal managers and OLMCs about section 41 of the OLA. As pointed out earlier, PCH has made substantial efforts to enhance understanding of section 41 and the responsibilities that flow from it.

5.0 Conclusions, Observations and Management Response

This section presents our conclusions on the questions raised by this evaluation, as well as certain key observations where we consider them necessary.

Relevance of the commitment and of coordination

Sections 41 and 42 of the OLA continue to be relevant in the present context.¹⁴ The federal Action Plan for Official Languages and its Accountability and Coordination Framework strengthen the federal government's commitment to Canada's linguistic duality and support for the official-language communities.

Section 41 also draws its relevance from the fact that the development of the OLMCs is an ongoing process. What is more, within the multitude of governmental and departmental priorities, this commitment must be well supported and remain in the forefront. Support for the OLMCs is not integrated in the organizational culture of all the federal departments and agencies, and the importance of meeting this commitment has to be continually promoted.

The legislative mandate that section 42 confers upon PCH remains just as relevant in light of the role that has more recently emerged for PCO and the minister responsible for Official Languages. The roles and responsibilities of each of these organizations lie at different levels. While PCO and the minister responsible for Official Languages have to promote the implementation of section 41 and the entire official languages program at the highest levels of management, the primary role of the Department of Canadian Heritage, although it does contribute to raising the awareness of federal managers, is to promote a coordinated approach to actions taken at the more operational level.

Observation **1. The complementarity of the roles of PCO / minister responsible for Official Languages and of PCH is not clearly understood by all the stakeholders involved in the implementation of sections 41 and 42. It is important for PCH to accurately describe this complementarity and clarify its meaning to federal managers and community representatives.**

The recent involvement of PCO and the minister responsible for Official Languages will surely facilitate the task of PCH, so that it can focus more on the role conferred under section 42.

Observation accepted. The Official Languages Accountability and Coordination Framework contained in the Action Plan for Official Languages released in March 2003 describes the roles

14. We felt it was also important to examine the relevance of section 41, as it is linked to the relevance of section 42. Indeed, perceptions of the commitment set out in section 41 are part of the present context in which section 42 is being implemented.

of the various stakeholders with respect to official languages issues. It preserves intact the statutory responsibilities of each federal institution, including those of the Department of Canadian Heritage pertaining to Part VII (sections 41 and 42). The Framework also gives the Minister responsible for Official Languages an horizontal coordination role to enable the Government of Canada to maintain an overall approach. The Privy Council Office therefore plays a more strategic role on issues that may affect official languages, while Canadian Heritage works continuously with a network of 34 designated departments and agencies to coordinate activities and encourage the sharing of best practices.

In its communications, the Interdepartmental Coordination Directorate will clearly describe the respective roles of PCH and PCO as set out in the Official Languages Accountability and Coordination Framework. The Directorate will proactively provide this information to federal and community officials.

Time frame: ongoing

Successes and achievements

At first glance, the evaluation results show that PCH's section 42 role is interpreted in different ways. Under the OLA, the Department is assigned the mandate of encouraging and promoting a *coordinated approach* to the implementation of section 41. However, it is commonly thought that the Department of Canadian Heritage is entrusted with ensuring that federal departments and agencies assume their responsibilities under section 41. As a result, expectations of the role of PCH, on the part of federal managers and communities alike, have largely exceeded what PCH is actually capable of achieving. What is more, high expectations have led many people to take a very critical and even excessively severe view of the work done by PCH.

Observation **2. The interpretation of the mandate of PCH, as set forth in section 42 of the OLA, must be brought closer to the actual letter of the Act. PCH must formulate its mandate clearly and promote a common and accurate understanding of it and the activities that follow from it.**

The objectives that PCH has set for itself, as well as the measures it has adopted to achieve those objectives, necessarily follow from the interpretation of its role. Consequently, a revision of that interpretation will result in a revision of the objectives and the measures taken.

In addition, the documentation review shows that the Department of Canadian Heritage reports on the activities it has taken to implement section 42 of the OLA on an annual basis, in its reports on achievements. The model used for its 2003-2004 report, compared with that used in 2002-2003, allows for a more systematic profile of activities implemented and a clearer establishment of the links between those activities and the results obtained. All the same, the results attained by means of the activities are difficult to measure and quantify, because

numerous players other than PCH and numerous factors contribute to the changes observed in this regard. The evaluation nonetheless shows that the main accomplishments to date arising from PCH's activities are increased awareness by federal managers of their section 41 responsibilities and participation of departments and agencies in the IPOLC. It also shows that PCH's awareness activities have served to make federal managers more open to supporting the development of the OLMCs. PCH has in fact laid the foundations upon which the departments and agencies can take action.

Observation accepted. Together with the regional offices, the Interdepartmental Coordination Directorate will develop a common understanding of the coordination mandate arising from section 42 to be carried out both regionally and nationally. Headquarters and the regions will work together to define their respective roles and responsibilities in carrying out this mandate and to develop clear messages in this regard. PCH staff responsible for official languages will then be able to work continuously with clients to promote a common understanding of PCH's coordination mandate and will then be able to better manage expectations.

Time frame: Document describing the mandate: December 31, 2005

Observation **3. The Department of Canadian Heritage must continue its awareness activities. Because federal departments and agencies are in a state of constant change, awareness raising is an ongoing task.**

Now that section 41 and its resulting responsibilities are better known and understood by federal managers, PCH can focus more on coordinating the actions taken by the different departments under section 41 of the OLA.

Observation accepted. Interdepartmental coordination officials will continue to raise awareness among federal departments and agencies of the realities of official-language minority communities, provide them with tools to support their efforts at the national and regional levels and to help them fully assume their responsibilities.

Time frame (day/month/year): ongoing

Observation **4. While maintaining its awareness activities, PCH must put more emphasis on the activities that encourage cooperation and coordination among federal departments, at both the national and regional levels.**

The IPOLC is an important mechanism for encouraging the federal departments and agencies to commit to supporting the development of the OLMCs. The smaller agencies have particular need of this funding so that they can set up projects to support this development. However, this evaluation demonstrates that the centralized management of the program is detrimental to the formulation of projects that meet the communities' needs, and that IPOLC funds are not allocated in sufficiently strategic fashion.

Observation accepted. The Interdepartmental Coordination Directorate has begun to set up an internal network of national and regional PCH interdepartmental coordination officials. Their goal is to develop an understanding of the coordination effort aimed at further promoting a coordinated approach among federal agencies at the national and regional levels. To accomplish this, the network will foster exchange activities among federal departments and agencies on various national and regional topics of interest to official-language communities (culture, early childhood, immigration, etc.).

Time frame (day/month/year): ongoing (Network launch: September 2005)

Observation **5. More involvement by the regional offices in decisions related to partnerships established and initiatives developed under the IPOLC would make the mechanism more effective by helping to better target IPOLC funds so as to meet needs identified by the OLMCs as priorities.**

The evaluation confirms that PCH is not the only organization involved in coordinating the implementation of section 41. Other structures have been put in place to ensure support for the OLMCs on the one hand, and a coordinated approach to that support on the other. At the national level, the joint committees, set up in collaboration with PCH, are excellent methods of bringing managers and community representatives together in specific sectors. At the regional level, the federal councils, through official languages committees, are the primary mechanism of coordination on official languages issues. The Department of Canadian Heritage cooperates with the stakeholders in these structures and participates in the various activities carried out.

Observation accepted. This observation is consistent with the observation made in the IPOLC's formative evaluation. An IPOLC steering committee made up of regional and national representatives was formed in March 29, 2004, to address this recommendation. The committee's efforts to date have helped PCH officials (regional and from Operations) to review the project proposals presented under the IPOLC, recommend courses of action and take part in the implementation strategy. The steering committee will continue its work and will consider other possible avenues for improvement.

Time frame (day/month/year): in progress since March 2004

Observation **6. Coordination of the implementation of section 41 requires PCH to maintain close ties with the joint committees and official languages committees of the federal councils in the regions.**

The reporting process is not being applied in sufficiently rigorous fashion. PCH's role in applying this process involves analysing the action plans, conveying the results of the analysis to deputy ministers and coordinators, and reporting to Parliament on the results obtained in implementing section 41. In this regard, the evaluation shows that analysis of the action plans and the follow-up they are given are not extensive enough to promote useful reporting.

Observation accepted. PCH interdepartmental coordination officials will maintain their ties with the joint committees at both the national and regional levels. Furthermore, the regional official languages or interdepartmental coordination officials will work to develop ongoing relationships with federal councils where such relationships do not yet exist and to strengthen already existing ones.

Time frame: ongoing

Observation **7. The follow-up that PCH provides for the action plans and reports on achievements should incorporate more in-depth analysis so as to permit federal departments and agencies to make relevant, useful changes to their action plans.**

Observation accepted. A performance measurement tool was recently developed to measure the progress made in implementing section 41 within federal departments and agencies. Interdepartmental coordination officials will use the tool to conduct a more in-depth analysis of departmental and agency action plans and annual reviews in order to give them feedback and suggest new courses of action at both the regional and national levels. Departments will also be able to use the tool to conduct self-evaluations, prepare their reports and identify areas for improvement.

Time frame: implemented in 2005-2006

Cost-effectiveness / Design and delivery

Their differing interpretations of section 42 leave stakeholders with different perspectives on which is the best organization to coordinate implementation of section 41. The evaluation suggests that the Department of Canadian Heritage is the organization in the best position to encourage a *coordinated approach* to the implementation of section 41, in light, among other things, of its expertise in the area and its capacity to take action in the field.

The activities undertaken by PCH to implement section 42 of the OLA may all be relevant, but their effectiveness is more uneven. The evaluation shows that the biggest issue surrounding the implementation of section 42 and achievement of its objectives is the absence of linkages, at

various levels, between the various coordination and management structures, including those that are the responsibility of PCH. Communications and exchanges among the key players are in fact inadequate, with the result that PCH's capacity to coordinate the actions taken by federal departments and agencies is weakened.

At the national level: Certainly, linkages have been established at the national level; the ICD collaborates with the national coordinators, who work together. It is in this way that the ICD encourages coordination. However, the national coordinators have not established relations with the key stakeholders in their respective departments and agencies, and specifically at the senior management level.

Observation **8. The official languages champions are natural partners of the national coordinators. The introduction of communication mechanisms between these two groups could facilitate collaboration among these key stakeholders and permit the coordinators' work to reach the senior management level.**

At the regional level: In the regions, solid ties have been created between the PCH offices and the regional managers/coordinators, by means of the federal councils' official languages committees. What is more, these ties extend to the OLMCs. In most regions, however, the regional coordinators of the different departments and agencies have set up no structure for communicating with each other.

Between the regional and national levels: There are obvious deficiencies in communications and exchanges between the ICD and the PCH regional offices. It is difficult for an organization to promote a coordinated approach when the two levels responsible for coordination are not in regular communication with each other. Furthermore, the same phenomenon exists between the national coordinators and regional coordinators in the other federal departments and agencies. However, we recognize that, while PCH can encourage the national coordinators to set up communication mechanisms, it is the responsibility of each department and agency to take the measures that are necessary to improve this situation.

Observation accepted. Interdepartmental coordination officials will work with representatives from the official languages champions' network to organize exchange activities between the champions and the national coordinators in order to promote actual working relations among the champions and the coordinators from every federal institution.

Time frame (day/month/year): March 31, 2006

Observation **9. Mechanisms for bringing the regional coordinators in the same region together are important for coordinating the regional action of federal departments and agencies. Furthermore, these types of coordination mechanisms must establish liaison between the**

national and regional levels within PCH and in the other federal departments and agencies.

Finally, with regard to results achieved relative to level of investment allocated, the evaluation can draw no definitive conclusions because of the difficulties associated with this question, as discussed in section 4.3.3.

Observation accepted. Some regions already have coordination groups composed of officials from various federal departments. Often these are program coordinators rather than regional coordinators. As stated in observation 5, PCH interdepartmental coordinators will set up an internal network of interdepartmental coordinators to discuss a common understanding of the coordination mandate. The group will work on an approach to organize a network of coordinators or key stakeholders from a given region and ensure that information from the national coordinators network is shared with the regions.

Time frame (day/month/year): March 31, 2006

Appendix A
Evaluation Framework

Table 4: Evaluation Framework: Impact of the implementation of section 42 in the designated federal departments and agencies		
Questions	Indicators	Sources
Relevance		
1. Is the coordination of the federal commitment set out in section 41 by one specific department essential? Does it still meet a real need? Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Interviews with spokespersons of organizations representing OLMCs, TBS, the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages (OCOL), network of provincial and territorial Francophone affairs officials (RGAF), and PCO ▶ Discussion groups with section 41 national coordinators
Successes and achievements		
2. Have the activities implemented by the Department of Canadian Heritage to coordinate the federal commitment served to:		
a) increase the knowledge and understanding of managers at PCH and the federal departments and agencies designated under section 41 of their responsibilities pursuant to this section?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Degree of knowledge and understanding of managers ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders ▶ Conclusions of the evaluations conducted by some departments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Telephone survey of PCH managers and managers in other designated departments and agencies, including managers in the regions ▶ Discussion groups with section 41 national coordinators ▶ Findings of evaluations conducted by designated departments and agencies other than PCH
b) increase the knowledge of OLMCs of the policies and programs of federal departments and agencies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Interviews with spokespersons of organizations representing OLMCs ▶ Discussion groups with section 41 national coordinators
c) raise the visibility of section 41 among designated departments and agencies, interest groups, OLMCs and the general public?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Visitors to Web site ▶ Knowledge of Bulletin 41-42 ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Administrative files ▶ Interviews with OLSPB managers ▶ Interviews with spokespersons of organizations representing OLMCs ▶ Discussion groups with section 41 national coordinators
d) encourage federal departments and agencies to take concrete measures to strengthen their ability to act? How?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Identification of mechanisms implemented by designated departments and agencies (e.g. guidelines, coordinating committees, etc.) ▶ Number and scope of IPOLC agreements ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Discussion groups with section 41 national coordinators ▶ Interviews with spokespersons of organizations representing OLMCs, OCOL, the RGAFs and OLSPB managers ▶ Insert on interdepartmental coordination ▶ Sample analysis of action plans and reports on achievements ▶ Administrative files ▶ Survey of PCH managers and managers in other

Table 4: Evaluation Framework: Impact of the implementation of section 42 in the designated federal departments and agencies		
Questions	Indicators	Sources
		designated departments and agencies, including managers in the regions
e) increase designated federal departments' and agencies' knowledge of OLMCs' needs and of sectoral and horizontal issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Level of knowledge of designated departments and agencies of the needs of the OLMCs, as demonstrated in their data and information about the communities ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Interviews with spokespersons of organizations representing OLMCs, OCOL, the RGAFs and OLSPB managers ▶ Discussion groups with section 41 national coordinators ▶ Relevant data and studies produced by the designated departments and agencies
f) provide for more useful reporting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Usefulness of reports on achievements prepared by designated departments and agencies and of the insert in the annual report on official languages ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Interviews with spokespersons of organizations representing OLMCs, OCOL, and OLSPB managers ▶ Discussion groups with section 41 national coordinators ▶ Comments on reports on achievements of federal departments and agencies
3. To what extent has the Department of Canadian Heritage been able to foster a coordinated approach among designated federal departments and agencies? What form has this taken?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Specific examples (e.g. signing of multipartite agreements, etc.) ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Interviews with spokespersons of organizations representing OLMCs, OCOL, PCO, TBS, and OLSPB managers ▶ Discussion groups with section 41 national coordinators
4. Have the efforts by PCH led to the creation of partnerships: a) among designated federal departments and agencies? b) between designated federal departments and agencies and OLMCs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Level of participation of designated departments and agencies in the various interdepartmental committees ▶ Number of programs serving OLMCs through the IPOLC ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Interviews with spokespersons of organizations representing OLMCs, OLSPB managers, PCH regional officials, and regional coordinators of designated departments and agencies ▶ Discussion groups with section 41 national coordinators ▶ IPOLC evaluation report ▶ Agenda/minutes of interdepartmental committee meetings
5. Have the planning activities and studies allowed the Department to better understand OLMC needs and tailor its activities accordingly?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Interventions/actions by the Department further to these studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Interviews with spokespersons of organizations representing OLMCs and with OLSPB managers
Cost-effectiveness / Design and delivery		
6. Would an organization other than Canadian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Interviews with spokespersons of organizations

Table 4: Evaluation Framework: Impact of the implementation of section 42 in the designated federal departments and agencies		
Questions	Indicators	Sources
Heritage be better suited to coordinate the implementation of section 41 in the federal government? Which one and why?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> representing OLMCs, TBS, OCOL, PCO and with OLSPB managers ▶ Discussion groups with section 41 national coordinators
<p>7. Have the activities implemented been useful and relevant in achieving the expected results? Should these activities be continued? For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preparation of action plans and reports on achievements? - Coordinators' network activities? - Information, awareness, promotional and training activities and tools? - Consultation mechanisms (sectoral tables, coordinating committee)? - Studies and planning tools? - The IPOLC? <p>Should other delivery methods be considered?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Effectiveness of mechanisms ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders ▶ Conclusions of IPOLC formative evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Interviews with spokespersons of organizations representing OLMCs and OCOL, and with OLSPB managers ▶ Discussion groups with section 41 national coordinators ▶ IPOLC evaluation report
<p>8. Has the coordination of the federal commitment by Canadian Heritage over the last ten years served to increase OLMCs' access to programs and services in their language and to promote more effective and targeted cooperation among all federal departments and agencies?</p> <p>Are the results sufficient in view of the resources allocated? Has the Department truly made a difference?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Level of resources allocated ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Interviews with spokespersons of organizations representing OLMCs, TBS, OCOL, and with OLSPB managers ▶ Discussion groups with section 41 national coordinators

Table 5: Evaluation Framework - Impact of the implementation of section 42 within PCH		
Questions	Indicators	Sources
Relevance		
1. What importance has PCH senior management attached to the implementation of section 41? How was this importance communicated to managers?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders ▶ Contribution to the PCH action plan and to the insert on interdepartmental coordination in the Department's annual report on official languages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Interviews with PCH ADMs ▶ PCH action plan and insert on interdepartmental coordination ▶ Administrative files ▶ Discussions with PCH section 41 sectoral coordinators ▶ Survey of PCH managers
Successes and achievements		
2. To what extent are departmental program managers (other than in the OLSPB) aware of section 41 and did they consider it in the renewal of their programs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Reference in program terms and conditions ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Review of a sampling of program terms and conditions ▶ Discussions with PCH section 41 sectoral coordinators ▶ Survey of managers ▶ Discussion with directors general of key programs
3. To what extent has the Department established lasting relationships with OLMCs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Interviews with spokespersons of organizations representing OLMCs
4. What progress has the Department made over the past decade? Do some sectors still not have a good understanding of their role and responsibilities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Interviews with spokespersons of organizations representing OLMCs ▶ Interviews with OLSPB managers
5. To what extent do the departmental action plans reflect the communities' needs? Are the commitments set out in these plans kept?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Opinion of key stakeholders ▶ Comparison between action plans and PCH reports on achievements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Interviews with spokespersons of organizations representing OLMCs and with directors general of key programs ▶ Administrative files

Appendix B
Research Tools

Evaluation of the Implementation of Section 42 of the *Official Languages Act*

Interview Guide for Organizations representing Official Languages Minority Communities (OLMC)

The Department of Canadian Heritage has engaged PRA Inc. to conduct an evaluation of the implementation of section 42 of the *Official Languages Act* (OLA). Section 42 of the OLA states that the Minister of Canadian Heritage is responsible for encouraging and promoting a coordinated approach to the implementation of the commitments set out in section 41. Therefore, the purpose of this evaluation is to identify results attained and progress achieved by the Department of Canadian Heritage since 1994 in fulfilling this mandate. It will also explore whether the coordination of section 41 is still essential and if the current delivery methods are adequate or if other methods should be considered.

As part of this process, PRA Inc. wants to gather information from a number of key stakeholders. As representatives of official-language minority community organizations (OLMCs), your input is valuable. All information you provide is strictly confidential. You will not be associated with any comments and all interviews will be reported in aggregate form only.

INTRODUCTION

1. Please briefly describe your position within your organization. What are your role and responsibilities? How long have you been in this position?

SUCCESS

As you may know, to perform its responsibilities pursuant to section 42 of the OLA, the Department of Canadian Heritage undertakes a number of activities which can be grouped under four categories:

- Coordination and liaison (e.g. network of section 41 coordinators, interdepartmental working groups, action plans, Canadian Heritage annual report, etc.);
- Communication, promotion, awareness and training (e.g. Bulletin 41-42, presentations to community organizations on section 41, Web site, etc.);
- ▶ Consultation (e.g. sectorial tables and various committees);
- ▶ Research.

2. How did Canadian Heritage coordination activities increase the visibility of section 41 among OLMCs?
3. How did Canadian Heritage coordination activities contribute to increasing the knowledge of OLMCs of the policies and programs of federal departments and agencies?
4. In the last decade, to what extent did federal departments and agencies take concrete measures to better address the needs of minority communities? (Please provide specific examples). Do you have any reason to believe that these measures resulted from some coordination activities undertaken by Canadian Heritage?
5. Given the mandate of Canadian Heritage to foster a coordinated approach among federal departments and agencies, what level of progress did you observe in the past decade?
6. What have been the key achievements resulting from Canadian Heritage coordination activities in the past decade for official-language minority communities?

RELEVANCE

7. Considering the activities undertaken by Canadian Heritage for the implementation of section 41 in the last decade and the current environment, is the coordination of the federal government commitment as set out in section 41 of the OLA still required? If so, why? If not, why not?

DESIGN AND DELIVERY

8. Were Canadian Heritage's efforts well targeted? Is it implementing the right activities to achieve the objectives of section 41? What could Canadian Heritage do better?
9. Are the following activities still relevant and useful:
 - ▶ action plans and reports on achievements?
 - ▶ information, awareness, promotional and training activities and tools (Bulletin 41-42, Web site, etc.)?
 - ▶ consultation mechanisms (sectoral tables, coordinating committee, etc.)?
 - ▶ the Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities (IPOLC)?

10. Are there other activities that should be undertaken? And if so, what are they and for what purpose?
11. Which organization is best suited to implement of section 42 of the OLA and why?

CONCLUSION

12. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you for your participation

**Evaluation of the
Implementation of Section 42 of the *Official Languages Act***

**Interview Guide for
Directors General of key PCH programs (other than OLSPB)**

The Department of Canadian Heritage has engaged PRA Inc. to conduct an evaluation of the implementation of section 42 of the *Official Languages Act* (OLA). Section 42 of the OLA states that the Minister of Canadian Heritage is responsible for encouraging and promoting a coordinated approach to the implementation of the commitments set out in section 41.

Therefore, the purpose of this evaluation is to identify results attained and progress achieved by the Department of Canadian Heritage since 1994 in fulfilling this mandate. In addition, as part of the evaluation, PRA Inc. is conducting a case study of Canadian Heritage in order to better understand the impact of the implementation of section 42 within the Department.

As part of this process, PRA Inc. will be interviewing a number of stakeholders. All information you provide is strictly confidential.

Introduction

1. Please briefly describe your Branch's mandate and your role and responsibilities within this mandate. How long have you been in this position?

Relevance

As you know, section 41 of the OLA states that the Government of Canada is committed to enhancing the vitality of the English and French linguistic communities in Canada and supporting and assisting their development, as well as fostering the full recognition of both English and French in Canadian society.

2. In your opinion, given the current state of affairs, is there still a need for the Government of Canada to pursue these commitments? Please explain your answer.
3. In your view, how relevant is the implementation of section 41 of the OLA to your branch? If applicable, in what ways have you communicated to managers and staff in your branch the relevance and importance of implementing section 41?

4. What major steps has the Department of Canadian Heritage, and more particularly your branch, taken to fulfill these commitments in the past decade?

Success/Results

5. To what extent would you say departmental program managers are aware of section 41 of the OLA? What evidence exists to support your answer? Did departmental program managers consider section 41 in the renewal of their programs?
6. In what ways does your branch contribute to the departmental action plan? What process is used to develop the action plan?
7. Based on your experience, to what extent do the departmental action plans for the implementation of the OLA reflect the communities' needs? What activities are undertaken to ensure an adequate understanding of their needs?
8. To what extent are the commitments set out in the departmental action plans kept? Do you monitor the achievement of results? Please elaborate.
9. What have been the main challenges to implementing section 41 within your branch? Has anything been put in place to overcome these challenges?
10. In your view, to what extent has the Department of Canadian Heritage been successful in promoting a coordinated approach to implementing section 41 within the Department (specifically, among the department's various branches)? What have been the most significant achievements? Please provide examples to support your answer.

Conclusion

11. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you for your participation

Evaluation of the Implementation of Section 42 of the *Official Languages Act*

Interview Guide for Joint Consultative Committee members (Human Resources, Justice, Health, and Immigration)

The Department of Canadian Heritage has engaged PRA Inc. to conduct an evaluation of the implementation of section 42 of the *Official Languages Act* (OLA). Section 42 of the OLA states that the Minister of Canadian Heritage is responsible for encouraging and promoting a coordinated approach to the implementation of the commitments set out in section 41. Therefore, the purpose of this evaluation is to identify results attained and progress achieved by the Department of Canadian Heritage since 1994 in fulfilling this mandate. It will also explore whether coordination of section 41 is still essential and if the current delivery methods are adequate or if other methods should be considered.

As part of this process, PRA Inc. will be interviewing a number of key stakeholders. All information you provide is strictly confidential.

Introduction

1. What community organization/federal department do you represent and what are your roles and responsibilities within this organization?
2. Please provide a brief overview of the joint committee's background, mandate, and objectives. What were the impetus for and intentions behind the creation of the committee?

Relevance

As you know, section 41 of the OLA states that the Government of Canada is committed to enhancing the vitality of the English and French linguistic minority communities in Canada and supporting and assisting their development, as well as fostering the full recognition of both English and French in Canadian society.

3. Given all that has taken place and the current state of affairs, is there still a need for the Government of Canada to pursue these commitments? Please explain your answer.

As previously mentioned, Canadian Heritage has the mandate to encourage and promote a coordinated approach to the implementation by federal institutions of the commitments set out in

section 41.

4. Given the role and mandate of your committee, how do you perceive the role of Canadian Heritage in coordinating the implementation of section 41? Please explain your answer.
5. Is the Department of Canadian Heritage still the best suited organization to coordinate section 41? Why or why not?

Design and Delivery / Alternatives

6. Please describe the working relationship between the Department of Canadian Heritage and your committee. In your view, is this relationship effective? Should it be reviewed and/or improved? Please explain your answer.
7. How does your committee use any of the following activities and tools offered by Canadian Heritage:
 - ▶ action plans and reports on achievements?
 - ▶ information, awareness, promotional and training activities and tools (Bulletin 41-42, Web site, etc.)?
 - ▶ consultation mechanisms (sectoral tables, other committees, etc.)?
 - ▶ the Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities?

In your view, which of these activities are the most effective at achieving results? What, if anything, could be improved?

Success

8. What have been the main activities and initiatives undertaken as a result of your committee's work? What was Canadian Heritage's contribution or involvement, if any, in these activities/initiatives?
9. In what ways has the work of the committee enabled the participating federal department to meet its responsibilities pursuant to section 41?
10. Can you identify specific partnerships that have been established between the participating federal department and the official-language minority community/organizations? If yes, did Canadian Heritage have a part in creating these partnerships? Please elaborate.
11. To what extent would you say improvements in implementing section 41 in your federal department would have taken place without Canadian Heritage's intervention?

Conclusion

12. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you for your participation

Evaluation of the Implementation of Section 42 of the *Official Languages Act*

Interview Guide for Project Managers (Select Departments and Agencies)

The Department of Canadian Heritage has engaged PRA Inc. to conduct an evaluation of the implementation of section 42 of the *Official Languages Act* (OLA). Section 42 of the OLA states that the Minister of Canadian Heritage is responsible for encouraging and promoting a coordinated approach to the implementation of the commitments set out in section 41. Therefore, the purpose of this evaluation is to identify results attained and progress achieved by the Department of Canadian Heritage since 1994 in fulfilling this mandate. It will also explore whether coordination of Section 41 is still essential and if the current delivery methods are adequate or if other methods should be considered.

As part of this process, PRA Inc. will be interviewing a number of key stakeholders. All information you provide is strictly confidential.

Introduction

1. Please briefly describe the project/initiative being examined for this evaluation. What was your involvement in the project/initiative?

Design / Delivery

2. What factors led to the development of this project/initiative? In other words, what was the impetus for its development? To what extent were each of the following players involved:
 - ▶ official-language minority community representatives?
 - ▶ Canadian Heritage?
 - ▶ your department/agency?
3. Please describe in detail the decision-making process for developing and implementing the project/initiative. What steps were taken within your department/agency to develop and implement the project/initiative? What was Canadian Heritage's involvement, if any, throughout these various stages?
4. How is the project/initiative managed within your department/agency? If applicable, in what ways is Canadian Heritage involved in assisting your department/agency to manage the project/initiative?
5. In your view, what factors contributed to the success of the project/initiative? Please elaborate.

Success

6. In your opinion, did Canadian Heritage coordination activities influence the decision of your department/agency to develop and implement this project/initiative? (PROBE: network of national coordinators, information and promotion activities, participation in the federal council, etc.) Please explain your answer.
7. In your opinion, did Canadian Heritage coordination activities allow you to better understand the needs of the official-language minority communities? Please explain your answer.
8. Are there additional activities that could be undertaken by Canadian Heritage to encourage and assist departments and agencies in adopting concrete measures to meet their responsibilities with respect to section 41 of the OLA?
9. Based on your knowledge, has there been any progress, over the last decade, in the extent of activities undertaken by your department to support official-language minority communities? If yes, did the Department of Canadian Heritage have any influence on this progress? Please explain your answer.

Conclusion

10. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you for your participation

Evaluation of the Implementation of Section 42 of the *Official Languages Act*

Interview Guide for Discussion Groups with Section 41 National (and Sectoral) Coordinators

INTRODUCTION

Section 42 of the *Official Languages Act* (OLA) states that the Minister of Canadian Heritage is responsible for encouraging and promoting a coordinated approach to the implementation of the commitments set out in section 41 of the OLA.

The Department of Canadian Heritage has engaged PRA Inc. to conduct an evaluation of the implementation of section 42. The purpose of this evaluation is to identify results attained and progress achieved by the Department of Canadian Heritage since 1994 in fulfilling this mandate. It will also explore the question of whether coordination of section 41 is still essential and if the current delivery methods are adequate or if other methods should be considered.

As part of this process, Canadian Heritage wants to gather information from a number of key stakeholders. As national coordinators of section 41, your input is valuable. All information you provide is strictly confidential and will be reported in aggregate form only.

SUCCESS

As you know, to implement section 42 of the OLA, the Department of Canadian Heritage, mainly through the Interdepartmental Coordination Directorate, implements a number of activities. They can be grouped under four categories: coordination and liaison; communication, promotion and training, and research.

1. What Canadian Heritage coordination activities, if any, have contributed to managers in your department or agency becoming aware of their responsibilities pursuant to section 41?
2. How have Canadian Heritage coordination activities encouraged your department or agency to take concrete measures with respect to implementing section 41?
3. What Canadian Heritage coordination activities, if any, have contributed to increasing the awareness of official-language minority communities about the policies and programs of your department or agency?
4. How have Canadian Heritage coordination activities contributed to strengthening the knowledge and understanding of your department or agency about the needs of the official-

language minority communities and of sectoral and horizontal issues? What effect, if any, did this have on better addressing the needs of minority communities?

5. Has Canadian Heritage been able to foster a coordinated approach among federal departments and agencies? Please explain your response.
6. Have the efforts by Canadian Heritage led to the creation of partnerships:
 - among designated federal departments and agencies? Which ones?
 - between federal departments and agencies and OLMCs? Which ones?

If so, are these partnerships sustainable? Please explain your response.

7. What have been the key achievements resulting from coordination activities implemented by Canadian Heritage in the last decade:
 - within your department or agency?
 - within the official-language minority communities?
8. To what extent do you feel that improvements in implementing section 41 in your department or agency would have taken place without Canadian Heritage's intervention?

RELEVANCE

Canadian Heritage has coordinated the federal commitment relating to section 41 of the OLA for the last ten years.

9. Given the activities engaged in by Canadian Heritage in the past decade and the changing environment, do you feel that coordination of the federal government commitment is still required? Please explain your response.

DESIGN AND DELIVERY

Canadian Heritage allocates certain resources (human and financial) to the implementation of section 42, which translate into various activities.

10. Considering the activities carried out in the last decade to implement section 41, are the results achieved in line with the level of investment (human and financial)?
11. In your opinion, what coordination activities (e.g.; action plans and reports on achievements; information, awareness, promotional and training activities and tools; consultation mechanisms; the Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities [IPOLC]) are the most effective in achieving results?

12. Are there other activities that should be undertaken? And if so, what are they and for what purpose?
13. Would another organization be better suited to assume the coordination responsibility set out in section 42? Which one, and why? If not, why not?

CONCLUSION

14. Do you have any other comments?

Specific question for the focus group with PCH sectorial coordinators regarding design and delivery

The Department of Canadian Heritage is a key player in the implementation of section 41 of the *Official Language Act* and as such is expected to exercise leadership.

- How have senior management implemented section 41 of the OLA within the Department? What has been done to communicate the importance of implementing section 41 to program managers and staff?

Thank you for your participation

Evaluation of the Implementation of Section 42 of the *Official Languages Act*

Interview Guide for the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages (OCOL)

The Department of Canadian Heritage has engaged PRA Inc. to conduct an evaluation of the implementation of section 42 of the *Official Languages Act* (OLA). Section 42 of the OLA states that the Minister of Canadian Heritage is responsible for encouraging and promoting a coordinated approach to the implementation of the commitments set out in section 41.

Therefore, the purpose of this evaluation is to identify results attained and progress achieved by the Department of Canadian Heritage since 1994 in fulfilling this mandate. It also addresses to what extent the coordination role is still relevant in the current environment.

As part of this process, PRA Inc. will be interviewing a number of key stakeholders. All information you provide is strictly confidential.

Introduction

1. Can you describe OCOL's involvement to date in issues relating to sections 41 and 42 of the OLA? Have you produced specific studies relating to these issues? If so, would it be possible to access them?

Relevance

As previously mentioned, the Department of Canadian Heritage is responsible for encouraging and promoting a coordinated approach to the implementation by federal institutions of the commitments set out in Section 41.

2. In your opinion, is there an ongoing need for federal coordination of the implementation of the commitments set out in section 41 of the OLA by one specific department?
3. Is the Department of Canadian Heritage still the best suited organization to coordinate section 41? Why or why not?
4. The *Official Languages Accountability and Coordination Framework*, adopted in 2003, assigns responsibility for horizontal coordination of the *Official Languages Act* to the minister responsible for Official Languages. In your view, is that role different from that of the Minister of Canadian Heritage pursuant to section 42? Do you see their coordination mandates as complementing each other in any way? Please explain your response.

Success / Results

5. To what extent do you feel that the Department of Canadian Heritage has succeeded in promoting a coordinated approach among the designated departments and agencies? What have been the most significant achievements? Please provide examples to support your response.
6. In your view, to what extent have the coordination activities served to increase federal departments' and agencies' knowledge of official language minority community needs? Of sectoral and horizontal issues pertaining to the implementation of Section 41? Please elaborate.
7. In your opinion, have minority communities had increased access to programs and services in their language in the past ten years as a result of the activities undertaken by the Department of Canadian Heritage to implement section 42 of the OLA? Please explain your answer.

Cost-effectiveness / Design and Delivery

8. In your view, are the following activities delivered by the Department of Canadian Heritage still relevant and useful:
 - ▶ action plans and reports on achievements?
 - ▶ information, awareness, promotional and training activities and tools (Bulletin 41-42, Web site, etc.)?
 - ▶ consultation mechanisms (sectoral tables, coordinating committee, etc.)?
 - ▶ the Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities?

Can you think of any other activities that could be more useful and relevant in coordinating the implementation of section 41? If so, which ones, and for what purpose? How would you prioritize the existing activities and the proposed additional activities?

9. In your view, is the Department of Canadian Heritage making good use of the resources allocated for the implementation of section 42? Please explain your answer. Can you suggest any improvements?
10. To your knowledge, what have been the main factors that have influenced the ability of the Department of Canadian Heritage to implement section 42 of the OLA? What have been the main challenges?

Conclusion

11. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you for your participation

**Evaluation of the
Implementation of Section 42 of the *Official Languages Act***

**Interview Guide for
Official Languages Support Program Branch (OLSPB) Managers
(HQ and Regions)**

The Department of Canadian Heritage has engaged PRA Inc. to conduct an evaluation of the implementation of section 42 of the *Official Languages Act* (OLA). Section 42 of the OLA states that the Minister of Canadian Heritage is responsible for encouraging and promoting a coordinated approach to the implementation of the commitments set out in section 41. Therefore, the purpose of this evaluation is to identify results attained and progress achieved by the Department of Canadian Heritage since 1994 in fulfilling this mandate. It will also explore whether the coordination of section 41 is still essential and if the current delivery methods are adequate or if other methods should be considered.

As part of this process, PRA Inc. will be interviewing a number of key stakeholders. All information you provide is strictly confidential. You will not be associated with any comments and all interviews will be reported in aggregate form only.

INTRODUCTION

1. Please briefly describe your position within the Department of Canadian Heritage. What are your role and responsibilities? How long have you been in this position?

SUCCESS

2. In what ways have Canadian Heritage coordination activities raised the visibility of section 41:
 - ▶ within the Department?
 - ▶ within other federal departments and agencies?
 - ▶ within official-language minority communities?
3. What Canadian Heritage coordination activities, if any, have contributed to federal managers becoming aware of their responsibilities pursuant to section 41?

4. How have Canadian Heritage coordination activities encouraged federal departments and agencies to take concrete measures with respect to implementing section 41?
5. What Canadian Heritage coordination activities, if any, have contributed to increasing the awareness of official-language minority communities about the policies and programs of federal departments or agencies?
6. How have Canadian Heritage coordination activities contributed to strengthening the knowledge and understanding of federal departments and agencies about the needs of official-language minority communities and of sectoral and horizontal issues? What effect did this have on better addressing the needs of these communities?
7. How has Canadian Heritage been able to foster a coordinated approach among federal departments and agencies?
8. Have Canadian Heritage efforts led to the creation of partnerships:
 - ▶ among designated federal departments and agencies? Which ones?
 - ▶ between federal departments and agencies and OLMCs? Which ones?

Are these partnerships sustainable? Please explain your response.

9. What have been the key achievements resulting from coordination activities implemented by Canadian Heritage in the last decade:
 - ▶ within the department?
 - ▶ within designated departments and agencies?
 - ▶ within official-language minority communities?

RELEVANCE

10. Given the activities implemented by Canadian Heritage to date and the changing environment, is the coordination of the federal government commitment set out in section 41 still essential? Does it still meet a real need? What gaps remain to be filled?

DESIGN AND DELIVERY

Canadian Heritage plays a key role in the implementation of section 41 of the OLA and as such is expected to exercise leadership.

11. How have Canadian Heritage senior management ensured the implementation of section 41 of the OLA within the Department? What has been done to communicate the importance of implementing section 41 to program managers and staff?
12. In your view, is Canadian Heritage implementing the right activities to achieve the results expected? What, if anything, could be improved?
13. Are the following activities still relevant and useful:
 - ▶ action plans and reports on achievements?
 - ▶ information, awareness, promotional and training activities and tools (Bulletin 41-42, Web site, etc.)?
 - ▶ consultation mechanisms (sectoral tables, coordinating committee, etc.)?
 - ▶ the Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities (IPLC)?
14. Are the results achieved to date in implementing section 41 in line with the level of investment (human and financial) allocated?
15. What have been the main challenges faced by Canadian Heritage in fulfilling its responsibilities pursuant to section 42?
16. In your view, would this coordination responsibility be better suited to some other organization than Canadian Heritage? If so, which one, and why? If not, why not?

CONCLUSION

17. Do you have any other comments that you would like to make concerning this initiative?

Thank you for your participation

Evaluation of the Implementation of Section 42 of the *Official Languages Act*

Interview Guide for the Privy Council Office (PCO)

The Department of Canadian Heritage has engaged PRA Inc. to conduct an evaluation of the implementation of section 42 of the *Official Languages Act* (OLA). Section 42 of the OLA states that the Minister of Canadian Heritage is responsible for encouraging and promoting a coordinated approach to the implementation of the commitments set out in section 41.

Therefore, the purpose of this evaluation is to identify results attained and progress achieved by the Department of Canadian Heritage since 1994 in fulfilling this mandate. It also addresses to what extent the coordination role is still relevant in the current environment.

As part of this process, PRA Inc. will be interviewing a number of stakeholders. All information you provide is strictly confidential.

Introduction

1. Please briefly describe your organization and its mandate.
2. Please briefly describe your position within your organization. What are your role and responsibilities? How long have you been in this position?

Relevance

As you know, section 41 of the OLA states that the Government of Canada is committed to enhancing the vitality of the English and French linguistic minority communities in Canada and supporting and assisting their development as well as fostering the full recognition of both English and French in Canadian society.

3. In your view, what major steps have taken place to fulfill these commitments in the past decade?
4. Given all that has taken place and the current state of affairs, is there still a need for the Government of Canada to pursue these commitments? Why?

As previously mentioned, the Department of Canadian Heritage has a mandate to encourage and promote a coordinated approach to the implementation by federal institutions of the commitments set out in section 41.

5. Given the current state of affairs, is there still a need for federal coordination of section 41?

6. Is the Department of Canadian Heritage still the best suited organization to coordinate section 41? Why or why not?

SUCCESS

7. To your knowledge, what have been the main factors that have influenced the ability of the Department of Canadian Heritage to coordinate section 41? What have been the main challenges?
8. In your view, to what extent has the Department of Canadian Heritage been successful in promoting a coordinated approach among designated federal departments and agencies in the past decade? What have been the most significant achievements?

DESIGN AND DELIVERY / ALTERNATIVES

In 2003, the Government of Canada approved the Action Plan for Official Languages. The Privy Council Office obtained funding to coordinate this initiative.

9. How do the coordination activities delegated to PCO under the Action Plan differ from the coordination responsibilities given to Canadian Heritage under section 42?
10. Is there duplication of effort? Does this situation create confusion for federal departments and agencies? For official-language minority communities?

CONCLUSION

11. Is there anything that you would like to add regarding the implementation of section 42 by Canadian Heritage that could be beneficial to our study?

Evaluation of the Implementation of Section 42 of the *Official Languages Act*

Interview Guide for Regional Coordinators from other designated federal departments and agencies

The Department of Canadian Heritage has engaged PRA Inc. to conduct an evaluation of the implementation of section 42 of the *Official Languages Act* (OLA). Section 42 of the OLA states that the Minister of Canadian Heritage is responsible for encouraging and promoting a coordinated approach to the implementation of the commitments set out in section 41.

Therefore, the purpose of this evaluation is to identify results attained and progress achieved by the Department of Canadian Heritage since 1994 in fulfilling this mandate. It will also explore whether the coordination of section 41 is still essential and if the current delivery methods are adequate or if other methods should be considered.

As part of this process, PRA Inc. will be interviewing a number of key stakeholders. All information you provide is strictly confidential. You will not be associated with any comments and all interviews will be reported in aggregate form only.

INTRODUCTION

1. What are your role and responsibilities within your department/agency?
2. Please briefly describe your role and responsibilities pursuant to section 41 of the OLA. How long have you been in this position?

SUCCESS

3. What Canadian Heritage coordination activities, if any, have contributed to federal managers in your department or agency becoming aware of their responsibilities pursuant to section 41?
4. How have Canadian Heritage coordination activities encouraged managers of your federal department or agency to take concrete measures with respect to implementing section 41?
5. What Canadian Heritage coordination activities, if any, have contributed to increasing the awareness of official-language minority communities about the policies and programs of your federal department or agency?
6. How have Canadian Heritage coordination activities contributed to strengthening the knowledge and understanding of your federal department or agency about the needs of

official-language minority communities and of sectoral and horizontal issues? What effect, if any, did this have on better addressing the needs of these communities?

7. In your view, has Canadian Heritage been able to foster a coordinated approach among federal departments and agencies? Please explain your response.
8. Have Canadian Heritage's efforts led to the creation of partnerships:
 - among designated federal departments and agencies? Which ones?
 - between federal departments and agencies and OLMCs? Which ones?

Are these partnerships sustainable?

9. What have been the key achievements resulting from coordination activities implemented by Canadian Heritage in the last decade:
 - within your department or agency?
 - within official-language minority communities?
10. To what extent would you say that improvements in implementing section 41 in your department/agency would have taken place without Canadian Heritage's intervention?

RELEVANCE

11. Given the activities implemented by Canadian Heritage to date and the changing environment, do you believe that coordination of the federal government commitment set out in section 41 is still essential? Does it still meet a real need? What gaps remain to be filled?

DESIGN AND DELIVERY

12. Considering the activities undertaken in the last decade in implementing section 41, are the results to date in line with the efforts made?
13. In your view, which coordination activities implemented by Canadian Heritage are the most effective in achieving results (e.g. action plans and reports on achievements; information, awareness, promotional and training activities and tools; consultation mechanisms; the Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities)?

What, if anything, could be improved?

14. Are the following activities delivered by Canadian Heritage still relevant and useful:
 - ▶ action plans and reports on achievements?
 - ▶ information, awareness, promotional and training activities and tools (Bulletin 41-42, Web site, etc.)?
 - ▶ consultation mechanisms (sectoral tables, coordinating committee, etc.)?
 - ▶ the Interdepartmental Partnership with the Official-Language Communities?
15. In your view, what have been the main challenges faced by Canadian Heritage in fulfilling its responsibilities pursuant to section 42?
16. Would an organization other than Canadian Heritage be better suited to assume this coordination responsibility? If so, which one, and why? If not, why not?

CONCLUSION

17. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you for your participation

Evaluation of the Implementation of Section 42 of the *Official Languages Act*

Interview Guide for Department of Canadian Heritage Assistant Deputy Ministers (ADM)

The Department of Canadian Heritage has engaged PRA Inc. to conduct an evaluation of the implementation of section 42 of the *Official Languages Act* (OLA). Section 42 of the OLA states that the Minister of Canadian Heritage is responsible for encouraging and promoting a coordinated approach to the implementation of the commitments set out in Section 41.

Therefore, the purpose of this evaluation is to identify results attained and progress achieved by the Department of Canadian Heritage since 1994 in fulfilling this mandate. In addition, as part of the evaluation, PRA Inc. is conducting a case study of Canadian Heritage in order to better understand the impact of the implementation of section 42 within the Department.

As part of this process, PRA Inc. will be interviewing a number of stakeholders. All information you provide is strictly confidential.

Introduction

1. Please briefly describe your sector's mandate and your role and responsibilities within this mandate. How long have you been in this position?

Relevance

As you know, Section 41 of the OLA states that the Government of Canada is committed to enhancing the vitality of the English and French linguistic communities in Canada and supporting and assisting their development, as well as fostering the full recognition of both English and French in Canadian society.

2. In your opinion, given the current state of affairs, is there still a need for the Government of Canada to pursue these commitments? Please explain your answer.
3. In your view, how relevant is the implementation of section 41 of the OLA to your sector? If applicable, in what ways have you communicated to managers and staff in your sector the relevance and importance of implementing section 41?
4. What major steps has the Department of Canadian Heritage, and more particularly, your sector taken to fulfill these commitments in the past decade?

Success/Results

5. What have been the main challenges to implementing section 41 within your sector? Has anything been put in place to overcome these challenges?
6. To what extent are the commitments set out by your sector in the departmental action plans for the implementation of the OLA kept? Do you monitor the achievement of results? Please elaborate.
7. In your view, to what extent has the Department of Canadian Heritage been successful in promoting a coordinated approach to implementing section 41 within the Department (specifically, among the department's various sectors)? What have been the most significant achievements? Please provide examples to support your answer.

Conclusion

8. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you for your participation

Evaluation of the Implementation of Section 42 of the *Official Languages Act*

Interview Guide for the Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS)

The Department of Canadian Heritage has engaged PRA Inc. to conduct an evaluation of the implementation of section 42 of the *Official Languages Act* (OLA). Section 42 of the OLA states that the Minister of Canadian Heritage is responsible for encouraging and promoting a coordinated approach to the implementation of the commitments set out in section 41. Therefore, the purpose of this evaluation is to identify results attained and progress achieved by the Department of Canadian Heritage since 1994 in fulfilling this mandate. It also addresses to what extent the coordination role is still relevant in the current environment.

As part of this process, PRA Inc. will be interviewing a number of stakeholders. All information you provide is strictly confidential.

Introduction

1. Please briefly describe your organization and its mandate, generally and more specifically as it relates to official languages and sections 41 and 42 of the OLA.
2. Please briefly describe your function within your organization. What are your role and responsibilities? How long have you been in this position?

Relevance

As previously mentioned, the Department of Canadian Heritage is responsible for encouraging and promoting a coordinated approach to the implementation by federal institutions of the commitments set out in section 41.

3. Given the current state of affairs, is there still a need for federal coordination of section 41?
4. Is the Department of Canadian Heritage still the best suited organization to coordinate section 41? Why or why not?

Success / Results

5. To your knowledge, what have been the main factors that have influenced the ability of the Department of Canadian Heritage to coordinate section 41? What have been the main challenges?
6. In your view, to what extent has the Department of Canadian Heritage been successful in promoting a coordinated approach among designated federal departments and agencies in the past decade? What have been the most significant achievements?

Design and Delivery / Cost-effectiveness

Treasury Board Secretariat has put in place several mechanisms to support the implementation of section 41 of the OLA, including a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Canadian Heritage, the Network of Departmental Official Languages Champions and the regional councils of senior federal officials (along with their official languages committees).

7. In your opinion, has the MOU between TBS and PCH been an effective tool to support the implementation of section 41 of the OLA? What have been the main strengths and weaknesses of this MOU? What is the current status of the MOU? What are the plans and objectives of TBS with respect to this MOU?
8. What is the relationship, if any, between the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Official Languages Champions? In your view, is the current working relationship between the Department of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages Champions effective? Does it vary between the national and the regional offices? If so, how? Please explain your answer.
9. As the agency responsible for regional councils of senior federal officials and their official languages committees, what has been your relationship with PCH's regional and provincial offices? Can you identify avenues by which PCH could strengthen its support for the federal councils and their official languages committees?
10. In your view, is the Department of Canadian Heritage making good use of the resources allocated for the implementation of section 42? Please explain your answer. Can you suggest any improvements?

Conclusion

11. Is there anything that you would like to add regarding the implementation of section 42 by Canadian Heritage that could be beneficial to our study?

Thank you for your participation

Appendix C
Logic model

Logic model - Implementation of section 42 of the OLA				
Activities	Coordination and liaison	Communication / Awareness / Promotion / Training	Consultation	Planning / Development / Research
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network of national coordinators ▸ Action plans and reports on achievements of federal departments and agencies ▸ PCH annual report on official languages ▸ TBS/PCH MOU ▸ IPOLC MOUs ▸ Working groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Bulletin 41 - 42 ▸ Section 41 coordinators' guide ▸ Promotional material ▸ Web page ▸ Information sessions, teleconferences, etc. ▸ Training sessions ▸ Ad hoc presentations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Meetings of network of section 41 coordinators ▸ Meetings with OLMCs ▸ Participation in the HRDC sectoral tables, the Health Canada Consultative Committees, the Citizenship and Immigration OL Steering Committee, the TBS Champions Committee ▸ PCH coordinating committee ▸ Departmental Official Languages Advisory Committee (DOLAC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Studies
Direct results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Offer a permanent cooperation framework ▸ Clarify and reinforce roles and responsibilities ▸ Create ties with federal departments and agencies with a view to influencing policies and programs ▸ Create partnerships resulting in projects in support of the development of OLMCs ▸ Report on progress made 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Inform section 41 coordinators, interest groups, OLMCs, federal departments and central agencies and the general public ▸ Raise the profile of issues relating to section 41 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Increase OLMCs' knowledge of the policies and programs of federal departments and agencies ▸ Increase federal departments' and agencies' knowledge of OLMC needs and of sectoral and horizontal issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Develop new tools or initiatives ▸ Deepen the understanding of OLMC needs
Medium-term results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Effective and more targeted cooperation among the multiple partners working to further the vitality and development of OLMCs ▸ Increased access for OLMCs to programs and services in their language 			
Long-term result	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Sustainability of OLMCs in Canada 			