



Consulting and Audit  
Canada

An Agency of Public Works  
and Government Services  
Canada

Conseils et Vérification  
Canada

Une agence de Travaux publics  
et Services gouvernementaux  
Canada

**344 4585**

## **PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE**

### **FINAL REPORT**

# **EVALUATION OF THE ACTION PLAN FOR OFFICIAL LANGUAGES CO-ORDINATION PROGRAM**

January 2006

Consulting and Audit Canada

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The Co-ordination Program evaluation team, Louis Cournoyer, Gilles Martin and Stéphane Sauvé-Boulet, wish to extend their warm and sincere thanks to everyone they met in the field, both Program partners and recipients, for their assistance with the evaluation. The team would especially like to mention the co-operative and accommodating managers and staff of the Privy Council Office's Official Languages Branch. The contribution, goodwill and confidence of everyone we interviewed helped us enormously in carrying out this evaluation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	4
I.1	BACKGROUND	4
I.2	EVALUATION OBJECTIVES	5
I.3	EVALUATION STRATEGY	5
II.	EVALUATION RESULTS	6
II.1	RELEVANCE OF PROGRAM DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION	6
II.1.1	Program design	6
II.1.2	Program implementation	9
II.2	EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CO-ORDINATION PROGRAM	12
II.2.1	Expected intermediate outcome - Improved horizontal communication among federal institutions	12
II.2.2	Expected intermediate outcome - Federal institutions are using tools to fulfil their obligations under the Act	14
II.2.3	Expected intermediate outcome - There is increased discussion and improved communication between the Government of Canada and OLMCs	15
II.2.4	Expected intermediate outcome – Consultation processes have been improved at the sectoral and national levels	18
II.2.5	Expected intermediate outcome – Improved scientific and empirical knowledge of language minorities in Canada	21
II.2.6	Expected intermediate outcome – More effective co-ordination among federal institutions in the application of the <i>Official Languages Act</i>	22
III	CONCLUSION AND PROSPECTS	25
	Appendix 1 Evaluation Matrix	27
	Appendix 2 Bibliography	31

## ACRONYMS

Canadian Heritage	PCH
Committee of Deputy Ministers on Official Languages	CDMOL
Health Canada	HC
Horizontal Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework	HRMAF
Human Resources and Skills Development Canada	HRSDC
Industry Canada	IC
Justice Canada	JC
Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages	OCOL
Official Languages	OL
Official Languages Branch	OLB
Official Languages Law Group	OLLG
Official Language Minority Communities	OLMC
Privy Council Office	PCO
Public Service Human Resources Management Agency of Canada	PSHRMAC
Results-Based Management	RBM
Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework	RMAF
Treasury Board Secretariat	TBS

# FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE ACTION PLAN FOR OFFICIAL LANGUAGES CO-ORDINATION PROGRAM

## I. INTRODUCTION

### I.1 Background

On March 12, 2003, the government issued a policy statement on official languages, entitled *The Next Act: New Momentum For Canada's Linguistic Duality - The Action Plan for Official Languages*. The action plan was the result of reports on Official Languages (OL) and extensive consultation with Canada's minority language communities and representatives of the various levels of government and institutions working to promote and protect linguistic duality.

The objective of this five-year plan, with an original budget of \$751.3 million, is to give new momentum to the official languages policy, for the benefit of all Canadians. The Action Plan for Official Languages provides for the allocation of new financial resources for three priority targets: education, community development and the federal Public Service.

The Action Plan also includes an accountability and co-ordination framework which defines the responsibilities of federal institutions involved in enforcement of the *Official Languages Act* (OLA). The accountability and co-ordination framework is intended to:

- make federal institutions more aware of the *Official Languages Act*;
- strengthen the mechanisms for consultation with communities; and,
- improve overall co-ordination of the government's Official Languages Program

To encourage the attainment of these three objectives, the Action Plan also identifies terms and conditions for horizontal co-ordination of the Official Languages Program, which consists of all government initiatives related to official languages. These terms and conditions make up the five-year "Official Languages Co-ordination Program", implementation of which has been assigned jointly to the Privy Council Office (Official Languages Branch of Intergovernmental Affairs) and the Department of Justice (Official Languages Law Group).

About thirty months after the start of implementation of the Official Languages Co-ordination Program, the Official Languages Branch (OLB) of the Privy Council Office (PCO) asked Consulting and Audit Canada (CAC) to prepare a midterm, or formative, evaluation of the program. The work began in July 2005 and lasted about five months.

## I.2 Evaluation objectives

The midterm evaluation examined the appropriateness and implementation of the Official Languages Co-ordination Program. More particularly, it focussed on:

- examining whether the design and execution of the Program were appropriate and effective;
- establishing if the first intermediate results obtained, as targeted by the Program, would lead to:
  - improved horizontal communication among federal institutions;
  - use of tools by federal institutions to meet their OLA obligations;
  - more contact and improved communication between governments and OLMC;
  - improved consultation at the sectoral and national levels;
  - better scientific and empirical understanding of linguistic minorities;
  - more effective co-ordination among federal institutions in application of the OLA;

and, lastly:

- identifying methods or ways of improving the Program's design or implementation, if need be, so as to attain the strategic objectives and outcomes of the Co-ordination Program.

The midterm evaluation is not intended to evaluate attainment of Program outcomes, which will be covered by the final (or summative) evaluation, planned for the last year of implementation. Consequently, it is not intended to examine the efficiency of the Program, that is, determine whether results were attained at a reasonable cost and the extent to which the resources used translated into results that were meaningful in terms of quality and quantity. In addition, the unique nature of the Official Languages Co-ordination Program makes it difficult to compare it with other, similar, horizontal co-ordination programs or approaches to determine whether the same results could be attained at a lower cost. However, in the Conclusion and Outlook section at the end of this report, some recommendations have been included to optimize production of the summative evaluation for the program.

## I.3 Evaluation strategy

To attain the target objectives, the evaluators used a combination of quantitative and qualitative information gathering methods. Following a summary examination of the documentation, the evaluators first drew up a detailed list of evaluation questions, provided in Appendix 1 of the Evaluation Matrix document, which was validated by the OLB. The evaluation questions were sent to the respondents before the interviews. The following methods were then used to obtain the information required to carry out the evaluation mandate:

- a review of files and documents related to the Co-ordination Program;
- a brainstorming workshop with employees of the PCO's OLB;
- in-person and telephone interviews with representatives of the federal government, the provincial governments and official language minority communities;
- analysis of the data and information gathered;
- validation of findings and recommendations with the PCO; and,
- presentation of the interim report to the main Action Plan implementation partners (PCO, PCH, HRMA).

It should be noted that Justice Canada was unable to attend the presentation of the interim report, but had an opportunity to comment on it in writing. Almost fifty interviews were carried out and about seventy-five people participated. Interview participants included:

- PCO and Justice Canada senior management (Official Languages Law Group);
- Co-ordination Program managers (PCO and JC);
- representatives of key federal institution partners of the Program (PCH, HRMA, JC);
- representatives of federal institutions participating in activities in the Program's priority sectors (ie, Canada School of Public Service, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Health Canada, Human Resources and Skills Development Canada, Industry Canada and Social Development Canada);
- Treasury Board Secretariat representatives (in charge of horizontal initiatives);
- representatives of provincial and territorial partners; and,
- community representatives.

All these methods enabled us to obtain a variety of information on progress made, lessons learned, strengths and weaknesses, problems arising along the way and solutions used, continuous performance measurement and any changes made in the original design of the Co-ordination Program. Based on the information obtained, an analysis was carried out to cross reference the data and identify the main findings and lessons learned from implementation of the Program. Lastly, so as to clarify or validate certain information, additional interviews were conducted to establish a clearer profile of the findings.

## **II. EVALUATION RESULTS**

Evaluation results are presented on the basis of the three objectives of the Co-ordination Program, as listed in Point I.2. The report will therefore deal, first of all, with the appropriateness of Program design and implementation, before moving on to the results obtained after thirty months for the six categories of anticipated results. The report also includes a series of recommendations to improve Program implementation. Some of these recommendations result from lessons learned from this initial implementation phase or best practices identified in studies on horizontal co-ordination.

It should also be noted that some anticipated intermediate results concern related and indivisible areas of activity. Better horizontal communications, more dialogue and improved consultation processes are examples of interconnected results sought by the Co-ordination Program. As a result, some of the observations and recommendations may appear redundant to the reader, but are necessary to clarify certain co-ordination details.

### **II.1 APPROPRIATENESS OF PROGRAM DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION**

Evaluation of appropriateness is intended, in this instance, to determine the extent to which the design and implementation of the Co-ordination Program are appropriate and allow for the attainment of the anticipated results.

#### **II.1.1 Program design**

To evaluate the appropriateness of Program design, the evaluators examined the mechanisms, terms and conditions and tools developed to implement the Co-ordination Program.

**Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework (RMAF):** The review of the RMAF developed to help co-ordinate implementation of the Action Plan for Official Languages indicated that adequate thought had been given to historical background and the issues identified in the area of official languages. The RMAF proposes appropriate harmonization of strategic objectives, inputs and overall outcomes to be attained over a five-year period. The interviews carried out during the evaluation confirmed that the areas of activity of the Co-ordination Program in large measure reflect the concerns expressed by all the stakeholders in the area of OL, including, in particular, the Official Language Minority Communities (OLMC). These communities expressed a very high degree of satisfaction with regard to this mechanism for co-ordination management, since it was aimed at increased government accountability, improved reporting and clear leadership with regard to official languages. In particular, the consultations planned with communities by the key ministers and senior management of departments involved in the Action Plan were, for the vast majority of respondents, an appropriate response to the need for departments to learn more about the needs of the communities and for representatives of linguistic minorities to develop a better understanding of government programs and operating methods.

With regard to the risks related to implementation of the Co-ordination Program identified in the RMAF and the mitigation measures developed, it would seem that, almost thirty months after the start of implementation of the Co-ordination Program, they remain relevant and have, to some extent, guided senior management in implementing the Action Plan. In addition, recognizing that the partners in implementation of the Action Plan could not control the risk for official language minority communities of a lack of data, it was wisely decided, during design of the RMAF, to conduct a post-census survey to lessen the risk.

In short, both the review of the RMAF and the interviews indicated that the management document to help co-ordinate implementation of the Action Plan for Official Languages is, in general, highly appropriate.

**Roles and responsibilities of implementation partners:** Although the roles of the four main Action Plan implementation partners are included in the plan, interviews almost thirty months after the launch of Program implementation indicate that the vast majority of respondents would still like roles and responsibilities to be clarified and to be complementary among the departments, especially PCH and the PCO. Even though the Action Plan Accountability and Co-ordination Framework spells out the roles and responsibilities of the implementation partners under the *Official Languages Act*, clarification is also required because this information has not been adequately disseminated among the communities. In addition, the review of the RMAF indicated the need for a more detailed definition of the roles and responsibilities of the PCO and, to a lesser extent, JC, which are jointly responsible for implementation of the Co-ordination Program, as compared with those of the Public Service Human Resources Management Agency of Canada (PSHRMAC) and Canadian Heritage (PCH). The research documents on horizontal co-ordination consulted (see Bibliography in Appendix 2) mention the importance of a clear division of responsibilities and their widespread distribution among implementation partners as soon as such an initiative is begun.

**The Committee of Deputy Ministers on Official Languages (CDMOL) and the Support Committee:** Official confirmation of the role of the CDMOL is considered by respondents overall as an appropriate response to the problems related to political mobilization and strengthening of culture in the area of official languages in the Public Service. The main partners in implementation of the Action Plan confirmed, overall, the relevance of the CDMOL and its leadership in the management of official languages programs, particularly in terms of promoting

collective accountability for fostering linguistic duality and encouraging the use of both official languages in the workplace. More specifically, the governance structure created under the Action Plan is considered by the vast majority of respondents as having:

- fostered synergy among the players and, in general, mutual trust among members;
- improved thinking on the approach and tools to promote attainment of the desired outcomes;
- identified differences in the roles and responsibilities assigned to PCH, HRMA, JC and the PCO;
- encouraged discussions on ways of promoting more effective horizontal co-ordination;
- reviewed the performance of the Co-ordination Program;
- initiated joint action on a range of points discussed by the CDMOL, the Support Committee and working groups; and,
- promoted a better understanding of OL issues, including extent of project completion, legal risks, policy issues and measures implemented by the OLB.

In addition, it is acknowledged by respondents overall that the CDMOL provides a unique opportunity to bring the representatives of the ten departments directly involved in implementation of the Action Plan together around the same table, and to foster greater understanding of the concerns and interests of the partners. The initiative is all the more important in that studies on the subject have established that effective horizontal co-ordination demands open and voluntary co-operation among the partners.

However, a strong majority of respondents reported a lack of complementarity between the discussions held in the CDMOL and the Support Committee. While the CDMOL has had its mandate clarified by the Clerk of the Privy Council, the Support Committee still does not have a clear reference document on its mandate and the outcomes to be attained. The vague terms of reference and the newness of the Committee have resulted in duplication of functions between the CDMOL and the Support Committee. This situation has sometimes meant that the CDMOL and the Support Committee repeated the same discussions. In addition, the lack of a clear framework for outcomes in the terms of reference does not encourage member support for the administrative aspects of Action Plan implementation, particularly with regard to sharing of best practices by members.

**Recommendation 1: To promote greater complementarity between the CDMOL and the Support Committee and strengthen governance, it is recommended that the roles and responsibilities of these committees and the strategic results targeted be more clearly defined.**

Lastly, poor attendance by deputy ministers at CDMOL meetings has been noted over the past eighteen months. Among the reasons cited are the limited level of strategic intervention within the CDMOL, too many meetings, duplication of functions with the Support Committee and the tardy transmission of information and notices of meetings. In light of this information, it would be a good idea for the OLB to remind deputy ministers of the mandate and strategic importance of the CDMOL and to initiate mechanisms to correct the situations identified above which have an impact on attendance at committee meetings.

**Performance measurement strategy:** The performance measurement strategy developed for the Co-ordination Program proposes a range of relevant guidelines for the formative and summative evaluations, as well as a suitable framework for the strategy to promote the implementation and utilization of a continuous system for gathering and archiving data on the

level of achievement of the immediate, intermediary and final results of the Co-ordination Program.

In addition, it was determined during the interviews with OLB staff that most of them were not aware of the existence of the Program's performance measurement strategy and that not enough work had been done to make the strategy known. It would also appear that development of the measurement strategy had taken precedence at the OLB over the need to establish a strong corporate memory and to acquire staff who were highly experienced in results-based management (RBM) so as to implement the measurement strategy.

**Recommendation 2: Since the PCO is involved in a complex co-ordination initiative, it is strongly recommended that the OLB strengthen its corporate memory, including the RBM skills of its employees, so as to be able to continuously measure results and lessons learned from implementation of the Co-ordination Program and establish mechanisms to disseminate data to its partners.**

**Recommendation 3: Given the large number and wide range of results to be attained in the coming years, it is recommended that the OLB develop communications tools to make its employees and key partners more aware of its RMAF and encourage the development of a collective vision of results to be attained.**

In order to strengthen this measurement strategy, the OLB could review the performance indicators to obtain a better balance between the qualitative and quantitative aspects of results (eg, number and quality of joint activities, level and quality of co-ordination network integration, etc).

## **II.1.2 Program implementation**

The Co-ordination Program was implemented as planned, but with a slight lag in the attainment of results. This situation resulted from both a delay in the allocation of budgets and staffing and an inadequate number of employees at the OLB to fully carry out its responsibilities in co-ordinating implementation of the government's Official Languages Program.

Given this situation at the start, the evaluators are of the opinion that, 30 months after the start of implementation, the appropriateness of the Co-ordination Program's design, combined with the implementation approach advocated by the OLB, have favoured attainment of a large proportion of the anticipated outcomes. We will look at the results in more detail in the section on effectiveness. To evaluate the appropriateness of program implementation, we examined the main factors or mechanisms established in this regard.

**HRMAF horizontal co-ordination:** The decision to develop a Horizontal Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework (HRMAF) so as to initiate OL reporting for all government programs is considered by the evaluators to be a cornerstone of horizontal co-ordination and a convenient mechanism for the effective reporting of accomplishments to Canadians. However, this is a new approach, meaning that all the implementation partners have to buy into it to a significant degree. The interviews conducted during the evaluation indicated a low level of buy-in with regard to the objectives and results presented in the HRMAF. The partners would have been more likely to embrace the HRMAF, and, consequently, its objectives and anticipated results, had they been made more aware of the implementation context, objectives, purpose and advantages of development and use of this tool. Respondents often

mentioned the limited time for discussion of the HRMAF. This lack of time is one of the reasons why the partners have not embraced the HRMAF.

Some aspects of co-ordination design were not adequately developed, which was detrimental to attainment of the anticipated outcomes in terms of horizontal co-ordination. In this regard, it would be a good idea to look at the factors that limited the effectiveness of the horizontal co-ordination as initially planned.

- the lack of resources at the OLB, combined with the fact that it was a new organization, not sufficiently structured and with limited skills in terms of results-based management (RBM);
- the relative novelty of horizontal co-ordination within the federal government;
- the limited time (less than 30 months) to implement the many initiatives related to the Action Plan;
- the lack of a communications strategy to foster optimal synergy with all implementation partners;
- the fact that RMAFs for sectoral programs were developed before the HRMAF, resulting in a lack of harmonization between the management and accountability frameworks.

**Recommendation 4: It is recommended that the OLB, together with its implementation partners, ensure that the RMAFs for sectorial programs and the HRMAF are brought in line.**

Despite the lack of buy-in and notwithstanding the fact that a silo approach to management and communication in departments involved in implementation of the Action Plan was sometimes an issue in implementation co-ordination activities, it would appear that the implementation approach favoured by the OLB strongly encouraged the emergence of greater synergy and co-operation among departments. In the face of resistance on the part of some departments which, from all appearances, considered the PCO's presence unnecessary in their own areas of activity, the PCO took a proactive approach in supporting, advising and meeting its partners. Respondents overall mentioned the PCO's sustained attention to identifying the implementation and reporting problems encountered by the departments. The review of the documentation on horizontal co-ordination confirms the soundness of such an approach, intended in general to convince rather than force players to participate diligently in implementation.

In terms of the promotion of OL within the federal government, the OLB carried out its role in an exemplary fashion through many activities at the political level and with senior management. It emerges clearly from the interviews that the OLB took advantage of the PCO's position as a central agency to encourage and, in rare instances, instigate, meetings to solve some implementation problems reported by departments or communities.

Still in the context of horizontal co-ordination, in 2004, the PCO set up an extranet site to facilitate communications related to development of the HRMAF and foster a continuous exchange of information among federal institutions and co-operation among all the partners affected by linguistic duality. The site has recently been improved to respond to the communications needs of the support committees and the CDMOL. Site functions are relevant and provide users with an opportunity to upload and download working, research and general interest documents and disseminate general information aimed at the public, Action Plan implementation partners and persons working in the area of official languages. In light of the review of the extranet site, evaluators are of the opinion that the PCO has made a wise investment in developing this communications tool. The interviews and consultation of the site,

however, indicate that the extranet needs to be updated more regularly to maintain, or even improve, the level of use of the site. From the standpoint of horizontal co-ordination, it is important that the HRMAF become a true strategic planning, co-ordination and reporting tool. To this end, the extranet site could be improved to provide an interactive version of the HRMAF, with a search function that would allow more user-friendly browsing and make it possible for users to find results, indicators, risks and any other information related to the HRMAF.

**Recommendation 5: Given the major challenges to be met with regard to implementation of the HRMAF, it is recommended that the OLB strengthen its internal capabilities in the area of horizontal co-ordination, so as to be able to respond diligently to requests for information and support from Action Plan implementation partners.**

To a lesser extent, in order to respond to the problems associated with the silo-type operations of some departments and encourage better horizontal co-ordination, it would be a good idea for the CDMOL to take the initiative in identifying growth-generating horizontal OL initiatives. The review of documentation on horizontal co-ordination and comments from a large number of respondents indicate that the operating method of some departments is conditioned by a tradition of operating in silos, where priorities are more sectoral and much less cross-cutting.

**Consultations with Official Language Minority Communities:** The decision to hold consultations between Official Language Minority Communities (OLMC) and departments and senior officials would appear appropriate insofar as these consultations open a wider door to the various government departments for community representatives. In addition, the consultations are a new opportunity for community representatives to learn more about the objectives of some government programs and the related administrative and financial terms and conditions, as well as the context in which senior public servants have to manage. The consultations also allowed both ministers and senior officials to learn, for the first time, directly from the source, about the interests and concerns of the communities. Most of the respondents questioned in this regard lauded the work of the OLB in preparing for the official consultations with ministers and senior officials. These efforts allowed for a better definition of the parameters of the discussions with ministers and senior officials and gave the communities an opportunity to prepare their input more thoroughly.

However, community respondents had diverging points of view with regard to the format and frequency of the consultations. For example, the large number of participants and the limited time they had to intervene were often mentioned as elements that did not foster true consultation with the ministers, but rather a mere exchange of information. Most respondents also had reservations about the strategic contribution of these consultations. The reservations related mainly to the relevance of the agenda items and the lack of resources for preparing the consultations and presentation documents. It was also pointed out that the 12-month period between ministerial consultations was too short and that an 18-month cycle would perhaps be an improvement. Some respondents said that the communities had to be given enough time to produce the desired results, so as to prevent the departments and the communities from running out of steam in preparing for and holding the consultations.

**Recommendation 6: In order to improve the effectiveness of consultations with communities, it is recommended that the OLB :**

- **clarify the overall framework for the consultations and take another look at their frequency;**

- **obtain feedback from participants on the results of the consultations, to enable communities to prepare better for the next consultation sessions, encourage buy-in to the consultation process and keep up interest in future consultations.**

Lastly, the community representatives and senior officials met also suggested the use of themes for the consultations, including:

- capacity building with regard to RBM;
- communications products to be developed by communities to keep their members and the federal and provincial governments better informed;
- the Enabling Fund for Official Language Minority Communities.

Given the substantial needs of the communities in terms of reporting, and considering the high level of confidence community representatives have in the OLB, it is suggested that the OLB, in co-operation with its partners, look into the possibility of increasing the RBM capacities of recipients.

## **II.2 EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CO-ORDINATION PROGRAM**

Within the framework of this formative or midterm evaluation, the assessment of effectiveness involves determining the extent to which the design and implementation of this horizontal Co-ordination Program have allowed for attainment of the Program's expected intermediate outcomes. For each of the six expected intermediate outcomes presented in section 2, the evaluators have attempted, insofar as is possible, to answer the questions in the evaluation matrix (Appendix 1) and to measure performance based on the indicators identified for each question. To make it easier to read and understand their observations, we have included the evaluation questions and performance indicators for each intermediate outcome at the beginning of each section.

### **II.2.1 Expected intermediate outcome - Improved horizontal communication among federal institutions**

<b>QUESTIONS</b>	<b>INDICATORS</b>
Has a horizontal RMAF been developed for the Action Plan with the departments represented, including a series of common indicators and an evaluation plan?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Type of HRMAF developed</li> <li>➤ Types and quality of common indicators and joint evaluation plans developed</li> <li>➤ Type of evaluation planned</li> </ul>
Has there been an improvement in horizontal communication among federal institutions?  If so, provide specific examples of types and method of communication.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Type and number of joint activities (committees, consultations, discussions, etc, including the group consulted, the frequency, etc)</li> <li>➤ Outcomes of these discussions that have led to the development and implementation of solutions</li> <li>➤ Degree of horizontal intervention resulting from the co-ordination</li> <li>➤ Frequency and quality of communications to date</li> </ul>

One significant outcome of the initial implementation phase of the Co-ordination Program was the Horizontal Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework (HRMAF), a tool developed by the OLB in co-operation with the 10 federal institutions and Action Plan community

stakeholders. This framework, a ground-breaking initiative for the federal government in the area of OL, has been used as a basis for identifying, among other things, aggregated outcomes and indicators relating to official languages; links between departmental activities and programs; and, the achievement of expected outcomes. For the most part, respondents acknowledged:

- the conceptual significance of a framework such as this in determining the extent to which sectoral accomplishments have contributed to the collective effort for the achievement of the objectives of the Action Plan;
- the importance of the framework as a tool to clarify the responsibilities of each institution and strengthen links between the federal government and Official Language Minority Communities.

The literature review and interviews reveal that the PCO's participation in the development of the framework has led to improved horizontal communication among all partners involved who, for the first time ever, have engaged in a collective exercise involving the identification, aggregation, accountability and allocation of results.

In addition, further to a comparative analysis of the HRMAF developed by the PCO, and of the developmental principles for this crosscutting framework defined by the Treasury Board Secretariat, it appears that the majority of these principles have been respected, both in terms of transparency and flexibility, allowing for adjustment to changes over time. However, although they acknowledge the value added of this tool for improving horizontal communication, the vast majority of the respondents find the accountability and co-ordination framework to be complex and potentially difficult to manage. At the current time, a number of partners do not feel that this tool provides a real opportunity for improved understanding of program alignment in terms of results and the use of resources. According to the evaluators, this overriding perception among the respondents they spoke to results from the fact that HRMAF stakeholders are not totally familiar with horizontal co-ordination and performance measurement tools.

Awareness efforts will nonetheless be required to ensure that partners adopt this tool and, in particular, the objectives and expected outcomes, even though the Minister of Official Languages and the PCO have repeatedly stressed the adaptive and innovative nature of this management framework. Since the culture of working in silos still seems to predominate within the federal apparatus, the evaluators believe that the development of the HRMAF has provided a sound base for fostering improved horizontal communication between partners.

**Recommendation 7: In order to increase buy-in among HRMAF partners, it is imperative that the OLB develop and implement a communication and support strategy for implementation of the framework in order to demystify this co-ordination and performance measurement tool.**

In conjunction with this communication and support strategy, it will be important for the OLB and its partners involved in the implementation of the Co-ordination Program to specify, in the coming months, certain results and key indicators in order to ensure efficient and diligent reporting of results by federal institutions and community organizations by the end of the next year.

It should be noted that the data collection process associated with the HRMAF now involves the regular collecting of data from recipients, partners and other stakeholders, such as provincial and territorial governments, for the purpose of making comparisons and cross-sectional analyses and identifying trends or spotting potential problems. This process should also

contribute to improved horizontal co-operation. The Treasury Board Secretariat recently indicated that, from now on, all RMAFs submitted for the purpose of obtaining funding for initiatives or programs must include information on specific official languages indicators and performance measurement criteria. This decision will lead to improved consideration of OL issues, as stipulated in the Action Plan.

## II.2.2 Expected intermediate outcome - Federal institutions are using tools to fulfil their obligations under the Act

QUESTIONS	INDICATORS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To what extent has advice from PCO, PCH, TBS and JC given federal institutions a better understanding of their obligations and commitments?</li> <li>- What are the most common shortcomings?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Number of legal advisors with language rights' training</li> <li>➤ Number and types of questions about these responsibilities (frequency of use of legal opinions, advice and other documents provided by PCO and JC)</li> <li>➤ Types of shortcomings identified by stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What tools are available to federal institutions to help them adequately fulfil their obligations? Are these tools being used?</li> <li>- Has a supply and demand analysis been performed for these tools?</li> <li>- Do you have any suggestions for new tools?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Frequency of use of legal opinions, advice and other documents provided by PCO and JC</li> <li>➤ Number of requests by federal institutions for information or documents</li> <li>➤ Type and amount of evidence in MCs and other reports from departments and agencies that the tools are being used</li> <li>➤ Type, availability and access to all other tools deemed useful and necessary</li> <li>➤ Perception of the level of knowledge of federal government employees</li> </ul>

Responsibility for developing and implementing tools aimed at ensuring that government institutions comply with the OLA is shared by JC, PSHRMAC and PCH. However, the roles and responsibilities assigned to each of these institutions are vague and open to wide interpretation by the stakeholders as to the attribution of results. Despite these grey areas, as well as a lack of information on results produced by PSHRMAC and PCH, information obtained and interviews conducted point to concrete results stemming from the work of JC's Official Languages Law Group (OLLG). Progress was noted with respect to the development of legal tools, training, horizontal monitoring and legal advice. These results include:

- the production (drafting, translation, revision) of 35 summaries of Supreme Court rulings, which the OLLG will soon publish on the JC intranet site so that case law information on linguistic rights is available on-line to all members of the Department;
- the production of summaries of language-related disputes, which are sent out on a monthly basis;
- the preparation and publishing of analysis bulletins;
- the publication in 2004 of the official records of the conference entitled "Access to Justice in Both Official Languages: English and French Before Federal Courts."
- twenty awareness sessions dealing with linguistic rights and the accountability frameworks, given to certain JC regional offices, various departmental legal services, and Group clients between 2003 and 2005;

- an awareness and information session was given in 2005 to communications officers from various federal institutions who are in charge of implementing sections 11 and 30 of the OLA;
- broader, systematized and more sophisticated OLB monitoring activities since the implementation of the Action Plan; and
- the creation of a network of co-ordinators for language-related litigation further to a directive from the Assistant Deputy Attorney General indicating that the OLLG must be consulted in all litigation involving official language issues.

Although the work of the Group appears to have had positive results in terms of awareness of the issues, information sharing and co-operation, as well as the more sustainable considerations of language-related issues in various high-profile cases, a lot remains to be done if the expected outcomes of the RMAF are to be achieved. At the current time, there is a risk that a possible increase in demand for services (relating to legal services, for example) would prejudice the ability of the OLLG to achieve these expected outcomes. New factors, such as the emergence of new problems stemming from the rulings of tribunals and possible changes to the OLA, will create new requirements in terms of advisory services. The evaluators believe that, within this context, the possibility of additional resources for 2006 should be examined in order to boost the response capacity of the OLLG.

In conclusion, some performance measurement framework indicators in this component of the Co-ordination Program could not be properly documented in this evaluation because of a lack of adequate mechanisms for measuring outcomes on an ongoing basis. Particular attention should be paid to this component in the final evaluation.

**Recommendation 8: Within a context of horizontal co-ordination, it is recommended that, once the roles and responsibilities regarding the implementation of the Action Plan have been clarified, these roles and responsibilities be associated with specific expected outcomes for each partner.**

**II.2.3 Expected intermediate outcome - There is increased discussion and improved communication between the Government of Canada and OLMCs**

QUESTIONS	INDICATORS
<p>- Is there a communication plan and strategy and other tools to better support and raise the awareness of partners, including federal institutions?</p> <p>- Do you have any recommendations for improving communication?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ Type and quality of the communication plan, strategy and tools implemented</li> <li>➢ Number of meetings at various levels</li> <li>➢ Types of improvements noted by stakeholders</li> <li>➢ Degree to which the frequency of consultations at the sectoral and national levels has increased</li> <li>➢ Degree to which the number of memorandums sent by communities as part of consultations or in regard to specific issues has increased</li> <li>➢ Usefulness and accessibility of Web sites for the communities concerned</li> <li>➢ Type and amount of opinions and advice provided by PCO and JC as compared with two years ago</li> <li>➢ Nature and number of communication products providing information on services versus baseline</li> </ul>

Interviews with representatives of Official Language Minority Communities (OLMCs) revealed a marked increase in communication between these communities and the federal government since the creation of the Co-ordination Program. Examples of initiatives that have fostered this increased communication include the direct involvement of the communities in the revision of the HRMAF, their participation in the production and revision of certain sections of the midterm report, and the communities' frequent requests to the OLB to facilitate their access to certain departments. As a result, there is a high level of satisfaction on the part of OLMC representatives as concerns the OLB's role as an intermediary. Moreover, the OLB has conducted numerous formal and informal activities aimed at increasing the instances of direct contact between OLMCs and the Minister responsible for Official Languages, as well as with a number of senior executives. The majority of the respondents told the evaluators that they had a greater sense that the government was listening to what they were saying, since they had been given an opportunity to express their specific requirements and concerns within the context of pre-consultations, working groups and official consultations that had taken place over the past thirty months.

The representatives also mentioned the quality of communication products, improved access to departments, and more abundant and relevant information about programs and the terms and conditions of contribution applications. In certain cases, these interactions resulted in new funding for communities. In this respect, almost all of the respondents said that the OLB had played an instrumental role in improving this communication. Indeed, an impressive number of representatives applauded the OLB and its staff for their user-friendly and proactive approach when it came to responding to their requests for information and facilitating access to the government's broad OL network. This component has been a tremendous and unequivocal success for the PCO and its partners. Within this context, it is recommended that the OLB maintain this high level of openness towards the communities and continue its communication initiatives aimed at guiding these communities to the services and programs available within the federal government. In order to develop a more in-depth and systematic understanding of the capacity-building requirements of OLMCs, the OLB, in co-operation with its federal government partners, could develop a questionnaire for the communities aimed at identifying their needs in terms of the formulation, collection and communication of the results of their activities relating to the implementation of the Action Plan. The findings of this pre-consultation could also be used in a more formal consultation process aimed at guiding preparation of the 2008 Action Plan.

At the same time, there was a lot of criticism from community representatives regarding administrative delays among certain departmental divisions with respect to the processing of contribution and disbursement requests, and also as concerns the transparency of communications issued by some departments. Given the important role played by certain departments in the implementation of the Action Plan, the OLB should work with its partners to identify the problems associated with the implementation and attempt, insofar as is possible, to come up with solutions to these problems. Furthermore, from a horizontal co-ordination perspective, in which best management practices are the order of the day, the OLB, in co-operation with the Treasury Board Secretariat, should identify, document, and make available to the ten partner departments, standards for the delivery of programs and services linked to the objectives of the Action Plan.

The question of the use and accessibility of Web sites did not come up very often during interviews with community representatives. This can be explained by the fact that:

- the extranet site has not been updated for almost 12 months;
- there is no strategy for promoting the Websites among partners;
- information about OL is general in nature and incomplete (for example, in the research sector, there is a lack of varied and complete information);
- the sites are too linear and do not have a dynamic tree structure for searching information.

In light of the above, it would be advisable to periodically update the extranet site to ensure that it provides relevant information for all parties involved in the implementation of the Action Plan, including:

- an interactive directory of government resources providing the e-mail addresses and responsibilities of federal and provincial officials involved in the implementation of the Action Plan and other OL programs;
- a database of community organizations;
- maps identifying minority communities;
- a portal to directories of OL best practices (regardless of whether or not they appear elsewhere);
- links to members of networks involved in the implementation of certain expected outcomes of departmental RMAFs and the HRMAF; and
- a scorecard of outcomes by sector to complement the midterm report.

Literature on horizontal co-ordination seems to point to the fact that the officials in charge of the implementation of a program need to be innovative in terms of communication in order to better reach clients increasingly drowned in a sea of information, and to foster the development of a collective vision of outcomes and a common understanding of the means for achieving them. Although this approach involves considerable work during the development phase of a program, it seems, according to studies on horizontal co-ordination, to lead to a reduction in management costs, resulting from a lower degree of resistance, and to foster the achievement of expected outcomes. The OLB could use this opportunity to take advantage of the cutting-edge expertise of the government and the private sector in the IT field in order to provide the PCO, and subsequently, its partners, with the information technology required to meet the tremendous challenges associated with the management and horizontal flow of information and knowledge. The OLB could also take advantage of the expertise and experience of its departmental partners involved in the implementation of the Action Plan in order to put in place a horizontal communication tool such as this.

**Recommendation 9: In order to promote enhanced information sharing among the partners involved in the implementation of the Action Plan, it is recommended that the OLB improve the quantity and quality of the information on its Websites, as well as the sites' functionalities and user-friendliness.**

Finally, given that horizontal co-ordination involves a large number of players, many of whom are often participating on a voluntary basis, the OLB, when communicating with departments and agencies, should adopt the approach that is used in its communications with OLMCs. For example, the OLB could hold workshops on networking, horizontal communication and knowledge management. It could also promote the adoption of best practices by partners as concerns horizontal co-operation for the achievement of collective and individual outcomes.

## II.2.4 Expected intermediate outcome - Consultation processes have been improved at the sectoral and national levels

QUESTIONS	INDICATORS
<p>- Are you more knowledgeable about your contacts in official language communities and their needs?</p> <p>- Do you have any suggestions as to how this knowledge could be improved?</p> <p>- To what extent have consultation processes improved further to the implementation of the Co-ordination Program?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Types and number of organizations representing OLMCs consulted (versus baseline)</li> <li>➤ Degree to which section 17 has been adopted by federal institutions (versus baseline)</li> <li>➤ Examples and number of best practices in terms of consultation with communities (versus baseline)</li> <li>➤ Communities' opinion of the consultation process</li> <li>➤ Types of improvements to the consultation process (versus baseline)</li> </ul>

**National consultations:** To date, five national consultations have taken place (three with senior executives and two with ministers), in addition to about ten pre-consultations on the development of the HRMAF and the midterm report. The majority of the players interviewed reported a growing degree of satisfaction with the overall consultation process, which has been improved on an ongoing basis over the past thirty months.

A majority of the respondents who work in the government said that these consultations provided them with a better understanding of the needs and concerns of the OLMC representatives. Based on information received, it appears that the consultations have also led to a significant consolidation of the participation of communities and departments in the development of the HRMAF. At the same time, the crosscutting and multi-sectoral co-operation that resulted from these consultations have fostered a mutual understanding of the viewpoints of the communities and the government with respect to expected outcomes and performance measurement indicators. Comments received during the evaluation and a review of official records from the consultations reveal that OLB management has adopted a proactive approach (working groups, informal consultations, etc) aimed at ensuring a significant contribution from OLMCs to Co-ordination Program outputs, such as the midterm report, for example. This initiative illustrates the commitment of implementation partners to ensuring that communities' viewpoints on matters relating to their development and vitality are adequately reflected.

This concept of vitality, which appears to be at the centre of communities' concerns, was more clearly defined during consultations leading up to the development of the HRMAF. One essential condition is that communities have the tools required to maintain and develop this vitality. This implies a capacity to define, in terms of outcomes, the objectives sought by members of OLMCs and the means to evaluate their degree of completion.

**Recommendation 10:** In order to increase co-ordination efficiency, which depends on the commitment and ability of stakeholders to implement programs or projects, it is recommended that the OLB identify, in co-operation with its partners, the specific requirements of OLMCs in terms of project planning, design, implementation and monitoring.

Some community representatives noted that, in a number of instances, their messages were forwarded to the officials in charge of certain files, who subsequently contacted OLMC representatives directly to provide clarifications or respond to their concerns. In addition, the direct involvement of the Minister responsible for Official Languages in dealings with certain departments resulted in the fast tracking of their requests for information or action to resolve implementation problems. These actions, among others reported to the evaluators, seem to have contributed to the OLMCs' increased level of satisfaction with the consultation process adopted as part of the implementation of the Action Plan.

As was mentioned in the previous section, the evaluators noted that the extent to which OLMCs were well prepared for the consultations had a significant impact on the nature and quality of the response from departments once the consultations were finished.

**Recommendation 11: In order to improve consultations and enable OLMCs to be better prepared, it is recommended that the OLB send the agenda to participating organizations at least six weeks prior to the consultations, along with examples of best practices or suggestions on how to prepare for the consultations.**

The interviews and the review of the official records of the consultations revealed that it is difficult for communities to keep track, on an ongoing basis, of action taken as a direct result of the consultations. This may be explained by the fact that:

- during the current consultations, a lot of time is devoted to communicating the results of the Action Plan to the various departments (whereas this could be done prior to the consultations);
- there are too many participants to allow in-depth discussions on strategic issues or the primary concerns of communities, ministers or senior executives; and
- further to the consultations, there is no written report on achieved sectoral outcomes.

In order to ensure follow-up further to the consultations, the OLB should send a summary of the results of the consultations to OLMC representatives at least two weeks prior to subsequent consultations, and should develop and use a report template to identify action taken in response to recommendations made by representatives, senior executives and ministers during the consultations.

**Sectoral consultations:** Section 17 of the Accountability and Co-ordination Framework in the Action Plan stipulates that “[...] every federal institution [...] will need to [...] consult affected publics as required, especially representatives of official language minority communities, in connection with the development or implementation of policies or programs.”

Some OLMC representatives noted improved sectoral consultations resulting from new consultation structures and a greater awareness on the part of government officials of the importance of holding effective consultations with communities. In order to comply with Part VII of the *Official Languages Act* and the provisions of the Action Plan, certain departments have introduced a number of initiatives aimed at improving sectoral consultations. Health Canada's Official Language Community Development Bureau (OLCDB) has adopted a policy aimed at encouraging branches and regional offices to work with OLMCs in order to make it easier for them to access the Department's programs and services. Respondents from this sector felt that this policy, the goal of which is to establish fair access for OLMCs, led to an improved understanding of communities' needs. Interviews with community representatives revealed a high degree of satisfaction with the consultation model adopted by Health Canada (HC), which

promotes greater community involvement in the implementation of programs. The communities consider this model to be an excellent example of partnership, given that it was developed and is managed by the communities themselves, with the support and advice of HC. This initiative has proven to be a best practice that should be adopted Government-wide, since it encourages true accountability on the part of communities in terms of the achievement of results.

The following tools and consultation and co-operation mechanisms aimed at providing a better understanding of communities were also identified during the interviews:

- Industry Canada has set up a network of advisors in the regions who will work directly with communities, and has created a new position, namely an advisor who will liaise with Anglophone community groups;
- Justice Canada has consolidated its FAJEF-AJEF network (Fédération des associations des juristes d'expression française - Associations des juristes d'expression française);
- HC has strengthened its French-language Health Services Network serving all provinces and territories; and
- Immigration Canada has set up provincial structures (subcommittees or round tables).

OLMCs also expressed certain concerns regarding the consultations, including the need for:

- greater representation from Anglophone legal groups in the two working groups focussing on access to justice;
- a better balance as concerns consultations with provincial and territorial communities; and
- the creation of formal Francophonie consultation mechanisms in the education sector.

A document drawn up by Heritage Canada on best practices relating to interdepartmental consultation was brought to the attention of the evaluators, who believe that circulating this document among implementation partners could encourage discussion on this issue (format, content, dissemination etc) and might eventually lead to the drafting of similar documents by other departments. It is recommended that the OLB encourage the development of documents on best practices, and that it make these documents available to all partners via its Web site.

It undoubtedly appears that the quality of the relationships between government institutions and the OLMC has been significantly conditioned by the proactive consultation approach adopted by the OLB and by the consultations undertaken by the departments associated with the implementation of the Action Plan. These relationships play an indispensable role in developing the capacities of communities to implement Action-Plan related initiatives in an effective and efficient manner. The evaluators consider that the Co-ordination Program is currently conducive to the dovetailing of consultation efforts and a change in organizational culture among the government institutions, which seems to be an essential condition for the effective integration of the minority community dimension in their programs and policies.

## II.2.5 Expected intermediate outcome - Improved scientific and empirical knowledge of language minorities Canada

QUESTIONS	INDICATORS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To what extent has scientific and empirical knowledge been enhanced and disseminated since the Co-ordination Program was implemented?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Quality and completeness of academic and action research data on language minorities in Canada (versus baseline)</li> <li>➤ Types and number of national consultations carried out with official language communities</li> <li>➤ Number of research partnerships created or maintained</li> <li>➤ Type, quality and level of sharing of information on research results (users of the results)</li> </ul>

Research is one of the main components of co-ordination efforts whose aim in the medium term is better scientific and empirical knowledge of Canada's linguistic minorities and, in the longer term, more consideration of the concerns of communities when policies and programs of federal institutions are being developed. To facilitate the achievement of these outcomes, the Co-ordinating Committee on OL Research was set up in 2003 at the request of the CDMOL. This committee was tasked with evaluating the situation of official language research and informing the partners engaged in implementing OL programs of any gaps it found respecting information and data. The Research Committee's objectives are:

- to better share the information from and findings of research within the federal government;
- to improve co-ordination among researchers and research projects;
- to identify the main gaps in the research, in order to develop means to fill them; and
- to strengthen co-ordination and information exchange mechanisms among governments, communities and universities with respect to their research on OL.

According to a documentation review and interviews that were carried out, the committee was instrumental in initiating governmental networking in OL research and in increasing knowledge of the type of research available within the government, thanks, among other things, to the fact that the committee created and disseminated a research inventory. This inventory also gave rise to a provisional analysis of the gaps between current knowledge and needs in the field of OL.

Other initiatives also enabled researchers from non-government organizations to share the fruits of their OL research and work in conjunction with PCH, Industry Canada and the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages (OCOL) in the area of research. While these initiatives are undoubtedly steps in the right direction, they currently do not appear to have any clear strategic goal. While there was to be a global approach to research and data analysis in the Co-ordination Program to support strategic planning and co-ordination of policies, it appears that thirty months after implementation of the Co-ordination Program began, the scientific and empirical knowledge base remains relatively inaccessible and enjoys limited distribution. A range of factors can explain this situation, for example:

- the fact that the Research Committee has no clear terms of reference and the absence of a detailed annual work plan;
- the fact that some members of the Research Committee are not accountable;
- the Committee's limited efforts to convince departmental policy development units to give more consideration to data and information on OL;

- the departments' limited interest in OL research;
- the limited sharing of information within departments;
- the high turnover rate among Research Committee members; and,
- limited harmonization between, and the lack of a concerted approach to, the committee's work and government initiatives to increase the capacity to create intersectoral links in the field of research within the government.

In the light of these considerations, it is imperative that efforts be increased with respect to this component of the implementation of the Co-ordination Program and that diligence be shown in providing a better framework and better direction for any research that is undertaken, thereby facilitating the achievement of the outcomes that are being sought.

**Recommendation 12: It is recommended that a full-time resource be assigned to co-ordinating the implementation of this research component, that a strategic action plan be developed for the Research Committee (this plan will have to seek harmonization between the monitoring/evaluation and research functions in order to eliminate gaps in the current information base), that all research be made available periodically on the Web site and that deputy ministers give clear directives to Research Committee members to ensure that empirical and scientific knowledge about the communities is more widely distributed.**

It should also be mentioned that funding and preparatory work for a post-census survey in 2006 is thought to be a major step forward in OL research, because it could lead to the gathering of valuable information on OLMC that is not currently available. Almost 50,000 OLMC members will be consulted on a variety of factors, including community vitality. The evaluators feel that this survey will make it easier to achieve the expected outcomes at the intermediate level as far as the research component is concerned. However, the ultimate goal of ensuring that the policies and programs of federal institutions take OLMC concerns into account cannot be reached unless research results are made sufficiently available. The CDMOL should encourage the Research Committee to develop a solid communications strategy to facilitate dissemination of the information gathered during the post-census survey among the policy directorates of all of the departments associated with the Action Plan.

**II.2.6 Expected intermediate outcome – More effective co-ordination among federal institutions in the application of the *Official Languages Act***

QUESTIONS	INDICATORS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What impact has the Co-ordination Program had on implementation of the Action Plan?</li> <li>- Can you think of any improvements that have been observed to date?</li> <li>- Can you think of any potential improvements?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Degree to which the quality of MCs has improved in response to the implementation of the Action Plan</li> <li>➤ Quantity/availability of information</li> <li>➤ Degree to which the number of contacts and meetings between the government and official language communities has risen versus baseline</li> <li>➤ Level of satisfaction of main departments with respect to the co-ordination</li> <li>➤ Types, level and quality of integration of services to official language minority communities</li> <li>➤ Frequency of interactions between the communities (joint meetings, identification of</li> </ul>

	common interests) following implementation of the Action Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What best practices have been developed to date to evaluate the performance of the Action Plan in an effective and sustained manner?</li> <li>- Have the key stakeholders been included in the RMAF monitoring framework?</li> <li>- Was performance information collected systematically?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Level of quality of the data with respect to outputs, effectiveness, etc. collected periodically and on an ad hoc basis (frequency, quality, use, etc.).</li> <li>➤ Qualitative and quantitative indicators developed and used since the beginning</li> <li>➤ Degree and quality of stakeholder involvement in performance monitoring</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is the basic information compiled sufficient to evaluate progress achieved against expected outcomes? If not, what changes need to be made?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Type and quality of baseline</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Do Co-ordination Program mechanisms allow for an evaluation of the impact of the Action Plan? If not, what changes need to be made?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Types and quality of mechanisms in place</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are Co-ordination Program delivery partners aware of the outcomes achieved? If not, what must be done to correct the situation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Types and number of reports produced</li> <li>➤ Level and quality of dissemination of the reports</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What progress has been noted with the achievement of the preliminary outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Extent of overall achievement of expected outcomes</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are there any factors that are hindering the achievement of Co-ordination Program objectives? If so, what are they?</li> <li>- Are there any indicators that the Co-ordination Program or the priority initiatives that it supports might have an unexpected positive/negative impact (eg, duplication of effort, development time)? If so, what are they?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Types of examples and facts noted by the stakeholders</li> </ul>

In 2003, the Official Languages Action Plan created a new co-ordination role associated with the minister responsible for official languages and the Committee of Deputy Ministers on Official Languages (CDMOL), supported by a secretariat at the OLB of the Privy Council Office. The ultimate purpose of this co-ordination role was to help the government maintain a uniform global approach to ensure full implementation of the Action Plan and evaluate the impact on the OLMC and the government. Evaluating the impact requires knowledge of the baseline situation for a number of aspects. The absence of this knowledge or the precariousness of the situation before the start-up of the Co-ordination Program makes it difficult to evaluate the exact extent of the program's performance. This situation should, however, be remedied by means of the post-census survey to be held in 2006.

Moreover, when it comes to evaluating the extent of the impact of the activities initiated during the first thirty months since implementation of the Co-ordination Program began, we are still at a relatively early stage. However, the evaluators have made an inventory of all of the achievements that appear to have contributed to supporting and promoting enforcement of the OL Act:

- departments have obtained funds from TB for OL-related activities thanks to the efforts of the OLB;
- in recent years, the OLB has succeeded in ensuring that priorities executives must take into account with respect to OL are included in executives' performance agreements;

- the OLB's dealings with provincial governments, through the good offices of the federal councils, for example, have resulted in significant progress towards the signing of an agreement on child-care centres, which includes a section on services for linguistic minorities in their own language;
- the tenacity and the proactive approach of the PCO in advancing the issues have fostered solid support for the Action Plan among all departments and communities;
- in meetings with stakeholders in the departments, the former indicated that they had developed a better sense of horizontality through becoming more familiar with the OL programs and projects implemented by other departments;
- the Coasters' Association received initial financial support in the wake of consultations conducted by the OLB; and
- the federal councils have strengthened their capacity to take action in the area of OL by relying on advice from the champions, who act as agents for change and spokespersons with respect to official languages.

In the light of these achievements, the OLB would do well to increase efforts to give interested provinces information respecting the lessons that have been learned in the area of horizontal co-ordination of OL.

Although this limited number of examples points to the positive contribution of the Co-ordination Program, some of the examples are anecdotal and poorly documented. However, the midterm report entitled *Update on the Implementation of the Action Plan for Official Languages*, published in 2005, provides more information on some of these achievements. Reporting on the outcomes is made difficult by the lack of standardization of both data sources and performance measurement methods. A great deal of effort and resources were needed to produce the midterm report, undoubtedly on account of the scope of the undertaking but also because there was no continuously updated data on outcomes. Adoption of the HRMAF by partner institutions, should, as was mentioned in the section on the relevance of the Program, partly rectify this situation as all parties will have access to quantitative and qualitative indicators and to well identified targets for measuring performance.

It is clearly stated in the risk-reduction strategy for implementation of the Co-ordination Program that, in the absence of formal processes and integrated mechanisms to co-ordinate data gathering, it will be extremely difficult to report on partners' progress and activities. This premise is very relevant and deserves the utmost attention in the coming months.

Meanwhile, the new partnerships created during the first phase of implementation of the Action Plan will, in the coming months, require increasing support and a larger communications effort from the OLB. Unless vigorous measures are adopted to impose a results-based management framework on all of the OLB's operations, some of the ground that has been gained and some support could quickly be lost. In this respect we should remember that the implementation of a horizontal results-based management and accountability framework requires those in charge of co-ordination to adopt processes and tools that are compatible with the RBM approach. The adoption of such a management approach could encourage partners in the implementation of the Action Plan to develop a similar model for themselves and could, at the same time, help make co-ordination easier in the years to come.

**Recommendation 13: It is recommended that the OLB create its own Results-Based Management (RBM) unit and develop, with the support of its Co-ordination Program implementation partners, a strategy for collecting and storing updated data on the results achieved by all partners.**

Meanwhile, it is reported that Memoranda to Cabinet (MC) are of a higher quality following the introduction of the Action Plan and the creation of the OLB to co-ordinate official languages initiatives. Although the evaluators were not able to examine these memoranda, the documentation points to a range of clear directives and essential questions that the OLB's analyst can use to carry out his role, which is to ensure that federal institutions have, in fact, given consideration to the impact their proposals contained in MC to TB will have on official languages. The information received also seems to suggest that examining MC and holding related discussions with key departments have encouraged departments to look at their proposals in terms of their compliance with the government's official languages priorities. To look at this issue in greater depth, the summative evaluation should examine a sample of MC submitted to TB between 2003 and 2006 so as to validate this assertion and provide more information respecting this outcome.

Last of all, strengthening the Council of the Network of Official Languages Champions is described as an initiative that has contributed to promoting the exchange of information on the enforcement of the *Official Languages Act*. A number of respondents indicated that the work done by council members within government services agencies is instrumental in promoting linguistic duality in the public service. The senior levels occupied by council members within the hierarchy and the relevance of the topics addressed during meetings with government members involved in policy development give the council a major influential role within the federal public apparatus and mean that it enjoys indispensable support for co-ordination efforts within the framework of the Action Plan for Official Languages.

### **III CONCLUSION AND PROSPECTS**

In conclusion, the development and implementation of the Official Languages Co-ordination Program are appropriate measures and constitute an adequate response to the problems identified in the area of official languages. The mechanisms and tools developed and the governance structure that has been adopted to ensure co-ordination of all of the government's initiatives respecting official languages are appropriate and have made it possible to achieve many of the expected outcomes in the thirty months since implementation began. These results include a net improvement in co-operation and communication among federal institutions and with official language minority communities, a high level of satisfaction among partners with the co-ordination efforts of the PCO and, more specifically, with the consultations between government representatives and the communities.

At the same time, the evaluation also revealed some aspects of co-ordination that need to be improved to facilitate achievement of the expected outcomes by 2008. The fact that partners involved in implementation have failed to buy into the Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework (RMAF) for the Co-ordination Program and the horizontal framework (HRMAF) of the government's Official Languages Program is undoubtedly something that will have to be remedied in the very near future. It is important that the OLB and its main partners implement some of the report's recommendations or other initiatives to make these management and accountability frameworks easier to understand. Another important issue the OLB will have

to focus its attention on in the coming weeks is the strengthening of its organizational capacity so that it can fully assume its co-ordination role, which should, according to the findings of this evaluation, expand, given the increasing need for support and information among all stakeholders affected by the horizontal co-ordination of the Official Languages Program.

The report offers a series of recommendations for improving various aspects of the government's Official Languages Co-ordination Program. The OLB, together with its main partners, should develop an action plan that includes details of the planned activities, the expected outcomes, timeframes and the identity of the entities responsible for implementation so as to comply with these recommendations and facilitate achievement of the outcomes targeted by the Co-ordination Program.

In terms of the summative evaluation that is planned for the final year of the Co-ordination Program, special attention will have to be paid to the planning and introduction of appropriate processes or mechanisms to facilitate this evaluation and ensure the availability of the information needed to provide a report on the outcomes. Here are some actions that could be initiated in this respect:

- set up an evaluation advisory committee that would include, besides representatives of the main partners involved in implementing the Co-ordination Program, experts in the fields of horizontal co-ordination and performance measurement to ensure that the evaluation is more independent and that the issues that have to be addressed are adequately covered;
- inform implementation partners of the final evaluation's key questions as quickly as possible;
- document results on an ongoing basis in the next thirty-six months;
- develop a strategy for the summative evaluation of the Action Plan that identifies a set of common performance indicators in the HRMAF.

The OLB's recent creation of an interdepartmental committee to create an appropriate reporting framework and plan implementation of the evaluation strategy, which will take into account the post-census survey, evaluations and audits related to the government's Official Languages Program as well as the Action Plan, is a significant and relevant undertaking in terms of meeting some of the evaluation report's recommendations.

**APPENDIX 1  
EVALUATION MATRIX**

**Evaluation Criterion 1: Relevance**

Questions	Indicators	Information Sources	Data Collection Methods
-To what extent does the Co-ordination Program support and promote the <i>mobilization of political and administrative leadership and the transformation of the organizational culture of the public service</i> in relation to official languages?	- Types and quality of approaches and mechanisms put in place by the Co-ordination Program to support and promote the mobilization of political and administrative leadership and the transformation of the public service	- OLB personnel - Those in charge of implementation within the departments	- Interviews - Documentation review - Focus group
-To what extent are the Co-ordination Program's methods and tools used to consult the official language communities adequate?	- Types and quality of consultation approaches and tools put in place by the Co-ordination Program - Stakeholders' opinion of the methods and tools	- Project document - Those in charge of implementation	- Documentation review - Interviews
-To what extent is the Co-ordination Program able to ensure <i>consistency of the government's official languages policies and programs</i> ?	- Types and quality of approaches and tools put in place to ensure consistency of the government's official languages policies and programs	- Action Plan - Program designers - Those in charge of implementation within the departments	- Documentation review - Interviews
-To what extent is the Co-ordination Program able to allow for <i>ongoing information sharing among federal institutions and to lead them to work together for the benefit of linguistic duality</i> ?	- Types and quality of approaches and tools put in place by the Co-ordination Program to allow ongoing information sharing among federal institutions	- Strategic and administrative documents	

**APPENDIX 1  
EVALUATION MATRIX**

**Evaluation Criterion 1: *Relevance***

Questions	Indicators	Information Sources	Data Collection Methods
<p>-To what extent has the Co-ordination Program been given the resources and mechanisms required to help enhance and implement the official languages policy accountability framework and implement the Action Plan to strengthen the official languages?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Types of resources and measures put in place to</li> <li>1. inform the government of stakeholders' priorities for action</li> <li>2. ensure that official languages issues are brought to the government's attention</li> <li>3. ensure that the government's standpoint is accurately reflected in current issues</li> <li>4. ensure that minority communities and other stakeholders are consulted at least once a year</li> <li>5. ensure that the minister responsible supports ministers with statutory or sectoral responsibilities relating to official languages</li> <li>6. ensure that the minister co-ordinates internal discussions on how to respond to reports by the Commissioner</li> <li>7. ensure that the minister co-ordinates the implementation of the Action Plan in an efficient manner</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Minutes</li> <li>- Co-ordination Program designers</li> <li>- Strategic plan</li> <li>- Key partners in implementation</li> </ul>	
<p>-To what extent is the design of the Co-ordination Program adequately structured and complete to co-ordinate the implementation of the Action Plan?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Types and quality of direct links between the issues identified and the action areas initially identified and reformulated</li> <li>- Types and quality of direct links between the issues identified and the expected activities/outcomes of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The RMAF</li> <li>- Action Plan for Official Languages</li> <li>- Canada's linguistic duality</li> <li>- The Branch's work plan</li> <li>- Key stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review of all documentation</li> <li>- Interviews</li> </ul>

**APPENDIX 1  
EVALUATION MATRIX**

**Evaluation Criterion 1: *Relevance***

Questions	Indicators	Information Sources	Data Collection Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To what extent do the activities of the Co-ordination Program comply with the priorities and policies of the government and target groups?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Examples of compliance or non-compliance with the priorities and policies of the government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All legislative and regulatory documents</li> <li>- MCs</li> <li>- Throne Speeches</li> <li>- Any other relevant documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Documentation review</li> <li>- Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are the implementation or delivery mechanisms that have been designed best suited (technical functionality) to meet the objectives?</li> <li>- Has enough time been set aside between the identification of the action areas and the implementation of initiatives?</li> <li>- Are there other methods that could improve the implementation or delivery of the Co-ordination Program (horizontal co-ordination)? (Difficulties with the way the Program is currently implemented or delivered?)</li> <li>- Can any design aspects have a negative impact?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Key stakeholders' perception</li> <li>- Time between the identification of priorities and the implementation of initiatives</li> <li>- Positive and negative risks identified since the plan was implemented</li> <li>- Types of mechanisms the stakeholders feel could have a negative impact on the achievement of outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Key stakeholders</li> <li>- Midterm report</li> <li>- Operational reports</li> <li>- Other organizations faced with a similar situation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Documentation review</li> <li>- Interviews</li> <li>- Comparative analysis</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are the parties concerned (clients, personnel and Program managers) satisfied with               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the support and/or services provided?</li> <li>▪ the administrative procedures that resulted in the recommendations?</li> <li>▪ the time required to make decisions?</li> <li>▪ the success rate?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level of satisfaction of key stakeholders (services, procedures, time, success rate of initiatives, etc.)</li> <li>- Significant gaps noted</li> <li>- Examples of achievements or failures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Key stakeholders</li> <li>- Midterm report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Documentation review</li> <li>- Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To what extent has the RMAF assisted with co-ordination, performance monitoring, outcome reporting and clarification of the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level of coherence, clarity and precision of the RMAF</li> <li>- Consistency between the strategic planning / co-ordination needs and the information provided by the RMAF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stakeholders within the departments</li> <li>- RMAF</li> </ul>	

**APPENDIX 1  
EVALUATION MATRIX**

**Evaluation Criterion 1: *Relevance***

Questions	Indicators	Information Sources	Data Collection Methods
- Are the systems and processes in place to create synergy and promote collaboration between the various stakeholders?	- Types and quality of project systems and processes that promote synergy and horizontal collaboration - Level of satisfaction of the key stakeholders	- Key stakeholders - Midterm report - Action Plan - Follow-up reports	- Documentation review - Interviews and surveys
- To what extent are the risks adequately identified and accompanied by a mitigation measure?	- Types of risks and mitigation strategies identified	- Risk management strategy for the Official Languages Program	

## APPENDIX 2 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Actions et décisions, Réunion du comité des sous-ministres sur les langues officielles, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 26 janvier 2005, 22 février 2005, 12 avril 2005, 26 mai 2005 April 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006, March 2005
- Atelier PCH, Workshop for the Development of the Profile and Performance Measurement Strategy, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 23 juin 2005
- Atelier pour l'élaboration du cadre horizontal de gestion et de responsabilisation axé sur les résultats, Rapport de rétroaction de l'atelier, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 30 juin 2004
- Attitudes face à l'utilisation des deux langues officielles dans la fonction publique du Canada (2002)
- Bilan des pré-consultations de février (2004) et préparatifs en vue des consultations de mars (2004) sur la mise en oeuvre du Plan d'action pour les langues officielles, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 2004
- Bakvis Herman, Juillet Luc, The horizontal Challenge : Line departments, central agencies and leadership, École de la fonction publique, 2004
- B. Guy Peters, La gestion d'un gouvernement horizontal, l'aspect politique de la coordination, Centre canadien de gestion, 1998
- Bureau du Conseil privé, Justice Canada, Présentation au Conseil du Trésor, 25 février 2003
- Cardinal Linda, Hudon Marie-ève, La gouvernance des minorités de langue officielle au Canada – étude préliminaire, Commissariat aux langues officielles
- Community Action Plan, Building on Our Knowledge Base Community Capacity Building (CCB)
- Community Economic Development (CED) – Employability
- Compte rendu de la consultation entre les représentants des communautés francophones et acadiennes du Canada et les représentants des ministères fédéraux visés par le Plan d'action pour les langues officielles, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, mars 2005
- Compte rendu de la rencontre du comité d'appui du CDMOL, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 3 mai 2005, 16 juin 2005
- Compte rendu des consultations avec les représentants des communautés anglophones du Québec, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé Québec, 29 mars

- Compte rendu, Consultation avec les représentants des communautés francophones et acadiennes, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, Ottawa, 22 mars 2004
- Corporate Priorities for 2004-2005, Greffier du conseil privé
- Deck presentation, HRMAF indicators, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 2005
- Documentation interne sur les budgets globaux, dépenses salariales et opérationnelles, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, (2003-2005)
- Enquête postcensitaire sur la vitalité des minorités de langue officielle, présentation Power Point, Statistique Canada
- Eric Forges, Capital Social gouvernance et rationalisation des pratiques communautaires; outils théoriques et méthodologiques, Institut canadien de recherche sur les minorités linguistiques, Août 2004
- Étude organisationnelle des Affaires intergouvernementales, Principales conclusions et possibilités de changement, Cercle Sussex
- Évaluation du Programme « Entreprise rurales » de la stratégie régionale, Bas-St-Laurent et Gaspésie/îles de la Madeleine, Développement économique Canada, 2000
- Extranet phase 2, 2004
- Governance for the languages Program, Deck presentation, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé
- Groupe de travail sur les consultations communautaires de Mars 2004, Compte rendu de la réunion du mercredi 21 janvier 2004, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé
- Guide d'élaboration des cadres de gestion et de responsabilisation axés sur les résultats, Secrétariat du Conseil du Trésor, Août 2001
- Hopkins Mark, Couture Chantal, Moore Elizabeth, De l'effort héroïque au travail quotidien, les enseignements découlant de la direction de projets horizontaux, Table ronde de recherche-action en gestion horizontale, Centre canadien de gestion, 2001
- Horizontalité et gestion publique- Bourgault Jacques, Lapierre René, Rapport final au Centre canadien de gestion, au Réseau du leadership, au Conseil des hauts fonctionnaires fédéraux du Québec et à l'École nationale d'administration publique, Décembre 2000
- Human Resources and Skills Development Canada, Workshop for the Development of the Profile and Performance Measurement Strategy, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 28 juillet 2004

- Initiative horizontale et paritaire visant le développement économique des communautés francophones et acadiennes en milieu minoritaire, Rapport de recherché et de consultation, Pierre Leblanc, Praxis, 9 octobre 2004
- La dualité linguistique au Canada- Un cadre horizontal de gestion pour le Programme des langues officielles, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 2005
- Landry et al., Évaluation du Programme des initiatives régionales stratégiques de développement économique Canada, Développement économique Canada pour les régions du Québec, Septembre 2003
- Leçons apprises, consultations ministérielles, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 27 octobre 2004
- Les conseils régionaux et la coordination horizontale, Rapport préparé pour les conseils fédéraux régionaux et le Secrétariat du Conseil du Trésor, M. Luc Juillet, professeur Centre d'études en gouvernance, Université d'Ottawa, Le 15 septembre 2000
- Les ententes de rendement des sous-ministres, priorités stratégiques de la fonction publique du Canada pour 2002-2003, Direction des langues officielles, Bureau du conseil privé, 2003
- Mandat du Comité des sous-ministres en langues officielles, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 12 avril 2005
- Meilleures pratiques de concertation interministérielle, Patrimoine Canada, Août 2005
- Mémos interne sur : le développement du site extranet (mai 2005)
- Mitchell James, Février 2005, Note d'aOLAcution, Consultation avec les représentants des communautés francophones et acadiennes, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Ottawa, 22 mars
- Note de diffusion, Décision de la Cour fédérale dans Desrochers et Corporation de Développement Économique Communautaire CALDECH c. Ministère de l'Industrie, Juillet 2005
- Note interne à l'intention des analystes, Examen des mémoires au Cabinet et autres documents discutés aux comités du Cabinet, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé
- Note interne sur les commentaires généraux sur le cadre horizontal de mesure du rendement, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 2004-2005
- Note interne, Bilan des pré-consultations de février et préparatifs en vue des consultations sur la mise en oeuvre du Plan d'Action pour les langues officielles, février, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 2004
- Politique de Santé Canada pour appuyer les communautés de langue officielle en milieu minoritaire,

- Bureau d'appui aux communautés de langue officielle (BACLO), Direction générale de l'information, de l'analyse et de la connectivité, 1er avril 2004
- Politique intergouvernementale, plan biennal, Bureau du conseil privé
- Priorités corporatives, 2005-2006, Greffier du Conseil privé
- Projets de recherche et analyse des lacunes en matières de données, Présentation au Comité des sous-ministres sur les langues officielles, 20 novembre 2003, Comité de recherche sur les langues officielles
- Rapport de la Direction du GDLO, Cadre d'imputabilité et de coordination en langues officielles Activités du GDLO 2003-2004, Justice Canada
- Rapport de la Direction du GDLO, Cadre d'imputabilité et de coordination en langues officielles Activités du GDLO 2004-2005, Justice Canada
- Rapport de mi-parcours, version ébauche, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 3 octobre 2005
- Rétroaction/feedback, Consultations ministérielles/ministerial consultations, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé , 27 octobre 2004, October 27th 2004
- Réunion du Comité élargi pour l'élaboration du RMAF du Programme des langues officielles du gouvernement, Justice Canada, 23 juin 2004
- Session de travail pour l'élaboration du profil et de la Stratégie de mesure continue de rendement
- Stratégie horizontale de mesure du rendement, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 2005
- Synthèse des réactions des ministères aux commentaires du Commissariat aux langues officielles, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 2005
- Utiliser des outils horizontaux pour transcender les frontières : Leçons apprises et indicateurs de réussite, École de la fonction publique, Centre canadien de gestion, 2002
- Une vision d'avenir : Plan d'action pour le réseau d'enseignement universitaire de la francophonie en situation minoritaire, mémoire présenté au Ministre responsable de la Loi sur les langues officielles, Juillet 2004
- Workshop for the Development of the Profile and Performance Measurement Strategy, Direction générale des langues officielles Affaires intergouvernementales, Bureau du Conseil privé, 23 juin 2004