Evaluation of Canada's Action Plan Against Racism

Evaluation Division

December 2010

Canada

Table of contents

List of tables

List of Acronyms

ARTCI	Anti-Racism Test Case Initiative
CAPAR	Canada's Action Plan Against Racism
CIBHC	Countering Internet-Based Hate Crime
CIC	Citizenship and Immigration Canada
DDPA	Durban Declaration and Programme of Action
DoJ	Department of Justice
EDS	Ethnic Diversity Survey
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent
GCS	Government Consulting Services
GoC	Government of Canada
GSS	General Social Survey
HRSDC	Human Resources and Skills Development Canada
ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racism
III	Inclusive Institutions Initiative
IWG	Interdepartmental Working Group
IVPHC	Interventions for Victims and Perpetrators of Hate Crimes
LEAD	Law Enforcement and Aboriginal Diversity Network
LOA	Letter of Agreement
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
ODIHR	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights
OGDs	Other Government Departments
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PAA	Program Activity Architecture
PCH	Department of Canadian Heritage
RBIJS	Race-Based Issues in the Justice System
RMAF	Results-based Management and Accountability Framework
RFWS	Racism-Free Workplace Strategy
STC	Statistics Canada
TB	Treasury Board
UN	United Nations
WCAR	World Conference against Racism
WCI	Welcoming Communities Initiative

Executive summary

Background and context

This report presents the findings of the evaluation of Canada's Action Plan Against Racism (CAPAR). This evaluation was undertaken by Government Consulting Services (GCS) for Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) between January and April, 2010. The objective of the evaluation was to examine relevance, design and delivery, and performance, with particular emphasis on evaluating the horizontal approach and design of CAPAR.

CAPAR, a five-year plan, was launched by the Government of Canada (GoC) in 2005 with the goal of ensuring that all Canadians were included and had a role in society and the economy regardless of background, race or ethnicity; that all barriers to full and active participation and opportunity were eliminated; and that the justice system was equipped to respond to overt manifestations of racism in society.

CAPAR included more than 40 initiatives and strategies that were part of existing budgets and programs in more than 20 departments and agencies. In addition, $53.6 million in funding was allocated to nine new initiatives within four departments (Department of Canadian Heritage, CIC, Human Resources and Skills Development Canada, and the Department of Justice).

CAPAR was led by the Multiculturalism Branch of the Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH) and then by the Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch, CIC (following the transfer of the Branch from PCH to CIC). The Initiative was supported by a Secretariat and an interdepartmental working group (IWG).

Methodology

The evaluation used multiple lines of evidence to ensure the reliability of reported results. The following research methods were used to gather data for the evaluation:

- interviews with 26 program staff, managers and stakeholders;
- a document review;
- a literature review; and
- a review of six individually funded program evaluation reports

Evaluation findings

Relevance

Canada's increasingly diverse society and the existence of racism demonstrate there is a need for initiatives to combat racism and discrimination.

An array of research and statistical information shows that Canada's society is becoming increasingly diverse, with growing populations of visible minorities and changes to its religious composition. There is evidence to suggest that minorities are experiencing racism and discrimination and recent data show that groups most at risk of being victimized by hate and bias activity are racial/ethnic minorities and religious minorities. Evidence also suggests that Aboriginal people, visible minorities

and immigrants are particularly vulnerable to unemployment, underemployment, lower incomes and social segregation.

Canada has a long history of promoting human rights, equality, and multiculturalism and the GoC has a continued role in addressing issues related to racism and discrimination.

CAPAR and its funded initiatives are in alignment with departmental mandates and support federal legislative responsibilities such as the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the *Multiculturalism Act*, the *Canadian Human Rights Act* and the *Employment Equity Act*. These pieces of legislation call for departments to place emphasis on inclusion, equality, and access for all Canadians. In addition, CAPAR is in alignment with numerous international initiatives and commitments, such as the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racism, and work being done by the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights.

Since the inception of CAPAR, GoC priorities have evolved to focus more on social cohesion and access to economic opportunity, rather than on anti-racism initiatives specifically.

The issue of anti-racism and discrimination was a clear priority for the GoC in the early- to mid-2000s. This is evident from Canada's activities leading up to World Conference Against Racism (WCAR); the October 2004 Speech from the Throne, in which the GoC pledged to "take measures to strengthen Canada's ability to combat racism, hate speech and hate crimes"; and the 2005 Federal Budget, which included a five-year investment of $56 million for CAPAR.[1] Since that time, the priorities of the GoC have evolved, with an increased focus on social cohesion and equal access to economic opportunity.

Design and delivery

The CAPAR design was not aligned with its original intent. More specifically, what was intended to be a GoC-wide initiative to combat racism ultimately was designed to coordinate performance measurement among the funded initiatives.

CAPAR was intended to be a GoC response to racism and discrimination which was to be a broad-based, all encompassing action plan, involving many different departments and agencies and aimed towards a wide variety of target audiences. CAPAR's subsequent design, however, did not meet these intentions. While the foundation documents called for a horizontal approach to manage the implementation of CAPAR, the precise rationale for such an approach was not clearly articulated in the documentation. Although the evidence suggests a horizontal approach may have been implemented to support a more unified government approach, the lack of clarity surrounding this rationale made it difficult to further define the nature and scope of intended collaboration. Ultimately, the design of CAPAR was limited to joint performance measurement and inter-departmental information-sharing, and these activities included only the CAPAR-funded initiatives. No communication or outreach was undertaken with the programs included in the original action plan that did not receive funding through CAPAR.

Recommendation: For future horizontal initiatives, CIC should ensure that the design of the initiative supports the intended rationale for horizontal management, the desired level of

---

[1] This amount includes funding to implement the Anti-Racism Test Case Initiative (ARTCI). However, only one-year funding was requested for 2005-06 in order to support the development of ARTCI. Thus, the total five-year allocation for CAPAR was $53.6 million.

collaboration with partners, and the expected outcomes of the Initiative. In particular, the rationale and scope of collaboration need to be clearly established before developing the design.

There was little cohesion between the funded initiatives.

While the selection of initiatives for CAPAR funding was based on the identified need for programming in six priority areas, this selection does not appear to have factored in the compatibility of the funded programs. Consequently, the funded initiatives could not be easily fit into a framework of common objectives and performance reporting. Furthermore, the design of the Initiative was not consistent with the wide scope of the issue of racism, as it did not include the non-funded initiatives. As a result, CAPAR had very limited overall cohesiveness, and its initiatives did not establish partnerships or any other forms of collaboration.

Recommendation: For future horizontal initiatives, CIC should ensure that there is a sufficient level of cohesion among the included activities and partners, particularly with respect to their ability to work towards common objectives and to develop meaningful collaborative relationships. This cohesion can facilitate the development of common performance measures as well as reporting on the achievement of common outcomes for the Initiative.

The governance structure put in place for CAPAR was limited in its effectiveness.

A governance structure was put in place for CAPAR that included a lead department, a Secretariat, and an IWG. The structure was tasked with limited duties, with a primary focus on performance measurement. The Secretariat was unable to fulfill some of its responsibilities, including those related to the IWG (i.e., organizing meetings four times a year, annual stakeholder consultations). This is likely attributable to limited resources allocated to the Secretariat. The effectiveness of the Secretariat was compromised by the lack of a senior management committee for CAPAR, which meant that there was no mechanism in place for coordinated decision-making.

Recommendation: For future horizontal initiatives, CIC should ensure that an appropriate governance structure, with the necessary level of senior management involvement, is in place.

Performance

Funded initiatives undertook a wide range of activities in support of CAPAR outcomes. Some information from the program evaluations of the funded initiatives demonstrated the achievement of immediate outcomes. However, the nature and scope of CAPAR made it difficult to assess its overall impact. Delays in the implementation of certain initiatives and the cancellation of others appear to have limited the success of CAPAR.

Activities undertaken by the funded initiatives targeted a wide range of stakeholders, including: settlement organizations, newcomers to Canada, police services, law enforcement agencies, legal experts and community groups. Information from the various evaluations show that many activities were undertaken that supported CAPAR outcomes at the immediate level and some progress has been made towards those outcomes. However, the inherent challenge in formulating a cohesive set of outcomes that could encompass all the funded initiatives (e.g., multiple departments, different mandates, different target groups), particularly for an issue such as racism, made it difficult to assess the overall results of CAPAR.

The horizontal approach added limited value to either the funded or non-funded initiatives, which was primarily a result of its design.

It is likely that a horizontal approach to a policy issue as wide in scope as racism can best be used to ensure that there is a coordinated government response that avoids duplication of effort across departments and, where appropriate, promotes inter-departmental collaboration.

However, CAPAR activities were not inclusive of the non-funded initiatives and no communication, information-sharing or outreach was conducted with them. It is not known how the non-funded initiatives fit within the objectives of CAPAR or what results have been achieved. Therefore, non-funded initiatives did not benefit from the horizontal approach.

With respect to the funded initiatives, joint activities were mostly limited to performance measurement, which does not appear to have been useful (e.g., little national reporting). Further, the impact and performance of these initiatives would likely have been the same without the added horizontal approach.

CAPAR evaluation — Management response

Key Finding	Response	Action	Accountability	Implement-ation Date
I. Program Relevance				
There is a need for initiatives to combat racism and discrimination in Canada, given the country's increasingly diverse society and the existence of racism. Canada has a long history of promoting human rights, equality, and multiculturalism, and the GoC supports various federal and international commitments to combat racism and discrimination.	CIC agrees with this finding. Issues related to discrimination and understanding in Canada have evolved. With ever increasing diversity (particularly religious diversity), the GoC's response to combat racism/discrimination should be adapted in order to face new challenges occurring in Canada. Approaches developed at CIC to addressing racism and discrimination now focus on commonalities rather than differences.	The Multiculturalism Program is undertaking a review of the approach to addressing racism and discrimination in order to better support to GoC's priority of building an integrated, socially cohesive society. This process will include advice to the Minister and a range of policy options. Decisions on the specific policy approach will be made in Q4 2010-11.	Citizenship and Multicultural-ism Branch (CMB)	Q4 2010-11
II. Program Implementation				
The CAPAR design was not aligned with its original intent. More specifically, what was intended to be a GoC-wide initiative to combat racism ultimately was designed to coordinate performance measurement among the funded initiatives. Recommendation: For future horizontal initiatives, CIC should ensure that the design of the initiative supports: the intended rationale for horizontal management; the desired level of collaboration with	Although CAPAR was cast as a five year action plan, funding for the current set of initiatives is ongoing. It should be noted that each of the CAPAR initiatives has its own terms and conditions. It should also be noted in response to this recommendation that improvements to the design of the horizontal initiative will need to take into account changes that have taken place since the launch of the CAPAR initiatives. Two of the funded initiatives were gradually subsumed under existing programming. This includes CIC's Welcoming Communities Initiative (WCI), which has been integrated into the streamlined settlement approach. Similarly, the Department of Justice's (DoJ's) ongoing Grants and Contributions funding for CAPAR is now	The Multiculturalism Program is undertaking a review of the approach to addressing racism and discrimination in order to better support to GoC's priority of building an integrated, socially cohesive society. This process will include advice to the Minister and a range of policy options. The results of this process will have implications for the future design of the horizontal initiative. Decisions on the specific policy approach will be made in Q4 2010-11. Given the lack of materiality of CAPAR-related funding (currently less than $10M per year across CIC, HRSDC and DOJ), CMB is not recommending a horizontal approach to renewed programming but rather focussing on strengthening CIC programming in this area. CMB will continue horizontal information sharing on	CMB	Q4 2010-11

Key Finding	Response	Action	Accountability	Implement-ation Date
partners; and the expected outcomes of the initiative. In particular, the rationale and scope of collaboration need to be clearly established before developing the design.	delivered under a larger umbrella program called the "Justice Partnership Innovation Program". In addition, of the nine new CAPAR initiatives, four were never launched or were discontinued for various reasons. As of October 2010, funded CAPAR initiatives are taking place in only three departments.	racism and discrimination related issues.		
There was little cohesion between the funded initiatives. Recommendation: For future horizontal initiatives, CIC should ensure that there is a sufficient level of cohesion among the included activities and partners, particularly with respect to their ability to work towards common objectives and to develop meaningful collaborative relationships. This cohesion can facilitate the development of common performance measures as well as reporting on the achievement of common outcomes for the initiative.	Initially (in 2005), the Action Plan included the funded and non-funded initiatives, and aimed to demonstrate an overall coordinated approach to GoC's efforts in combating racism and discrimination. In fact, Canada's Action Plan Against Racism focused on six key priority areas: • Assist victims and groups vulnerable to racism and related forms of discrimination • Develop forward-looking approaches to promote diversity and combat racism • Strengthen the role of civil society • Strengthen regional and international cooperation • Educate children and youth on diversity and anti-racism • Counter hate and bias The newly funded initiatives in 2005 had their own objectives within their respective priority area. While these initiatives fit within the six priority areas, there was no definition of common outcomes for the funded programs.	The Multiculturalism Program is undertaking a review of the approach to addressing racism and discrimination in order to better support the GoC's commitments to building an integrated, socially cohesive society. This process will include advice to the Minister and a range of policy options. Decisions on the specific policy approach will be made in Q4 2010-11. Given the lack of materiality of CAPAR-related funding (currently less than $10M per year across CIC, HRSDC and DOJ), CMB is not recommending a horizontal approach to renewed programming but rather focussing on strengthening CIC programming in this area. CMB will continue horizontal information sharing on racism and discrimination related issues.	CMB	Q4 2010-11
The governance structure put in place for CAPAR was limited in its effectiveness. Recommendation: For future horizontal initiatives, CIC should ensure that an	CIC agrees with this finding.	The Multiculturalism Program is undertaking a review of the approach to addressing racism and discrimination in order to better support the GoC's commitments to building an integrated, socially cohesive society. This process will include advice to the Minister and a range of policy options.	CMB	Q4 2010-11

Key Finding	Response	Action	Accountability	Implement-ation Date
appropriate governance structure, with the necessary level of senior management involvement, is in place.		Decisions on the specific policy approach will be made in Q4 2010-11. Given the lack of materiality of CAPAR-related funding (currently less than $10M per year across CIC, HRSD and DOJ), CMB is not recommending a horizontal approach to renewed programming but rather focussing on strengthening CIC programming in this area. CMB will continue horizontal information sharing on racism and discrimination related issues.		
III. Results				
Funded initiatives undertook a wide range of activities in support of CAPAR outcomes. Some information from the program evaluations of the funded initiatives demonstrated the achievement of immediate outcomes. However, the nature and scope of CAPAR made it difficult to assess its overall impact. Delays in the implementation of certain initiatives and the cancellation of others appear to have limited the degree of CAPAR's success.	Agreed. The measurement/evaluation of social outcomes continues to be a challenge. Some CAPAR initiatives have demonstrated a high degree of success. The recent evaluation of the Hate-Motivated Crime Data Collection Strategy has clearly shown that the initiative is a success. The evaluators have stated that the Data Collection Strategy demonstrates a high degree of relevance both in the context of aligning with federal priorities and in light of Canada's international commitments to collect hate crime data. As recognized in this evaluation finding, some of the CAPAR initiatives have been rolled out only recently (e.g. Hate-Motivated Crime Data Collection Strategy; Racism Free Workplace Strategy) and more time is required to gather more robust data as well as establish baselines and indicators to more accurately measure their intermediate outcomes.	No action required. We are considering, however, based upon initial results of the Hate-Motivated Data Collection Strategy, a modest increase to support increased training to allow for the expansion to more police forces, as well as improving awareness of this work.		

Key Finding	Response	Action	Accountability	Implement-ation Date
The horizontal approach added limited value to either the funded or non-funded initiatives, which was primarily a result of its design.	Agreed.	The Multiculturalism Program is undertaking a review of the approach to addressing racism and discrimination in order to better support the GoC's commitments to building an integrated, socially cohesive society. This process will include advice to the Minister and a range of policy options. Decisions on the specific policy approach will be made in Q4 2010-11. Given the lack of materiality of CAPAR-related funding (currently less than $10M per year across CIC, HRSDC and DOJ), CMB is not recommending a horizontal approach to renewed programming but rather focussing on strengthening CIC programming in this area. CMB will continue horizontal information sharing on racism and discrimination related issues.	CMB	Q4 2010-11

1. Introduction

1.1. Introduction and purpose of evaluation

This report presents the results of the horizontal evaluation of Canada's Action Plan Against Racism (CAPAR). The data collection was undertaken by Government Consulting Services (GCS) for Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) between January and April, 2010. The objective of the evaluation was to examine relevance, design and delivery, and performance, with particular emphasis on evaluating the horizontal approach and design of CAPAR.

The report is organized into four main sections.

- Section 1 presents a profile of CAPAR and its funded initiatives;
- Section 2 presents the methodology for the evaluation and discusses methodological considerations;
- Section 3 presents the findings; and
- Section 4 presents the overall conclusions.

This report is accompanied by a supplemental document which contains the appendices cited throughout this report.

1.2. Profile of CAPAR

1.2.1. Context and objectives

CAPAR was launched by the Government of Canada (GoC) in 2005 and represented Canada's first horizontal federal approach to combating racism. Its goal was to help ensure that all Canadians were included and had a role in society and the economy regardless of background, race or ethnicity; that all barriers to full and active participation and opportunity were eliminated; and that the justice system was equipped to respond to overt manifestations of racism in society.[2] The three objectives of CAPAR were:

- a reduction in discriminatory behaviours and practices, especially in the areas of police services, the justice system and the workplace;
- a greater capacity on the part of federal partners and stakeholders (other government departments (OGDs), police, justice system, employers, unions, schools and community groups) to work on solutions to racism and diversity issues in their milieu; and
- increased opportunities for ethno-cultural, ethno-racial and Aboriginal communities to participate in Canada's social and economic life.

Over the years, Canada has developed a strong legislative and policy framework to support and preserve shared core values, rights and responsibilities. CAPAR was founded on this framework, as well as on a series of domestic and international events that identified issues and priorities on anti-racism. Table 1-1 provides milestones in Canada's legal/policy framework leading up to the creation of CAPAR.

---

[2] Government of Canada. *A Canada for All: Canada's Action Plan Against Racism, 2005*.

Table 1-1: Timeline of anti-discrimination legislation, policies, and events in Canada

Year	Event
1948	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
1960	Canadian Bill of Rights
1970	Canada ratifies the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) (1965)
1971	Canada's Multiculturalism Policy
1977	*Canadian Human Rights Act*
1982	Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms
1986	*Employment Equity Act*
1988	*Canadian Multiculturalism Act*
2000	Canadian Secretariat formed within the Department of Canadian Heritage as the federal government's designated agent for the World Conference against Racism (WCAR)
2000	Youth Consultation - Satellite meeting for WCAR in Germany involving 29 delegates from Canada (Youth Working Group of the Canadian WCAR Advisory Committee)
2000	Six Canadian regional consultations (Edmonton, Vancouver, Winnipeg, Halifax, Toronto, and Montreal) held with representatives from civil society and chaired by the Hedy Fry, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism and Status of Women)
2001	National consultations held in Ottawa to identify national priorities for the WCAR
2001	Aboriginal and northern consultations held in Winnipeg and Iqaluit
2001	United Nation's 3rd WCAR, Durban, South Africa
2002	United Nations General Assembly officially adopts the WCAR Declaration and Program of Action
2002	Canada appears before the UN Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination to report on implementation of ICERD
2003	Results of the Ethnic Diversity Survey released
2004	United Nations Special Rapporteur report released
2004	The GoC pledged to "take measures to strengthen Canada's ability to combat racism, hate speech and hate crimes" in the Speech from the Throne
2005	CAPAR is launched

1.2.2. Delivery approach

At the time of inception, CAPAR was led by the Multiculturalism Branch of the Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH). A Secretariat was established within the Action Plan Unit, which was responsible for the horizontal management of the Initiative, including: the development of corporate documents (e.g., Treasury Board (TB) submission, results-based management and accountability framework (RMAF)), annual reporting, annual consultations with stakeholders, and coordination between the nine funded departments. In October 2008, the Multiculturalism Branch of PCH was moved to CIC. At that time, responsibility for CAPAR became situated within CIC's Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch.

An interdepartmental working group (IWG) was established as a consultative body for the horizontal initiative and assisted in the development of the 2005 TB Submission and the RMAF.

The working group included lead program officers, and, in some cases, evaluation representatives, from each funded department.

Funded departments were required to provide annual reports to the lead department (i.e., PCH or CIC) on key activities and results for their initiatives and were required to conduct their own program evaluations. Non-funded departments reported on initiative activities through the annual reporting mechanism in place for the Multiculturalism Program. PCH/CIC reported on CAPAR results and accomplishments through the Annual Report to Parliament on the Implementation of the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act*, and Canada's periodic reporting to the United Nations (UN) on the implementation of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD).

1.2.3. CAPAR initiatives and budget

CAPAR included initiatives and strategies that were part of existing budgets and programs. There were more than 20 departments and agencies involved in CAPAR (see Appendix A for a listing of all funded and non-funded programs).

In addition, five-year funding in the amount of $53.6 million (2005-06 to 2009-10), and $11.3 million ongoing, was allocated to support nine new and existing initiatives, as well as a Secretariat, for CAPAR. A brief description of each of the funded initiatives, including planned budget and operational status, is provided in Table 1-2.[3] The Secretariat was allocated $968.6K (over five years) and $227.8K ongoing.

The Multiculturalism Program at PCH had consulted with federal departments to identify where there were significant gaps in federal programming. A national forum on policing had similarly identified the need for policing authorities to incorporate diversity in their policies and programs and the need to establish rigorous data collection on hate crime. Finally, a gap analysis was completed which identified gaps in federal programming. On the basis of these consultations, forum, and gap analysis, new and existing initiatives were provided with CAPAR funding.

Funded initiatives were led by four departments: PCH, CIC, Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC), and the Department of Justice (DoJ). The nine new or expanded initiatives related to racism as it affected: youth in school; employers; the workplace; the justice system; policing services; victims and perpetrators of hate crimes; and the development of government policies, programs and services for Canadians.

---

[3] Four of the nine funded initiatives were either cancelled or not implemented, and the WCI did not receive CAPAR funding in 2005-06. As such, overall expenditures for CAPAR were lower than planned. Information on actual expenditures was not available for all nine initiatives, so the actual costs of CAPAR as a whole could not be established.

Table 1-2: Description of initiatives funded under CAPAR

Initiative	Department	5-year planned budget	Purpose / description	Status
Inclusive Institutions Initiative (III)	PCH (Multiculturalism Program)	$12,124,700 over 5 years; $2,847,200 ongoing	III aimed to support and encourage federal institutions to take the priorities and needs of ethno-cultural and ethno-racial communities into consideration when developing new and implementing existing policies, programs and services.	Cancelled in 2006
Anti-Racism Test Case Initiative (ARTCI)	PCH (Human Rights Program)	$268,784 for year 1 (excluding funds for implementation)	ARTCI was envisioned to provide funding to challenge provincial/territorial legislation, practice or policies that allegedly violated the racial equality provisions of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms where such cases were expected to be of potential national significance.	Not implemented
Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime (Data Collection Strategy)	PCH (Multiculturalism Program), CIC (Multiculturalism Program)	$2,289,200 over 5 years; $332,200 ongoing	The Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) delivers the Data Collection Strategy. Through the Strategy, police report hate-motivated crime to CCJS. The goal of the strategy is to provide both the public and policy makers with key indicators on racial discrimination.	Ongoing
Law Enforcement Aboriginal and Diversity Network (LEAD)	PCH (Multiculturalism Program)	$575,800 over 4 years	LEAD was founded in 2003 as a non-profit network of law enforcement agencies and individuals from all jurisdictions in Canada to raise the professional standard in serving Aboriginal and ethno-cultural and ethno-racial communities. Under CAPAR, PCH signed an agreement with the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police to support a number of LEAD-based activities on a 50-50 cost shared basis. Funding included support for a coordinator, and activities such as administrative functions/supplies and meetings, communication plans and tools, research, consultations, and website development.	Cancelled in 2008
Welcoming Communities Initiative (WCI)	CIC (Immigration Settlement and Adaptation Program)	$17.6 million over 5 years; $4.4 million ongoing	WCI aimed at creating a true sense of belonging and shared citizenship for immigrants. The Initiative focuses on working with non-governmental organizations and provincial partners to foster a welcoming environment in communities for newcomers.	Ongoing
Racism-Free Workplace Strategy (RFWS)	HRSDC (Labour Program)	$13 million over 5 years; $3 million ongoing	The goal of RFWS was to facilitate the integration of skilled individuals in Canadian workplaces by developing tools, guidelines and education materials for employers, practitioners, managers, employees, and the general public. Activities are intended to reduce discriminatory barriers faced by visible minorities and Aboriginals in Canadian workplaces.	Ongoing

Initiative	Department	5-year planned budget	Purpose / description	Status
Race-Based Issues in the Justice System (RBIJS)	DoJ (Justice Partnership and Innovation Fund)	$6.7 million over 5 years (distributed amongst the three Justice Initiatives); $500,000 ongoing	RBIJS aimed to improve fair treatment of Aboriginals and visible minorities in the justice system.	Ongoing
Interventions for Victims and Perpetrators of Hate Crimes (IVPHC)	DoJ (Justice Partnership and Innovation Fund)		This initiative aimed to identify and respond to the special needs and requirements of victims of hate crimes.	Ongoing
Countering Internet-Based Hate Crimes (CIBHC)	DoJ (Justice Partnership and Innovation Fund)		CIBHC was intended to detect and address the issue of hate speech on the internet. The initiative also aimed to provide public legal education and information on the definition of hate propaganda to enhance the capacity of the public and Internet Service Providers to recognize hate speech.	Not implemented

2. Methodology

The evaluation followed the scope and methodology set out in an evaluation plan developed during a planning phase completed by GCS prior to commencement of the evaluation. The evaluation planning phase was undertaken between December 2009 and January 2010 and was completed in consultation with the CIC evaluation team and CAPAR program representatives, including members of the IWG. The evaluation plan was designed to align with the Treasury Board Policy on Evaluation (April, 2009).

The following section outlines the evaluation issues and questions, data collection methods, and methodological considerations for the evaluation.

2.1. Evaluation issues and questions

The horizontal evaluation of CAPAR examined issues related to relevance, design and delivery, and performance. Table 2-1 details the evaluation issues and questions addressed in the evaluation (see Appendix B for the complete evaluation matrix, which also includes specific indicators and methodologies for each evaluation question).

Table 2-1:   Summary of evaluation issues and questions

Evaluation Issue	Evaluation Question
Relevance	• Does CAPAR continue to be consistent with departmental and government-wide objectives and priorities? • Is there a continuing need for initiatives to counter racism and discrimination in Canada? • Are CAPAR efforts consistent with federal roles and responsibilities?
Design and Delivery	• Were federal partners and stakeholders successfully engaged in the development and implementation of CAPAR? • Has CAPAR been effectively managed and coordinated? • Was the horizontal federal approach a necessary and appropriate design for the implementation of CAPAR?
Performance	• How has the initiative contributed to federal partners and stakeholders having knowledge, resources and tools to promote inclusion, address racism and discrimination and eliminate barriers to participation? • How has the initiative contributed to the understanding among federal partners and stakeholders of culturally competent policing, hate crimes and race-based issues in the justice system? • Have federal partners and stakeholders taken action to promote inclusion, address racism and discrimination and eliminate barriers to participation? • Has the knowledge of culturally competent policing, hate crimes and race-based issues in the justice system been applied by federal partners and stakeholders to develop and improve policies, programs and services? • Were there any unintended impacts or outcomes of the initiative, positive or negative? • Was the CAPAR horizontal initiative an efficient use of resources resulting in good value for money?

2.2. Data collection methods

The evaluation of CAPAR included the use of multiple lines of evidence and complementary research methods to help ensure the reliability of information and data collected. The following data collection methods were used to gather data for the evaluation:

- key stakeholder interviews;
- document review;
- literature review; and
- synthesis of individually funded program evaluation findings.

Each of these methods is described in more detail in the following sections.

2.2.1. Key stakeholder interviews

A total of 26 interviews were completed for the evaluation. Interviews were undertaken with five key stakeholder groups, as described below.

CAPAR Secretariat: Interviews were conducted with representatives of the Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch who were involved with the CAPAR Secretariat. This group was interviewed primarily to gather information on relevance (i.e., alignment of CAPAR objectives and departmental priorities) and the coordination of CAPAR.

Senior Management from the Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch: Interviews were conducted with senior management from the Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch. The primary purpose of these interviews was to gather information on program delivery and performance.

CAPAR-funded program representatives: Program representatives from the funded initiatives were interviewed, including those that were not implemented or were cancelled. Information obtained from this group was intended to inform the evaluation team on the relevance, delivery and outcomes of their respective initiatives, as well as on the overall success of CAPAR as a horizontal initiative.

Multiculturalism Champions: Interviews were conducted with Multiculturalism Champions from non-funded initiatives. The primary purpose of these interviews was to gather information on anti-racism activities being undertaken in the non-funded departments.[4]

Other stakeholders: Other stakeholders interviewed included members of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and a crown corporation, working in the field of anti-racism. A list of stakeholders was developed in conjunction with CIC's Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch. This interview group was expected to provide input on the need for, and utility of, a federal initiative against racism.

---

[4] The Multiculturalism Champions Network was launched in 2005 with the goal of facilitating greater implementation of the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* and fostering a better understanding of multiculturalism throughout federal institutions. The Network is composed of senior officials whose primary responsibilities are: to build awareness and understanding of the importance of multiculturalism and the *Act*; stress the importance of multiculturalism in the development and implementation of policies, programs and practices of their institutions; and play a leadership role as agents of change within their institutions. Many federal institutions have nominated a Multiculturalism Champion and there are currently seventy eight Champions across federal institutions (Annual Report on the Operation of the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* 2006–2007).

The number of interviews completed for each interview group is illustrated in Table 2-2 (see Appendix C for a list of interviewees).

Table 2-2:   List of interviews by interview group

Interview Group	Number of Interviews Conducted
CAPAR Secretariat	4
Senior Management from the Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch (including former management)	3
CAPAR-funded program representatives	6[5]
Multiculturalism Champions	10
Other stakeholders (e.g., NGOs)	3
Total	**26**

Interviews were conducted both in-person and via telephone. Different interview guides were developed for each of the interview groups and the interview questions were aligned with the evaluation questions identified in the evaluation matrix (see Appendix D for the interview guides). All interviewees received a copy of the interview guide in advance of the interview. The results of the interviews were summarized in an interview notes template and were then coded and analyzed to determine key themes.

2.2.2. Document review

Documentation was reviewed primarily to inform an assessment of the relevance and design and delivery of the Initiative. The following types of documentation were reviewed during the evaluation:

Foundation documents: including the Treasury Board submission and the Memorandum to Cabinet for CAPAR.

Corporate / accountability documents: including CIC's Departmental Performance Reports, Reports on Plans and Priorities, the RMAF, and other documentation that provided information on CIC and GoC priorities (e.g., Speech from the Throne).

Acts, charters, international conventions: Canada has an extensive legal and policy framework and many international obligations related to multiculturalism, rights and freedoms, and protection from discrimination. These legislative documents and international conventions were included in the review.

Reviews: CAPAR has undergone a number of reviews, including a baseline assessment, an evaluability assessment, and a management review. All of these reviews were included in the document review.

Program materials: including presentations, reporting templates and tools, consultation material and results.

The document review also provided information to assess whether CAPAR was an efficient use of resources. Financial information from CAPAR was analyzed to examine budgeted and actual costs of CAPAR. The document review was conducted using a customized template that was organized

---

[5] Some program representatives discussed more than one program so the number of interviewees does not equal the number of CAPAR-funded programs.

according to evaluation questions and indicators. Annex E contains a list of documents that were reviewed for the evaluation.

2.2.3. Literature review

GCS conducted a literature review of horizontal management, which examined: the various rationales for horizontal initiatives; the various types/classifications (i.e., informal and formal); and success factors for management.[6] Using the information from the literature review, GCS established criteria for assessing the effectiveness of CAPAR as a horizontal initiative (e.g., rationale for horizontality, effectiveness of management). See Appendix F for a list of the assessment components.

2.2.4. Synthesis of evaluation findings

A major source of information for the evaluation was the evaluations undertaken by the individual programs funded under CAPAR. GCS reviewed a total of six[7] evaluation reports and extracted relevant information as per the indicators in the CAPAR evaluation matrix. The information available from these program evaluations was used to assess the overall performance of the CAPAR initiative. To a lesser extent, the evaluations also provided information with respect to relevance and program design/delivery.

2.3. Limitations and considerations

A few methodological limitations and considerations for the evaluation should be noted.

Difficulty in assessing the overall impact of CAPAR as a whole

The wide scope of CAPAR activities, program beneficiaries, and target audiences, resulted in a range of program outputs and outcomes. Common outputs and outcomes could only be articulated at a very high level for the Initiative. This lack of definition hindered the ability of the evaluation to measure and aggregate program impacts for CAPAR as a whole. Furthermore, the evaluation did not attempt to examine changes in levels of racism in Canada over time.

Limited information on CAPAR non-funded Initiatives

Limited research was conducted to determine the scope of non-funded initiatives being undertaken by other departments. Interviews with Multicultural Champions were intended to inform the evaluation team of anti-racism activities being undertaken in other government departments and agencies; however respondents had varying degrees of familiarity with CAPAR and with anti-racism activities in their respective departments.

---

[6] The literature review was completed as a separate document titled: *Review of Recent Literature on Horizontal Management*.
[7] Justice programs (formative and summative), Evaluation of the Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime (evaluation report), Law Enforcement Aboriginal and Diversity Network (evaluation report), Evaluation of the Racism-Free Workplace Strategy (summary of preliminary findings), and Evaluation of the Welcoming Communities Initiative (evaluation report).

Amount and types of information available on the different CAPAR-funded initiatives varied considerably

The evaluation relied heavily on individual funded program evaluations to assess the results of CAPAR. In examining the documents available on the different CAPAR-funded initiatives, the evaluation team found considerable differences between evaluation reports in terms of the amount of information and the program results. Many evaluations focused on activities and outputs rather than program outcomes. In regards to initiatives that were cancelled or not implemented, the evaluation team found there was limited information available (i.e., ARTCI and III).

3. Evaluation findings

This section presents the findings of the evaluation, organized by the three major evaluation areas (relevance, design and delivery, and performance) and by the major identified themes.

3.1. Relevance

3.1.1. Continued need for initiatives to combat racism and discrimination

Finding: *Evidence shows that diversity in Canada will continue to increase and that intolerance remains an issue for Canadians. As such, the rationale for initiatives to combat racism and discrimination has not changed since CAPAR began.*

Context and prevalence of racism and discrimination in Canada

Canada is home to more than 200 ethnic groups, with 16% of its population (over five million individuals) identifying as a visible minority.[8] Information from the Census showed that Canada's visible minority population grew 27% from 2001 to 2006, five times faster than the population as a whole.[9] The diversity of Canada's population is expected to continue to increase over the next two decades.[10] According to projections by Statistics Canada (STC), up to 14.4 million Canadians (or about one-third of the population) will be members of a visible minority by 2031.[11] The religious composition of the country is also changing, with some of the largest increases seen in Muslim, Hindu, Sikh and Buddhist denominations.[12]

Within the context of these demographic changes, there are signs of intolerance. The 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey (EDS) found that nearly one-half of Blacks and one-third of South Asian and Chinese respondents reported having been the victim of discrimination and unfair treatment in the previous five years.[13] Another source found that almost one-quarter of visible minority workers reported having experienced racial harassment or discrimination in the workplace.[14] A 2003 Ekos survey found that 46% of Aboriginal people living off-reserve felt they had been a victim of racism or discrimination over the previous two years.[15] A 2005 poll from Ipsos-Reid showed that Canadians believe the groups most targeted by racism are Muslim/Arabs, Aboriginal people, Blacks, and East Indians.[16] A more recent poll undertaken by Angus Reid Strategies (2009) found that some Canadians hold unfavourable views towards some non-Christian religions, including Islam and Sikhism.[17]

---

[8] Statistics Canada. 2006 Census: *Ethnic origin, visible minorities, place of work and mode of transportation*. *April 2008*.

[9] Statistics Canada. *Police-reported Hate Crime in Canada*. Juristat Article by Phil Walsh and Mia Dauvergne, May 2009, vol. 29, no. 2.

[10] Statistics Canada. *Projections of the diversity of the Canadian population, 2006 to 2031*. March 2010.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Statistics Canada. *Police-reported Hate Crime in Canada*. Juristat Article by Phil Walsh and Mia Dauvergne, May 2009, vol. 29, no. 2.

[13] Government of Canada. *A Canada for All: Canada's Action Plan Against Racism*, 2005.

[14] John Samuel & Kogalur Basavarajappa. *The Visible Minority Population in Canada: A Review of Numbers, Growth and Labour Force Issues*, 2006. Page 260. Accessed online at: www.canpopsoc.org/journal/CSPv33n2p241.pdf

[15] Government of Canada. *A Canada for All: Canada's Action Plan Against Racism*, 2005.

[16] CTV News. *1 in 6 Canadians victims of racism*: poll. March 2005. Accessed online at: www.ctv.ca/CTVNews/Canada/20050321/racism_ipsos_050321/

[17] Vision Critical. *Canadians Hold Dissimilar Views on Six Religions*. Accessed online at: www.visioncritical.com/2009/05/canadians-hold-dissimilar-views-on-six-religions/. According to a poll of 1,002

Further, research on hate-motivated crimes has shown that groups most at risk of being victimized by hate and bias activity were racial/ethnic minorities and religious minorities.[18] In 2008, police services in Canada reported 1,036 hate-motivated crimes, with 55% motivated by race/ethnicity and 26% motivated by religion.[19]

Studies also demonstrate that Aboriginal people, visible minorities and immigrants are particularly vulnerable to unemployment, underemployment, lower incomes and social segregation.[20] A 2004 study found that the wage gap between visible minorities and the rest of the Canadian population had increased from 11% to 14.5% in the ten years from 1991 to 2000.[21] Among Canadian-born men, the three largest visible minority groups—Blacks, Chinese and South Asians—had significant wage gaps compared to their Caucasian counterparts.[22] The 2006 Census revealed that the unemployment rate of visible minority workers with university degrees in 2006 stood at 7.4% compared to 3.7% among non-visible minority workers with university degrees.[23] The incidence of poverty among immigrants, almost half of whom are visible minorities, has been shown to be increasing in Canada.[24]

Interviewed stakeholders were also all of the opinion (24 of 24) that there is a need for initiatives to counter racism and discrimination. Reasons given included that racism exists in Canada (15 of 24) and because of the trend of increasing diversity in Canada (8 of 24). The evaluations of the CAPAR-funded initiatives also cite these issues in the context of examining their own continued need. The various evaluation reports highlight issues such as Canada's increasing diversity; evidence of continued intolerance/discrimination against members of visible minority groups; and the significant labour/workforce inequalities faced by Aboriginal people and members of visible minorities.

3.1.2. Alignment with federal roles and responsibilities

Finding: *CAPAR is aligned with federal legislative responsibilities articulated in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the Canadian Human Rights Act, the Multiculturalism Act, and the Employment Equity Act. CAPAR also aligns with international initiatives and GoC commitments.*

Alignment with federal legislative responsibilities

Canada has a long history of policies on human rights, equality and multiculturalism (as previously shown in Figure 1). A review of documents showed that CAPAR is aligned with federal roles and responsibilities. More specifically, CAPAR and its funded initiatives support federal legislative responsibilities such as the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the *Canadian Human Rights Act*, the *Multiculturalism Act*, and the *Employment Equity Act*. These pieces of legislation call for

individuals across Canada, 72 per cent said they have a "generally favourable opinion" of Christianity. Islam scored the lowest favourability rating, just 28 per cent; Sikhism was rated favourably by 30 per cent; Hinduism by 41 per cent; Buddhism by 57 per cent; and Judaism by 53 per cent.

[18] Shaw, Margaret and Olivier Barchechat. *Preventing Hate Crimes: International Strategies and Practice,* April 2002.

[19] Statistics Canada. *Police-reported Hate Crime in Canada.* Juristat Article by Phil Walsh and Mia Dauvergne, May 2009, vol. 29, no. 2.

[20] Government of Canada. *A Canada for All: Canada's Action Plan Against Racism*, 2005.

[21] Conference Board of Canada. *Making a Visible Difference: The Contribution of Visible Minorities to Canadian Economic Growth*, April 2004. Page 4 & 5. Accessed online at:
www.hrpartnership.ca/images/HR%20Documents/Conf%20Board%20Visible%20minorities.pdf

[22] Citizenship and Immigration. *Addressing Racism and Discrimination – Evidence and Rationale* (Hou and Coulombe, 2008).

[23] Citizenship and Immigration. *Addressing Racism and Discrimination – Evidence and Rationale* (Statistics Canada, 2006).

[24] Citizenship and Immigration Canada. *Evidence of Racism and Discrimination in Canada – In-house Research.* Fernando Mata. Draft 9 February 2009.

departments to place emphasis on inclusion, equality, and access for all Canadians. Most interviewees (16 of 18) agreed that CAPAR was aligned with federal responsibilities, citing these legislative requirements. Note that the two remaining interviewees (both Multiculturalism Champions) were uncertain with respect to this alignment.

The CAPAR-funded program evaluations also noted that the initiatives were consistent with federal roles, suggesting that the federal government is well-placed to provide coordination and leadership on anti-racism initiatives. For example, the Data Collection Strategy is well situated within the federal government, which can coordinate data compilation and other activities involving all provinces and across the various jurisdictions (e.g., municipal, provincial, First Nation, federal).

The evaluations also provide examples of how the individual CAPAR-funded initiatives link to federal responsibilities, including:

- CIC is responsible for administering the *Multiculturalism Act* and is also responsible for assisting in the integration of newcomers, so it is appropriate that it has responsibility for WCI;
- RFWS focuses on employers covered by the *Employment Equity Act*, the Federal Contractors Program and the Legislated Employment Equity Program and, therefore, aligns well with federal government roles and responsibilities in relation to the discrimination faced by members of visible minorities and Aboriginal peoples in the workplace (as per the *Employment Equity Act*).

Note that, prior to the program's cancellation, the evaluation of the Law Enforcement and Aboriginal Diversity (LEAD) initiative had found that that program was not consistently aligned with federal roles and responsibilities, particularly with respect to its police training component.

The evaluation found that there does not appear to be any other federally coordinated efforts to combat racism. This is supported by a review completed by the Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch on the status of anti-racism efforts, which found that there was little other federal programming specifically on anti-racism. Federal programs were more focused on diversity, ethno-cultural programming, anti-discrimination, and diversity. The evaluation identified other initiatives in place to counter racism and discrimination in both provincial and municipal jurisdictions (e.g., Stop Racism Program in Ontario Schools, Manitoba's 2-Way Street Program). At this time, it appears that there is little coordination between the federal, provincial, and municipal programs.

Alignment with international initiatives and commitments

CAPAR is in alignment with numerous international initiatives and commitments. For example, the UN has organized three WCARs, which were held in 1978, 1983 and 2001. Prior to the 2001 WCAR, the UN noted that the goals of previous conferences had not been attained and emphasized the importance of action by attending states. Canada was a participant at the 2001 WCAR in Durban, South Africa where the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action (DDPA) was adopted by consensus, and called for member states to implement a national action plan against racism.

In addition, Canada is a signatory to ICERD. The Convention aims to eliminate racial discrimination and promote tolerance by requiring its parties to outlaw hate speech and criminalize membership in

racist organizations.[25] Canada has a commitment to report to the UN on its progress on the implementation of ICERD. CAPAR also responded to the UN Special Rapporteur's report on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, based on his visit to Canada in 2003.[26] The report recommended that a national programme against racism based on the DDPA be launched in a coordinated and coherent framework.

Finally, Canada is also a participating state of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), in which the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) works with members to combat intolerance and discrimination. All of these international initiatives were also raised by a few interviewees (4 of 18) and in the initiative evaluations, which particularly noted Canada's commitments under ICERD.

3.1.3. Alignment with federal and departmental priorities

Finding*: At the time of the inception of CAPAR, the issue of combating racism was a clear GoC priority. Since that time, stated priorities have evolved to focus on furthering social cohesion and access to economic opportunity. CAPAR is in alignment with the priorities of the funded departments.*

Alignment between CAPAR and GoC priorities

Evidence shows that the issue of anti-racism and discrimination was a clear priority for the GoC in the early- to mid-2000s. Between 2000 and 2001, in preparation for WCAR, the GoC carried out extensive consultations with national organizations and institutions in civil society, various levels of government, Aboriginal organizations, and human rights commissions. In the October 2004 Speech from the Throne, the GoC pledged to "take measures to strengthen Canada's ability to combat racism, hate speech and hate crimes".[27] The GoC's commitment to the issue was further demonstrated in the 2005 Federal Budget, which included a five-year investment of $56 million for CAPAR.[28]

More recent speeches from the throne suggest the GoC has shifted its priorities from anti-racism and discrimination, specifically, to furthering social cohesion and access to economic opportunity. For example, the November 2008 Speech from the Throne committed the GoC to reducing "barriers that prevent Canadians from reaching their full potential" and ensuring that "all Canadians share in the promise of this land, regardless of cultural background, gender, age, disability or official language."[29] The March 2010 Speech from the Throne stated that Canada demonstrated that "people drawn from every nation can live in harmony."[30]

---

[25] ICERD, Article 4.

[26] Prairie Research Associates. *Evaluation Assessment Of Canada's Action Plan Against Racism (CAPAR),* 2006. Page 4. Report by Mr. Doudou Diène was released in March 2004 and can be accessed online at: daccess-ods.un.org/TMP/9504787.html

[27] Government of Canada. *5 October 2004 Speech from the Throne*. Accessed online at: www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/index.asp?lang=eng&page=information&sub=publications&doc=sft-ddt/2004_2-eng.htm

[28] This amount includes funding to implement the ARTCI. However, only one-year funding was requested for 2005-06 in order to support the development of ARTCI. Thus, the total five-year allocation for CAPAR was $53.6 million.

[29] Government of Canada. *19 November 2008 Speech from the Throne*. Accessed online at: www.speech.gc.ca/eng/media.asp?id=1364

[30] Government of Canada. *3 March 2010 Speech from the Throne*. Accessed online at: www.discours.gc.ca/eng/media.asp?id=1389

This is supported by CIC and CAPAR-funded program interviewees, many of whom suggested that CAPAR (i.e., anti-racism initiatives specifically) was no longer a priority for the government (2 of 10) or that the priorities of the government had evolved over time (8 of 10). The latter interviewees suggested that current GoC priorities have shifted from a focus on anti-racism, to anti-Semitism, social cohesion, and supporting communities and families.

Alignment between CAPAR and departmental priorities

The objectives of CAPAR remain in alignment with the objectives of CIC's Multiculturalism Program, which, as of 2009, include: building an integrated, socially cohesive society; and improving the responsiveness of institutions to the needs of a diverse population. While CAPAR's objectives are specifically focused on reducing racism and discrimination, this is congruent with the Multiculturalism Program's overall focus on social cohesion, equality of opportunity, and responsiveness to diversity in the public sector.

All CIC and CAPAR-funded interviewees (11 of 11) indicated that CAPAR is aligned with their departmental objectives, particularly with respect to integration, equality, and removing barriers to participation (8 of 11) and to anti-racism (5 of 11). All Multiculturalism Champions who responded to this question (5 of 5) also believed that CAPAR was aligned with their departmental priorities.

Information from the initiative evaluations suggested that the funded initiatives were consistent with the mandates/priorities of the responsible departments. For example: CIC is responsible for assisting in the integration of newcomers, which aligns with the objectives of WCI; and RFWS complements HRSDC's employment equity programs. The DoJ evaluation report similarly noted that addressing race-based issues in the justice system is a departmental priority.

3.2. Design and delivery

CAPAR was the first federal initiative on racism and anti-discrimination to employ a horizontal approach. In order to assess the effectiveness of its design and delivery, the evaluation examined different elements of CAPAR in the context of findings from the literature review on effective practices and success factors in horizontal initiatives.

3.2.1. CAPAR design

Finding: *CAPAR was intended to be a horizontal initiative encompassing many government departments and agencies, building on existing programs and filling programming gaps. The design of CAPAR, however, did not meet this intent. More specifically, the original rationale for managing CAPAR as a horizontal initiative was not clear and the actual depth and breadth of CAPAR's horizontality was limited, with only the nine CAPAR-funded initiatives included in any joint activities, and with collaboration largely focused on performance measurement and basic information-sharing. Furthermore, the limited focus of the CAPAR design on the funded initiatives was not aligned with the nature of racism as a broad-based issue, and appears to have resulted in a lack of cohesion among the programs for the horizontal initiative.*

Origin of CAPAR and intended design

As discussed in section 3.1.2 (Alignment with federal roles and responsibilities) CAPAR was developed in response to a number of international events. In addition to these events, information from the RMAF/RBAF indicates that a number of other events and research fed into the design of CAPAR. The consultations completed prior to WCAR identified a need for domestic action to

combat racism. A national forum on policing identified the need for policing authorities to incorporate diversity in their policies and programs and the need to establish rigorous data collection on hate crime. Information from the 2001 Census and the 2002 EDS confirmed the scope of racism in Canada. The Multiculturalism Program consulted departments to identify measures undertaken to combat racism and significant gaps in federal programming. Finally, CAPAR was developed in response to the UN Special Rapporteur's 2004 report that called for Canada to develop an action plan.

The foundation documents for CAPAR advanced this work and committed the GoC to developing a coordinated, horizontal approach across federal departments to strengthen social cohesion by addressing significant gaps in key sectors of federal programming. Further documents note that the Action Plan is a deliberate and concerted effort by the GoC to develop a coordinated framework to combat racism and build on existing measures that strengthen Canadian citizenship. It was organized around six key priority areas:

- Assist victims and groups vulnerable to racism and related forms of discrimination;
- Develop forward-looking approaches to promote diversity and combat racism;
- Strengthen the role of civil society;
- Strengthen regional and international cooperation;
- Educate children and youth on diversity and anti-racism; and
- Counter hate and bias.

As the lead department, PCH was tasked with establishing a strong coordination and monitoring framework to measure progress on the implementation of the Action Plan and to ensure that existing gaps in the federal framework to combat racism are effectively addressed in a timely manner. The Action Plan itself characterized CAPAR as a collaborative effort aimed at eliminating racism in Canada (seeking) to enhance policies, programs and actions across federal departments.

This suggests that the GoC's intention was to develop a broad-based, all encompassing action plan, involving many different departments and agencies and aimed towards a wide variety of target audiences. CAPAR's subsequent design, however, did not meet these intentions. The 2006 Evaluation Assessment of CAPAR acknowledged that "although CAPAR has a horizontal vision, this is not easily or well-translated into a horizontal program design."[31] The following sections provide further evidence that the design of CAPAR did not match its intent.

Rationale for managing CAPAR as a horizontal initiative

As noted in the literature review, the need for horizontal coordination is not new. Given that the government is structured into separate departments and agencies, there is a need to find ways to address, in a coordinated manner, policy issues that cross departmental boundaries. The literature identified a number of reasons for managing horizontally, which include: promoting policy coherence; promoting cost-effective program and policy interventions; addressing the needs of particular groups in an integrated manner; addressing local and regional issues in an integrated manner; improving service delivery; improving operational efficiency; building capacity; supporting a more unified government approach; and improving the image of government.[32]

---

[31] Prairie Research Associates. *Evaluation Assessment Of Canada's Action Plan Against Racism*, 2006.
[32] Government Consulting Services. *Review of Recent Literature on Horizontal Management*, March 2010, page 3.

The original rationale for managing CAPAR as a horizontal initiative was not clearly articulated in program documentation. While the plan itself refers to CAPAR as a "collaborative effort" and foundation documents refer to CAPAR as a "horizontal approach," the available documents do not describe the precise rationale for designing CAPAR as a horizontal initiative. Interviewees most often suggested that CAPAR was designed as a horizontal initiative because anti-racism and discrimination is an issue that cuts across many departments, thus requiring federal coordination (9 of 13). Some interviewees also suggested that Canada's international obligations with respect to anti-racism required a coordinated approach (4 of 13), or that horizontality was a trend in government management at the time of CAPAR's development (2 of 13). Overall, these comments suggest a horizontal approach was implemented to support a more unified government approach—one of the reasons suggested in the literature for implementing horizontal initiatives—but this is not definitively clear.

The lack of a clearly articulated rationale for horizontal management likely presented a challenge to successful horizontal management from the Initiative's outset. As concluded in the literature review, "a sound understanding of the rationale and benefits expected from the [horizontal] initiative will […] help to determine the areas where collaboration is most needed, which organizations need to be involved in each case and the depth of collaboration required."[33]

Nature and scope of collaboration

The literature review identified a number of typologies of horizontal initiatives, ranging from informal to formal. CAPAR was analysed to determine where it was situated within these typologies, using in particular the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Policy Coordination Scale (1998), and Consulting and Audit Canada's Continuum of Escalating Options (2002) (see Appendix G for the full assessment).[34] The analysis concluded that along a continuum of informal to formal, CAPAR can be classified as a relatively informal initiative. Its horizontality was limited to:

- addressing elements related to communication, consultation, dialogue and information-sharing with other departments;
- ensuring that the government spoke with one voice on the issue; and
- undertaking joint projects in the areas of performance measurement and reporting.

The only vehicle for inter-departmental collaboration in CAPAR was the IWG. The Terms of Reference (ToR) developed by the IWG outlined four roles for the group: performance measurement, reporting, evaluation, and information exchange. Information from the interviews confirmed that the IWG's role remained focused on information exchange and integrated performance measurement and reporting. Neither the foundation documents for the horizontal design, nor the ToRs for the IWG included any reference to other forms of collaborative activities, such as joint planning and priority setting, joint research projects, exchange of expertise, mutual strategic adjustment or joint implementation. Furthermore, the IWG was not designed to include such formal elements as central decision-making and policy setting—elements which would have been more in-line with a more formal horizontal approach. Based on the foundation documents for CAPAR and its intentions, it can be concluded that CAPAR was intended to be a more formal horizontal approach; however, it evolved into something more informal.

---

[33] Government Consulting Services. *Review of Recent Literature on Horizontal Management*, March 2010, page 22.
[34] Note that there are other classifications, all which present a continuum of typologies, ranging from informal to formal.

It was suggested in interviews that the depth of inter-departmental collaboration could potentially have been expanded, such as through joint development of publications, further developing of working relationships, and joint creation of a communications strategy to raise the profile and visibility of CAPAR.

Participation in the IWG was limited to the nine (and ultimately fewer) CAPAR-funded initiatives. Although the original action plan listed over 50 initiatives in CAPAR, there was no involvement in the initiative's horizontality by the initiatives not directly funded by CAPAR. It was suggested in interviews that the breadth of coordination could have been increased by including more departments in the IWG. However, it was noted that involving all of the CAPAR initiatives originally listed as part of CAPAR was likely unrealistic and that further clarification of terminology and objectives would have been needed to determine the most appropriate members. More generally, it was also suggested that the level of collaboration in CAPAR could have been improved by actively involving other levels of governments, community groups and NGOs.

Cohesiveness

The literature review identified the degree to which the various initiatives demonstrate some form of overall cohesion as one of the factors that can aid or impede the success of a horizontal initiative. The component parts of a horizontal initiative should respond to a specific policy or operational issue in a coherent manner. The design of CAPAR lacked this cohesion. The evidence from the evaluation suggests that this was the result of two factors: the choice of initiatives included in the horizontal management of CAPAR and the nature of racism itself.

There is little available information on how the initiatives selected for CAPAR funding were chosen. Interviewees and the RMAF indicated that a formal gap analysis was undertaken prior to CAPAR to examine where additional federal programming related to anti-racism would be beneficial. Interviewees stated that this gap analysis then formed the basis for the selection of initiatives that would receive CAPAR funding. Note that this gap analysis was not available for review by the evaluation team.

While this selection process may have related to the original six priority areas of CAPAR and responded to identified needs for additional programming, it does not appear to have factored in the compatibility of the funded programs, including their potential ability to meaningfully collaborate. The funded programs included a wide variety of objectives and target audiences, and ranged from funding the development of programming for immigrant youth (WCI), to policy research related to race-based issues in the justice system (the DoJ component). While some programs appear to have had common elements or stakeholders (such as, most obviously, the hate crime-related activities undertaken by DoJ and the Data Collection Strategy of CIC), they were generally dissimilar and, arguably, fairly incompatible in terms of potential collaboration.

Interviewees agreed (9 of 10) that the funded initiatives largely lacked cohesion, primarily because they did not have common objectives, other than at the broad level. This was also noted in a number of previous reviews, which stated that "the outcomes identified in the logic model do not consistently align with the activities and outputs of the nine initiatives"[35] and that "Initiatives saw

---

[35] Prairie Research Associates. *Evaluation Assessment Of Canada's Action Plan Against Racism*, 2006.

linkages between their work and CAPAR only at a very high level and their efforts were not well reflected in the horizontal logic model."[36]

The challenge with cohesiveness is likely, in part, a consequence of the nature of racism as an issue. Since racism can have an impact on so many different areas—including the integration of immigrants, youth in schools, the workplace, the criminal justice system, and others—there is a great deal of policy scope for initiatives that do not complement each other in any natural way. Further, the fact that CAPAR activities were limited to only the funded initiatives (i.e., the identified gaps) affected the possible level of cohesion across the whole Initiative.

3.2.2. Effectiveness of CAPAR management and coordination

Finding*: A governance and management structure for CAPAR was put in place; however its effectiveness was limited in terms of both coordination and information-sharing.*

The effectiveness of the CAPAR governance structure was assessed by examining: the level of senior management support; the clarity of roles and responsibilities; performance measurement; and the effectiveness of coordination and information-sharing.

Governance and management structure and support

According to the information from the literature review, an effective and appropriate management structure is vital to the success of any horizontal initiative. While there are different types of possible governance structures, they typically consist of one or more interdepartmental committees and working groups, supported by a secretariat. The governance and management structure for CAPAR, established in the foundation documents, was aligned with this practice. The structure included a lead department—originally PCH and then CIC—and an IWG, to be composed of lead officials from the nine funded initiatives and evaluation officers from the four funded departments. Finally, the structure included a Secretariat, housed in the lead department, to provide leadership and support to the IWG and, in effect, to carry out the lead department's responsibilities under CAPAR.

The literature review also noted that it is "common to have a steering committee in place at the appropriate level to provide strategic direction and to oversee the initiative; and a Management Committee to organize the people, tasks, relationships, information and technology to get the work done and to formulate recommendations for the Steering Committee."[37] There was no senior management body in place for CAPAR that could have identified potential areas of collaboration, which was often identified by interviewees as a gap in the design. When asked to rate the overall effectiveness of the management of CAPAR (on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not effective, 5 being very effective), many CIC and CAPAR-funded interviews rated it a three (8 of 11), while two rated it a four or five and one rated it a one or two. In explaining their responses, interviewees were often critical of the fact that no management body was in place for CAPAR.

Interviewees often noted an overall lack of sustained commitment from senior management (10 of 13 interviewees said commitment was lacking or that commitment waned over time). As outlined in the literature review, horizontal initiatives require ongoing political and senior management support and leadership to maintain their legitimacy…and to operate efficiently and effectively.[38] This is

---

[36] Department of Canadian Heritage. *Canada's Action Plan Against Racism*: Management Review, 2008.
[37] Government Consulting Services. *Review of Recent Literature on Horizontal Management*, March 2010, page 14.
[38] Ibid., page 32, 34.

consistent with the 2008 Management Review which suggested that most federal departments with horizontal initiatives similar in organization to CAPAR have an ADM-level interdepartmental steering committee supported by working level committees. The findings of the Management Review noted that this issue had been raised with the IWG in 2006, however it was decided at that time that the working group was sufficient to guide CAPAR.

It was also noted during interviews that CAPAR lacked sustained political interest. It was suggested that the Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Status of Women) was a strong champion of the initiative at the time of its launch, but CAPAR lacked a senior political champion during its implementation. As a result, following its launch, the initiative lacked visibility within the federal government and among its stakeholders.

Roles and responsibilities of secretariat and IWG

As previously discussed, the foundation documents for CAPAR outlined specific responsibilities for the lead organization, the IWG and the Secretariat. The responsibilities of the IWG and the Secretariat were further defined in program documentation. Generally, the Secretariat was responsible for: coordinating the IWG; organizing stakeholder consultations; coordinating performance measurement and reporting, and developing the annual report (Table 3-1). The role of the IWG was to assist with the planning of the annual stakeholder consultations, and the development and collection of baseline and performance information.

Table 3-1:   Summary of expected responsibilities of the IWG and Secretariat

Key Roles and Responsibilities	
Secretariat	• Coordinate Interdepartmental working group meetings, to be held approximately four times a year (January, April, June and October). • Organize annual stakeholder consultations. • Coordinate performance measurement and reporting (e.g., RMAF, reporting framework, baseline information, evaluation). • Analyze input, draft the Annual Report and all related material. • Manager of the Action Plan Unit will chair the meetings.
Working Group	• The group will meet a minimum of four times a year until the final evaluation for CAPAR is completed (to discuss annual report preparations, engagement sessions, and evaluation). • Participate in planning and attend annual stakeholder consultations. • Cooperate with the Action Plan Unit on developing and collecting baseline information, performance information, and evaluation processes. • Provide comments on the Annual Report drafts.

Source: Terms of Reference for the IWG; 2006 CAPAR Reporting Framework.

Some Secretariat and CAPAR-funded interviewees believed the roles were clear (3 of 5), while others suggested they were not (2 of 5). Information from the evaluation suggests that perhaps the issue was not the clarity of the roles, but the expectations of stakeholders. The roles and responsibilities of the Secretariat and IWG were perhaps too narrowly defined for some. Information from interviewees suggests that much more was expected (for more on this see section below on coordination and information-sharing).

Performance measurement

The literature review identified performance measurement as one of the key success factors in the management of a horizontal initiative. It suggests that it is "necessary to establish a process whereby participating organizations provide performance data, usually to the secretariat, on a regular basis in

an agreed-upon format"[39] and that the ideal is to "establish an evaluation framework (such as an RMAF) and collect good baseline data at the outset."[40] The CAPAR Secretariat put in place a process for identifying performance indicators and collecting performance information. Information from interviews and the document review shows that an RMAF was developed for CAPAR, which was created in collaboration with the IWG. In addition, the requirements and processes for joint monitoring and reporting were clearly outlined in a CAPAR Reporting Framework (2006). The reporting framework was established to ensure that responsibilities and timelines for reporting were clear and that the collection of data was standardized.

On an annual basis, CAPAR-funded departments provided performance reports to the Secretariat using a standard template. A review of these templates showed that the first portion of the template was narrative and captured information such as: description and objectives of the initiative, partners and stakeholders involved, changes to the initiative, consultations held, and challenges encountered. The second portion of the template contained a performance section that included a table of performance measures on which initiatives were to report. In reviewing the annual reports submitted, the evaluation found that initiatives used different performance measures and not all initiatives reported on them. The lack of common performance measures means that it would have been very difficult to provide any reporting on the achievement of common CAPAR outcomes. This is evident from the Annual Reports to Parliament on the Implementation of the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act*, which featured very little information on CAPAR.[41]

Previous studies and reviews confirmed that there were challenges with performance measurement. For example, the Evaluation Assessment of CAPAR (2006) noted that there is often a significant gap between the description of objectives and outcomes and associated performance indicators. In addition, the Baseline Review conducted in 2007 identified challenges with respect to: integrating baseline and performance information into the reporting structure; ensuring that indicators align with activities, outputs and outcomes; and accommodating the variety of indicators and baseline information available. These findings are consistent with the information from the interviews. Two of three CAPAR-funded program representatives were critical of the reporting structure, suggesting that it was not useful because the measurements were not meaningful at the program level (for further discussion on the challenges of performance measurement, see 3.3 Performance).

Effectiveness of coordination and information-sharing

Information from the literature review identified coordination and information-sharing as a key success factor in the implementation of horizontal initiatives. The CAPAR logic model itself contained an activity related to "networking and information-sharing" and therefore was a planned component of the horizontal management.

The main mechanisms in place for coordination and sharing information were the Secretariat and IWG. The literature review stressed the importance of having a strong Secretariat in place, noting that "an effective secretariat can make a major contribution to the success of any horizontal initiative" and that it "can also play a key role in facilitating effective communication, not only by

---

[39] Government Consulting Services. *Review of Recent Literature on Horizontal Management*, March 2010, page 28.

[40] Ibid., page 29.

[41] Note that non-funded departments also provided information on their multiculturalism activities via the annual multiculturalism report to CIC, which may or may not have included information on CAPAR-relevant activities. These reports were not reviewed for the evaluation.

ensuring consistent messaging, but by ensuring that the various working groups and committees are kept fully up-to-date on what is happening and are given timely opportunities to provide input."[42]

The evaluation found that the Secretariat was not effective in ensuring coordination and information-sharing. With minimal staff, it was not able to undertake all of its responsibilities. The Management Review completed in 2008 indicated that CAPAR-funded representatives were mixed in their opinion on the horizontal coordination of CAPAR: two initiatives were somewhat unsatisfied; one was satisfied; one very satisfied; and one provided no response. Those interviewed for the evaluation suggested that the Secretariat did not provide sufficient coordination, communication, and information-sharing, primarily because there was too much turnover in Secretariat staff, too few meetings, and a lack of leadership. CAPAR-funded representatives were interested in having more opportunities for information-sharing among the departments. This was also noted in the Management Review, which concluded that there was general interest in increasing the level of information-sharing among initiatives, having the Secretariat share more information, and in changing the structure of the working group meetings.

While Secretariat and CAPAR-funded interviewees believed that the membership of the IWG was appropriate, there was some criticism that the group was too operational and lacked decision-making authority. Interviewees also suggested that the IWG was not effective because it did not meet frequently enough, lacked a clear mandate, had significant turnover in members, did not include non-funded departments, and lacked leadership or direction. Limited documentation was available for IWG meetings, although it confirmed that three meetings were held between 2008 and 2009 (January 2008, May 2008, and September 2009). Information from program representatives indicate that other meetings did occur, however, no records of those meetings were kept. Note that keeping records of minutes was a recommendation in the 2008 Management Review.

Overall, the effectiveness of both the Secretariat and the IWG were limited by the design of CAPAR in that it focused solely on performance measurement and reporting, which, as discussed previously, was not in line with its original intent.

3.2.3. Federal partner and stakeholder engagement

Finding: *Results of consultations completed for Canada's participation in WCAR fed into the development of CAPAR, however, little consultation was done specifically on CAPAR and stakeholders believe that consultation was insufficient. Funded departments undertook consultations following the launch of CAPAR in support of the development of their initiatives.*

Consultation prior to CAPAR

Extensive consultations were undertaken leading up to Canada's participation in WCAR. Records of the Proceeding for WCAR consultations indicate that a total of seven regional consultation sessions were held across Canada during fall 2000 and spring 2001.[43] The consultations involved members of civil society, including representatives of labour, business, academia, ethnocultural and non-governmental organizations, professionals, and race-relations groups. The regional meetings culminated in a National Consultation, held in Ottawa in February 2001. Again, this national

---

[42] Government Consulting Services. *Review of Recent Literature on Horizontal Management*, March 2010, page 26.
[43] Regional consultations included: Alberta, British Columbia, the Prairies, Atlantic Canada, Ontario, Quebec, and Northern Canada.

consultation brought together various members of civil society and was held to obtain national perspectives on WCAR themes, draft documents, and national priorities.

The information gathered through the WCAR consultations was one source of information that fed the development of CAPAR. However, this was not the common perception among interviewed stakeholders. When asked about the consultations completed for CAPAR, seven of 12 interviewees that commented on this question suggested that no consultations were completed and one suggested that consultation was limited. The four remaining interviewees indicated that consultations were done in preparation for WCAR. Only nine interviewees commented on the sufficiency of the consultations: six said it was insufficient; three said it was sufficient.

Consultation during CAPAR

The original action plan stated that the lead department would consult stakeholders annually on the progress of CAPAR's implementation. Information from the literature review suggests that regular consultation with key players is an important component of a horizontal initiative, as it can provide a source of leveraging and support, can further communication of the initiative and can keep the initiative on the political agenda.[44]

Information from the evaluation shows that very limited consultation took place following the launch of CAPAR and that it did not focus on the progress of implementation. A total of six consultation sessions were held across Canada between 2005 and 2007.[45] Individuals representing community, education, academic, municipal and police organizations attended these sessions. The sessions focused on raising awareness of CAPAR and discussing performance measurement challenges. Few interviewees were able to comment on the sufficiency of these consultations; all nine of those who did comment indicated that these consultation sessions were insufficient. Some specifically noted that the provincial governments were not adequately involved in consultations, although available documentation did not provide any information on the level of involvement from the provinces.

While there was limited consultation for CAPAR overall, it should be noted that information from the document review and the initiative evaluations demonstrated that consultations were undertaken with stakeholders for CAPAR-funded programs. For example:

- LEAD grew out of discussion at two policing in multicultural society forums;
- WCI and III conducted consultations with stakeholders to gain insight on how to best develop their initiatives;
- in developing the Data Collection Strategy, much work was done to develop ongoing relationships with policing services through attending relevant conferences and meetings; and
- DoJ conducted consultations with respect to hate on the internet.

---

[44] Government Consulting Services. *Review of Recent Literature on Horizontal Management*, March 2010, page 27.
[45] Consultations were held in Toronto, Vancouver (2), St. John's, Montreal and Edmonton.

3.3. Performance

Finding*: The nature and scope of CAPAR made it difficult to assess its overall impact, although activities undertaken in the funded initiatives have resulted in some progress at the immediate outcome level. Performance was affected by the fact that not all initiatives were implemented as intended.*

Context

A logic model for CAPAR, developed for the evaluation,[46] outlined the expected activities, outputs, and outcomes of the CAPAR-funded initiatives, overall. The logic model grouped the funded programs into two streams of programs:

1) Inclusion: which consisted of WCI, RFWS, and III; and

2) Law, Justice and Hate Crimes: which included ARTCI, the LEAD Network, the DoJ and the Data Collection Strategy.

The logic model illustrates the difficulty in assessing the overall results of CAPAR. Even within the two streams of programs, the funded initiatives involved a number of different target groups and types of activities. The Multiculturalism Program originally had a plan in place (with the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada) to "identify indicators to monitor progress in the fight against racism."[47] However, no such indicators or data were identified, and an assessment of CAPAR's performance is therefore reliant on examining the results of the individual initiatives. In developing the logic model for the evaluation, it was difficult to formulate a cohesive set of outcomes that could encompass all the funded initiatives. As a result, the CAPAR outcomes are very broad and diffuse. This presents a barrier to performance measurement of CAPAR as a single initiative.

This is an inherent challenge for a horizontal initiative that includes multiple departments with very different mandates. While CAPAR was always envisaged as "dynamic and inclusive", inviting "all sectors of society […] to embrace action against racism,"[48] its heterogeneity is a barrier to establishing the overall impact. Further, as pointed out in the evaluation assessment of CAPAR, anti-racism initiatives generally present severe difficulties for evaluators with respect to the attribution of changes in attitudes and behaviours.[49]

In addition to these measurement challenges, CAPAR experienced some issues that negatively affected the achievement of results. Most fundamentally, some planned initiatives did not begin at all, were cancelled or were not implemented:

- following initial conceptualization activities, ARTCI was cancelled in 2006;
- III and the LEAD Network were cancelled in 2008; and
- DoJ's activities related to combating Internet-based hate crime were not implemented following some initial consultations and policy development activities.

---

[46] A logic model was presented in the RMAF, however, was revised by the Multiculturalism Program. A third logic model was prepared for evaluation purposes.

[47] Government of Canada. *A Canada for All: Canada's Action Plan Against Racism*. 2005. p.53.

[48] Ibid., p.4.

[49] Prairie Research Associates. *Evaluation Assessment of Canada's Action Plan Against Racism (CAPAR)* – Final Report. June 2006.

In total, four of the original nine funded initiatives did not go forward as originally planned.

Program evaluations also noted significant delays in the initial implementation of some funded initiatives, including the DoJ component and RFWS. The reasons for these delays appear to be largely related to limited administrative capacity and slow administrative processes within the funded departments. Despite these challenges, the evaluations did document results achieved by CAPAR. The evaluations examined outcomes at the immediate outcome level, with few findings related to intermediate or long-term (ultimate) outcomes. CAPAR was intended to make progress related to the following two immediate outcomes, one for each of the two streams of programs:[50]

- federal partners and stakeholders have knowledge, resources and tools to promote inclusion and address issues of racism and discrimination in their milieu (Inclusion); and
- federal partners and stakeholders have an understanding of culturally competent policing, hate crimes, racial profiling and the problem of the overrepresentation of ethnocultural groups in the justice system (Law, Justice and Hate Crimes).

The following sections describe the target audiences reached by the CAPAR-funded initiatives, and provide highlights from the documented results.

3.3.1. Knowledge, resources and tools to promote inclusion and address issues of racism and discrimination

Target groups

CIC's WCI was intended to follow established models for settlement program delivery and support ongoing anti-racism activities. WCI provides services directly to immigrant-serving organizations and other community-based organizations, who in turn provide services to newcomers. Target groups for the WCI, therefore, included:

- settlement organizations;
- receiving communities, including community-based organizations/groups, educators, and the Canadian public; and
- newcomers to Canada, with a particular focus on youth.

RFWS was a complement to HRSDC's employment equity program, which targets employers covered by the *Employment Equity Act*, the Federal Contractors Program and the Legislated Employment Equity Program. III was intended to target all federal institutions, with an initial focus on 15 specific departments and agencies.

Results

WCI funded 56 projects (between 2006-2007 and 2008-2009), which included a diverse range of activities to promote the successful integration of newcomers to Canada, by reducing discriminatory barriers, in order to maximize the economic, social and cultural benefits of immigration. The evaluation of WCI grouped the projects into six themes:

---

[50] A third immediate outcome, linked solely to ARTCI, is identified in the CAPAR logic model: Stakeholders affected by racism and discrimination have access to the courts and share their experiences and views. As ARTCI was not implemented, this outcome was not examined.

- Awareness Raising and Education, including outreach activities, events, workshops, presentations and conferences (12 projects);
- Newcomer Participation and Integration, including mentoring, events, and developing special supports (11 projects);
- Anti-Racism and Diversity Training, which consisted of the development and delivery of training materials and a pilot training program (8 projects);
- Development of Tools and Resources, which involved the development of training materials and other tools, as well as conducting research, workshops and presentations (7 projects);
- Research and Policy Development (6 projects); and
- Community / Settlement Services Expansion / Enhancement, which included support for non-settlement organizations and the expansion of CIC's Settlement Workers in Schools and Host programs (12 projects).

With the possible exception of the last, all of these themes are likely to result in stakeholders having tools and resources to promote inclusion and address issues of racism. At the time of the evaluation, an estimated 32,000 individuals had used WCI products or participated in activities undertaken through WCI projects during the previous two years.

WCI projects appear to have had a positive impact on the capacity of newcomers, particularly youth, to deal with issues related to prejudice and discrimination and to integrate into their communities. Some WCI projects reached out to newcomers directly by providing information and educational activities through workshops and education seminars or by engaging them in discussions about racism and discrimination. Examples included sessions on prejudice and discrimination in English as a Second Language classes, training students as part of settlement supports in schools, and training newcomers to become ambassadors of anti-racism among their peers.

WCI projects also appear to have had a positive impact on receiving communities, enabling them to become more aware of issues related to racism and discrimination. For example, many WCI projects involved non-settlement organizations, such as businesses and Canadians, and have included workshops, presentations, and resources to educate on the experience of immigrants.

RFWS also completed an extensive range of activities related to promoting inclusion and addressing racism/discrimination in the workplace. According to preliminary findings from its summative evaluation, 827 individuals representing 490 organizations participated in RFWS-supported activities. In follow-up interviews undertaken with participants, 76% reported attending racism prevention workshops and/or training sessions; 39% used tools and resources (including slide shows, training materials, and handouts) provided by RFWS; and 26% were visited by a Racism Prevention Officer. Most participants communicated the knowledge they gained from RFWS activities back to their respective organizations.

While there is limited information available on III, primarily because it was in operation for only two years, existing documentation indicates that a total of five projects received funding covering activities such as: increasing departmental capacity to provide culturally relevant services; enhancing cultural competency of the department in dealing with ethno cultural/racial clients; creating linkages between the correctional system and the community; improving quality of translation services; and commissioning a study on barriers to ethno-cultural/racial communities in dealing with the Federal Government. No information was available regarding the progress or results of these projects.

3.3.2. Understanding of culturally competent policing, hate crimes, racial profiling, and the problem of the overrepresentation of ethnocultural groups in the justice system

Target groups

The target groups for the Law, Justice and Hate Crimes stream of CAPAR included the following:

- Police services and other law enforcement agencies (for the LEAD Network, the Data Collection Strategy, and the DoJ component);
- Policy makers and researchers within government and academia (for the Data Collection Strategy and the DoJ component);
- Legal experts, industry partners and educators, as well as Black youth in the criminal justice system (for the DoJ component);
- Community groups (for the LEAD Network); and
- International stakeholders (for the Data Collection Strategy).

Results

The LEAD Network was the CAPAR initiative primarily intended to increase the level of knowledge of culturally competent policing. The LEAD Network was intended to function as a catalyst for new research focused on policies and practices for policing in a multicultural society. The formative evaluation of the program (undertaken in 2007) indicated that, to a large degree, the network had produced limited results, and the program was cancelled in 2008. Some relevant activities undertaken prior to the cancellation of the program included: a conference on diversity, which included nearly 500 participants; and four cultural competency workshops with police diversity officers. A LEAD Network website was a major deliverable of the project, and was to act as a new forum for police services to exchange information on policing in Aboriginal and ethno-cultural communities. However, the website was found to have had a very limited impact on police services.

CAPAR appears to have been more successful in its funded activities related to increasing knowledge of hate crimes. Indeed, the Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate-Motivated Crime was frequently identified by interviewed key informants as one of the key successes of CAPAR. Between 2005-06 and 2008-09, a total of 681 participants at 156 police services / detachments received training on hate crime reporting through the Data Collection Strategy, and the training was well-received by participants. This training enabled police services to collect nationally consistent data on hate-motivated crime, which was noted as one of the main benefits of the Strategy. Further, Statistics Canada, through the Data Collection Strategy funding, produced a series of information products (including annual reports, data tables, and other materials) that appear to have raised the level of understanding of hate crime among police services that accessed them. The evaluation noted that the outputs of the Strategy will continue to become more relevant and valuable to researchers and other stakeholders as more years of data become available and as the geographic coverage continues to improve.

The DoJ component of CAPAR also involved a range of different activities related to hate crimes' victims and perpetrators. These included, among others:

- The Research and Statistics Division of the department produced a report on hate crime victims, and another (draft) report on hate crimes was presented at two conferences in 2009-2010;
- The department funded two projects intended to increase the understanding of effective interventions for perpetrators of hate crimes;
- The African Canadian Legal Clinic developed an Anti-Black Hate Crimes Manual, and held a forum on anti-Black hate crime, which included 200 attendees;
- Training materials related to the needs of hate crime victims were developed for victim service workers; and
- A chapter on victims of hate crimes was added to a manual used by criminal justice professionals and victim service workers and, at the time of the evaluation, 3,400 copies of the manual had been distributed.

The department had also undertaken consultations and research activities to determine how it should move forward in addressing Internet-based hate crime. Activities were halted; however, as the Department was awaiting further clarity on this issue following a review of a related section of the *Canadian Human Rights Act*.

With respect to racial profiling, some work was undertaken through DoJ on this topic, including policy research and consultations within the department. The LEAD Network had also commissioned a study on racial profiling.

Finally, activities related to the problem of overrepresentation of ethnocultural groups in the Justice system, with a particular emphasis on the overrepresentation of Black Canadians and Aboriginal people, were undertaken by DoJ. Activities included:

- The National Anti-Racism Council of Canada conducted four regional sessions with a total of 111 participants to highlight activities that help to address issues of overrepresentation of African Canadians and Aboriginal people;
- A report outlining the research and underlying factors in the overrepresentation of racial minorities in the Canadian criminal justice system was prepared; and
- Four forums were held in Ottawa, organized by DoJ's Collaborative Working Group: Responding to Violence in Aboriginal Communities.

3.3.3. Value-added of horizontal approach for CAPAR

Finding: *The horizontal approach provided very limited added value to either the CAPAR-funded initiatives or the non-funded initiatives.*

Overall, interviewees had mixed views on whether designing CAPAR as a horizontal initiative resulted in any added value. Senior managers, Secretariat members and CAPAR-funded representatives were asked to rate (using a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being no extent and 5 being great extent) the extent of added value resulting from the horizontality of the initiative. Half of the interviewees (5 of 10) rated this as three; three rated it a four or five; and two rated it a one or two. Of those that provided comments to explain their rating, four of 10 suggested the horizontal design added value because it provided the opportunity to bring people together. However, half (5 of 10) suggested that generally it did not add any value; and that the funded initiatives were too different for meaningful collaboration (2 of 10).

Overall, the evaluation demonstrated that there was very little value added to either the funded or non-funded initiatives as a result of CAPAR's horizontal approach. As previously discussed, there was little cohesion between the funded initiatives in terms of target groups, activities and intended outcomes. The non-funded initiatives, although part of CAPAR's original action plan, were not involved in subsequent activities, and it is not understood how they were expected to fit into the planned outcomes. Ultimately no communication, information-sharing or outreach was conducted with the non-funded initiatives and there is no information to determine their progress or outcomes.

The design of CAPAR also limited any meaningful coordination of performance measurement activities among the funded initiatives. Ultimately, while performance indicators were established and reported on, there was no apparent usage for the information. It did not appear in the Annual Reports to Parliament on the Implementation of the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* and no senior body was in place that would have made use of the information. Also with respect to the funded initiatives, it is unlikely that their progress or performance was influenced by CAPAR and the same results likely would have been achieved in the absence of horizontality.

Despite their views on the actual horizontal management of CAPAR, all interviewees were supportive of the idea of using a horizontal approach to address the issue of racism and discrimination in the future (26 of 26). Specific benefits included supporting the exchange of best practices, providing the government with a comprehensive view of what it is doing to combat racism (and enabling it to identify gaps) and helping the government to tell a coherent story (including integrated reporting). The preference on the part of interviewees for a federal government response to the issue of racism being managed as a horizontal initiative can be attributed to the fact that interviewees see the issue as one that cuts across all departments (with 18 of 26 interviewees citing this as a reason).

4.   Overall conclusions and recommendations

The following section provides a summary of the overall conclusions of the evaluation, organized by evaluation issue.

Relevance

Canada's increasingly diverse society and the existence of racism demonstrate there is a need for initiatives to combat racism and discrimination.

Statistical information shows that Canada's society is becoming increasingly diverse, with growing populations of visible minorities and changes to its religious composition. There is evidence to suggest that minorities are experiencing racism and discrimination and recent data show that groups most at risk of being victimized by hate and bias activity are racial/ethnic minorities and religious minorities. Evidence also suggests that Aboriginal people, visible minorities and immigrants are particularly vulnerable to unemployment, underemployment, lower incomes and social segregation.

Canada has a long history of promoting human rights, equality, and multiculturalism, and the GoC has a continued role in addressing issues related to racism and discrimination.

Canada Action Plan Against Racism (CAPAR) and its funded initiatives are in alignment with departmental mandates and support federal legislative responsibilities such as the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the *Multiculturalism Act*, the *Canadian Human Rights Act* and the *Employment Equity Act*. These pieces of legislation call for departments to place emphasis on inclusion, equality, and access for all Canadians. In addition, CAPAR is in alignment with numerous international initiatives and commitments, such as the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action (DDPA), the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racism (ICERD), and work being done by the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR).

Since the inception of CAPAR, GoC priorities have evolved to focus more on social cohesion and access to economic opportunity, rather than on anti-racism initiatives specifically.

The issue of anti-racism and discrimination was a clear priority for the GoC in the early- to mid-2000s. This is evident from Canada's activities leading up to WCAR; the October 2004 Speech from the Throne, in which the GoC pledged to "take measures to strengthen Canada's ability to combat racism, hate speech and hate crimes"; and the 2005 Federal Budget, which included a five-year investment of $56 million for CAPAR.[51] Since that time, the priorities of the GoC have evolved, with an increased focus on social cohesion and equal access to economic opportunity.

Design and delivery

The CAPAR design was not aligned with its original intent. More specifically, what was intended to be a GoC-wide initiative to combat racism ultimately was designed to coordinate performance measurement among the funded initiatives.

CAPAR was intended to be a GoC response to racism and discrimination which was to be a broad-based, all encompassing action plan, involving many different departments and agencies and aimed

---

[51] This amount includes funding to implement the ARTCI. However, only one-year funding was requested for 2005-06 in order to support the development of ARTCI. Thus, the total five-year allocation for CAPAR was $53.6 million.

towards a wide variety of target audiences. CAPAR's subsequent design, however, did not meet these intentions. While the foundation documents called for a horizontal approach to manage the implementation of CAPAR, the precise rationale for such an approach was not clearly articulated in the documentation. Although the evidence suggests a horizontal approach may have been implemented to support a more unified government approach, the lack of clarity surrounding this rationale made it difficult to further define the nature and scope of intended collaboration. Ultimately, the design of CAPAR was limited to joint performance measurement and inter-departmental information-sharing, and these activities included only the CAPAR-funded initiatives. No communication or outreach was undertaken with the programs included in the original action plan that did not receive funding through CAPAR.

Recommendation: For future horizontal initiatives, CIC should ensure that the design of the initiative supports the intended rationale for horizontal management, the desired level of collaboration with partners, and the expected outcomes of the Initiative. In particular, the rationale and scope of collaboration need to be clearly established before developing the design.

There was little cohesion between the funded initiatives.

While the selection of initiatives for CAPAR funding was based on the identified need for programming in six priority areas, this selection does not appear to have factored in the compatibility of the funded programs. Consequently, these funded initiatives could not be easily fit into a framework of common objectives and performance reporting. Furthermore, the design of the Initiative was not consistent with the wide scope of the issue of racism, as it did not include the non-funded initiatives. As a result, CAPAR had very limited overall cohesiveness, and its initiatives did not establish partnerships or any other forms of collaboration.

Recommendation: For future horizontal initiatives, CIC should ensure that there is a sufficient level of cohesion among the included activities and partners, particularly with respect to their ability to work towards common objectives and to develop meaningful collaborative relationships. This cohesion can facilitate the development of common performance measures as well as reporting on the achievement of common outcomes for the Initiative.

The governance structure put in place for CAPAR was limited in its effectiveness.

A governance structure was put in place for CAPAR that included a lead department, a Secretariat, and an IWG. The structure was tasked with limited duties, with a primary focus on performance measurement. The Secretariat was unable to fulfill some of its responsibilities, including those related to the IWG (i.e., organizing meetings four times a year, annual stakeholder consultations). This is likely attributable to limited resources allocated to the Secretariat. The effectiveness of the Secretariat was compromised by the lack of a senior management committee for CAPAR, which meant that there was no mechanism in place for coordinated decision-making.

Recommendation: For future horizontal initiatives, CIC should ensure that an appropriate governance structure, with the necessary level of senior management involvement, is in place.

Performance

Funded initiatives undertook a wide range of activities in support of CAPAR outcomes. Some information from the program evaluations of the funded initiatives demonstrated the achievement of immediate outcomes. However, the

nature and scope of CAPAR made it difficult to assess its overall impact. Delays in the implementation of certain initiatives and the cancellation of others appear to have limited the success of CAPAR.

Activities undertaken by the funded initiatives targeted a wide range of stakeholders, including: settlement organizations, newcomers to Canada, police services, law enforcement agencies, legal experts and community groups. Information from the various evaluations show that many activities were undertaken that supported CAPAR outcomes at the immediate level and some progress has been made towards those outcomes. However, the inherent challenge in formulating a cohesive set of outcomes that could encompass all the funded initiatives (e.g., multiple departments, different mandates, different target groups), particularly for an issue such as racism, made it difficult to assess the overall results of CAPAR.

The horizontal approach added limited value to either the funded or non-funded initiatives, which was primarily a result of its design.

It is likely that a horizontal approach to a policy issue as wide in scope as racism can best be used to ensure that there is a coordinated government response that avoids duplication of effort across departments and, where appropriate, promotes inter-departmental collaboration.

However, CAPAR activities were not inclusive of the non-funded initiatives and no communication, information-sharing or outreach was conducted with them. It is not known how the non-funded initiatives fit within the objectives of CAPAR or what results have been achieved. Therefore, non-funded initiatives did not benefit from the horizontal approach.

With respect to the funded initiatives, joint activities were mostly limited to performance measurement, which does not appear to have been useful (e.g., little national reporting). Further, the impact and performance of these initiatives would likely have been the same without the added horizontal approach.

Appendix A   CAPAR funded and non-funded programs[52]

	Ethnocultural	Aboriginal
Canadian Heritage	• Multiculturalism Program • Court Challenges Program • Human Rights Program • Exchanges Program • *Inclusive Institutions Initiative* • *Law Enforcement and Aboriginal Diversity Network* • *Data Collection on Hate Motivated Crime* • *Anti-Racism Test Case Initiative*	• Aboriginal Affairs Programs • Young Canada Works Program • *Law Enforcement and Aboriginal Diversity Network* • *Data Collection on Hate Motivated Crime* • *Anti-Racism Test Case Initiative*
NFB, Telefilm, Canada Council for the Arts	• Remove real and perceived barriers to underrepresented professional artists	• Remove real and perceived barriers to underrepresented professional artists
Canadian Race Relations Foundation	• Information sharing, research, project funding and public awareness on racial discrimination	• Information sharing, research, project funding and public awareness on racial discrimination
Status of Women	• Research and project support	• Research and project support
CIC	• Settlement and Integration programs(LINC,ISAP,HOST) • Research on immigration issues (Metropolis) • Internationally Trained Workers Initiative • *Welcoming Communities Strategy*	
Health Canada	• Family Violence Initiative (FVI)	• Family Violence Initiative (FVI) • Delivers services to Aboriginal communities
Indian Affairs and Northern Development		• Urban Aboriginal Strategy (UAS) • Programs in education, health, housing and economic development
Indian Residential Schools Resolution Canada		• Supports projects that promote healing and educate Canadians about the impact of the schools
Justice	• Research and outreach to examine the impact of the *Anti-Terrorism Act* • Funding for projects that address emerging justice issues • Policies on the issues of racial profiling, hate speech • *Race-Based Issues in the Justice System* • *Interventions for Victims and Perpetrators of Hate Crime* • *Countering Internet-based Hate Crime*	• Aboriginal Youth Cities Project for youth at risk • *Race-Based Issues in the Justice System* • *Interventions for Victims and Perpetrators of Hate Crime* • *Countering Internet-based Hate Crime*
Social Development	• The Voluntary Sector Initiative	• The Voluntary Sector Initiative
CRTC	• Regulates broadcasters to reflect Canada's cultural-diversity and to ensure that their programming contains no abusive or unduly discriminatory material	• Regulates broadcasters to reflect Canada's cultural-diversity and to ensure that their programming contains no abusive or unduly discriminatory material
Canada Human Rights Commission	• Receives and investigates complaints of human rights abuses and discrimination	• Receives and investigates complaints of human rights abuses and discrimination
HRSDC	• Legislated Employment Equity Program (LEEP)	• Legislated Employment Equity Program (LEEP)

---

[52] Funded initiatives are identified in italics.

	• Federal Contractors Program (FCP) • Internationally Trained Workers Initiative • Racism-Free Workplace Strategy	• Federal Contractors Program (FCP) • Racism-Free Workplace Strategy
Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness	• Supports intervention strategies for youth-at-risk • National Crime Prevention Bureau • Cross-cultural Roundtable on Security	• Supports intervention strategies for youth-at-risk • National Crime Prevention Bureau • First Nations Policing Program
Treasury Board	• Embracing Change Program	• Embracing Change Program
National Defence	• Diversity Council • Review racist conduct in forces	• Diversity Council • Review racist conduct in forces
RCMP	• Advisory Committee on Visible Minorities • Develop policy framework for policing in a diverse society	• Advisory Committee on Visible Minorities
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council	• Strategic Research Grant Initiatives	• Strategic Research Grant Initiatives
Statistics Canada	• Provides disaggregated data on general, social and economic indicators	• Provides disaggregated data on general, social and economic indicators
Government of Canada	• Policies and legislation • *Action Plan*	• Gathering Strength • Aboriginal Roundtables • *Action Plan*

Appendix B   CAPAR Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Issues / Questions	Indicators	Methodologies								
		Interviews					Doc Review		Lit Review	Synthesis of Initiative Evaluation Results
		CAPAR Secretariat	Senior Manag't	CAPAR-funded Initiatives	Multi Champs	NGOs	Program Docs	Research Stats		
1. Does CAPAR continue to be consistent with departmental and government-wide objectives and priorities?	1.1 Degree of alignment to objectives and priorities of CIC, federal partners and OGDs						●			
	1.2 Perceptions of key stakeholders	●	●	●	●					
2. Is there a continuing need for initiatives to counter racism and discrimination in Canada?	2.1 Evidence base for CAPAR: • Size of ethnocultural, ethnoracial, immigrant and Aboriginal populations in Canada • Incidence/prevalence of racism and racially-based discrimination in Canada							●		
	2.2 Evidence of need specific to CAPAR-funded initiatives						●			●
	2.3 Perceptions of key stakeholders	●	●	●	●	●				
3. Are CAPAR efforts consistent with federal roles and responsibilities?	3.1 Degree of alignment with legislative and international commitments						●			
	3.2 Evidence of federal roles and responsibilities specific to CAPAR-funded initiatives						●			●
	3.3 Evidence of initiatives to counter racism and discrimination in other jurisdictions (provincial/territorial, municipal)	●		●			●			
	3.4 Perceptions of key stakeholders	●	●	●	●	●				

Evaluation Issues / Questions	Indicators	Methodologies								
		Interviews					Doc Review		Lit Review	Synthesis of Initiative Evaluation Results
		CAPAR Secretariat	Senior Manag't	CAPAR-funded Initiatives	Multi Champs	NGOs	Program Docs	Research Stats		
4. Were federal partners and stakeholders successfully engaged in the development and implementation of CAPAR?	4.1 Profile of federal partners and stakeholders engaged (CAPAR reach)						•			•
	4.2 Nature/scope of engagement activities initiated by CAPAR Secretariat and federal partners	•		•			•			•
	4.3 Perceptions of key stakeholders	•	•	•	•	•				
5. Has CAPAR been effectively managed and coordinated?	5.1 Extent/quality/ appropriateness of management tools (i.e., performance measurement, monitoring and reporting) and resources (human and financial) for CAPAR	•	•	•			•		•	
	5.2 Extent/quality/ appropriateness of coordination, communication and information-sharing related to CAPAR: •by CAPAR Secretariat •within CAPAR Working Group	•	•	•			•		•	
	5.3 Perceptions and awareness among key stakeholders	•	•	•	•	•				
6. Was the horizontal federal approach a necessary and appropriate design for the implementation of CAPAR?	6.1 Comparisons with other horizontal federal approaches								•	
	6.2 Degree of alignment of CAPAR-funded initiatives to Action Plan objectives and priorities	•	•	•			•			
	6.3 Extent/quality/degree of cohesion between CAPAR-funded initiatives	•		•			•		•	
	6.4 Perceptions of key stakeholders	•	•	•	•					

Evaluation Issues / Questions	Indicators	Methodologies							Lit Review	Synthesis of Initiative Evaluation Results
		Interviews					Doc Review			
		CAPAR Secretariat	Senior Manag't	CAPAR-funded Initiatives	Multi Champs	NGOs	Program Docs	Research Stats		
7. How has the initiative contributed to federal partners and stakeholders having knowledge, resources and tools to promote inclusion, address racism and discrimination and eliminate barriers to participation?	7.1 Target groups of CAPAR and its funded initiatives									•
	7.2 Evidence that federal partners and stakeholders have knowledge, resources and tools to promote inclusion and address issues of racism and discrimination as a result of CAPAR									•
	7.3 Perceptions and examples provided by key stakeholders	•		•	•	•				
8. How has the initiative contributed to the understanding among federal partners and stakeholders of culturally competent policing, hate crimes and race-based issues in the justice system?	8.1 Target groups of CAPAR and its funded initiatives									•
	8.2 Evidence that federal partners and stakeholders have an understanding of culturally competent policing, hate crimes, racial profiling and race-based issues in the justice system as a result of CAPAR									•
	8.3 Perceptions and examples provided by key stakeholders	•		•	•	•				
9. Have federal partners and stakeholders taken action to promote inclusion, address racism and discrimination and eliminate barriers to participation?	9.1 Evidence of actions taken as a result of CAPAR									•
	9.2 Perceptions and examples provided by key stakeholders	•		•	•	•				

| Evaluation Issues / Questions | Indicators | Methodologies | | | | | | | | |
| | | Interviews | | | | | Doc Review | | Lit Review | Synthesis of Initiative Evaluation Results |
		CAPAR Secretariat	Senior Manag't	CAPAR-funded Initiatives	Multi Champs	NGOs	Program Docs	Research Stats		
10. Has the knowledge of culturally competent policing, hate crimes and race-based issues in the justice system been applied by federal partners and stakeholders to develop and improve policies, programs and services?	10.1 Evidence that knowledge of culturally competent policing, hate crimes and race-based issues has been applied to develop and improve policies, programs and services as a result of CAPAR									•
	10.2 Perceptions and examples provided by key stakeholders	•		•	•	•				
11. Were there any unintended impacts or outcomes of the initiative, positive or negative?	11.1 Evidence of unintended impacts/outcomes						•			•
	11.2 Perceptions and examples provided by key stakeholders	•	•	•	•	•				
12. Was the CAPAR horizontal initiative an efficient use of resources resulting in good value for money?	12.1 Budgeted and actual costs of initiative with and without CAPAR horizontal umbrella						•			•
	12.2 Comparison (nature/scope) of CAPAR-funded initiatives with initiatives developed and implemented without CAPAR funding				•		•			
	12.3 Incidence of initiatives outside of CAPAR with similar objectives, priorities or programming	•		•	•	•	•			
	12.4 Results achieved by CAPAR (horizontal work and funded initiatives)						•			•
	12.5 Perceptions and examples of value added of CAPAR umbrella provided by key stakeholders	•	•	•	•	•				

Appendix C   List of interviewees

CAPAR Secretariat	
Mary Farrell Manager, Policy, Partnerships & Engagement Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch Citizenship and Immigration Canada	Elizabeth MacDonald Senior Policy Analyst Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch Citizenship and Immigration Canada
Ann Roberts Policy Analyst Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch Citizenship and Immigration Canada	

Senior management (Citizenship and Multiculturalism branch)	
Justine Akman Director, Multiculturalism Policy Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch Citizenship and Immigration Canada	Ümit Kiziltan Director General, Integration Program Management Branch Citizenship and Immigration Canada
Andrew Griffith Director General Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch Citizenship and Immigration Canada	Christine Nassrallah Executive Policies and Talent Management Sector Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat

CAPAR-funded program representatives	
Marilou Reeve Counsel Youth Justice, Strategic Initiatives and Law Reform Justice Canada	Michel Fourzly Senior Policy Analyst Racism - Free Workplace Strategy Human Resources and Skills Development Canada
Jean Viel Manager, Policy, Information, Language and Community Program Policy Citizenship and Immigration Canada	Luigia Cistera Director, Policy, Partnerships & Engagement Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch Citizenship and Immigration Canada
Paul Delaney Senior Program Officer Policy, Partnerships & Engagement Citizenship and Multiculturalism Branch Citizenship and Immigration Canada	Marie Cocking Manager, Communications Program Services Citizenship and Immigration Canada

Multiculturalism champions (CAPAR non-funded departments)	
Philippe Thompson Director, Strategic Planning Division Public Safety Canada (Nathalie Gauthier, Joel-Jean Beauchemin)	Claude Joli-Cœur Assistant Commissionner National Film Board (Elema Villegas, Susan Nosov)
Suzanne Pilloud-Proulx Well-being Advisor Policy Development, Planning and Well-being Department of Canadian Heritage	Gail Johnson Director General - Civilian Employment Strategies and Programs Department of National Defence

Daniel Dubeau DG Workforce Programs and Services, Human Resources Royal Canadian Mounted Police (Joanne Smith)	Rosemary Bender Assistant Chief Statistician Social, Health and Labour Statistics Statistics Canada (Tina Chui)
Ray Hatfield Director General, Individual Affairs Indian and Northern Affairs Canada	Annie Laflamme Director, Radio Policy and Applications Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission
Harvey Goldberg Director General, Knowledge Centre Canadian Human Rights Commission	Gisèle Yasmeen Vice President, Partnership Branch Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada
Non-governmental organizations	
Ruth Klein National Director B'nai Brith Canada (Anita Bromburg)	Ayman Al-Yassini Executive Director, Canadian Race Relations Foundation
Estella Muyinda Executive Director, National Anti-Racism Council of Canada	

Appendix D   Matrix of interview questions

Horizontal Evaluation of Canada's Action Plan Against Racism (CAPAR)

Government Consulting Services (GCS) has been engaged by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) to conduct a horizontal evaluation of Canada's Action Plan Against Racism (CAPAR).

As part of the evaluation, GCS is conducting interviews with key stakeholders who have been involved in the initiative or who may be affected by its activities or outputs. The purpose of these interviews is to obtain informed perspectives on the initiative's relevance, design and delivery, and performance. The following questions will serve as a guide for our interview. In some cases, questions may not be relevant to your particular situation or experience. The interview will focus on those questions most relevant to you.

Question	Indicator	Interview Groups				
		CAPAR secretariat	Senior Mgt	CAPAR funded initiatives	Multi Champs	NGOs
Background						
1. What is your organization's involvement or mandate with respect to / anti-racism?	--				•	•
2. How familiar are you with CAPAR? [If they are familiar with CAPAR ask Q2, others skip to Q3.]	--				•	•
3. Can you briefly describe your involvement with CAPAR?	--	•	•	•	•	•
Relevance						
4. How did/does CAPAR align with the objectives and priorities of your federal department/organization?	1.2	•	•	•	•	•
5. How does CAPAR align with the priorities of the Government of Canada?	1.2		•			

Question	Indicator	Interview Groups				
		CAPAR secretariat	Senior Mgt	CAPAR funded initiatives	Multi Champs	NGOs
6. Is there a need for initiatives to counter racism and discrimination in Canada? Why or why not?	2.3	•	•	•	•	•
7. Has your department/organization implemented initiatives designed to counter racism and discrimination? a) If yes, please describe the nature and scope of these initiatives.	12.2				•	
8. Are you aware of other initiatives to counter racism and discrimination (including provincial/territorial, municipal or other federal programs/initiatives)? a) If yes, what are the differences and similarities between these initiatives and CAPAR?	3.3 12.3	•		•	•	•
9. Is CAPAR consistent with federal roles and responsibilities (i.e., does it respond to federal legislative or other obligations)?	3.4	•	•	•	•	
Design and Delivery						
10. Please describe activities undertaken to engage federal partners and other stakeholders in the initial development of CAPAR; and in the implementation of CAPAR. a) How appropriate was this level of engagement?	4.2 4.3	•	•	•	•	•
11. Please comment on each of the following aspects of the management and governance of CAPAR: a) Appropriateness of performance measurement, monitoring and reporting structures b) Sufficiency of financial and human resources provided for CAPAR c) The effectiveness of the Interdepartmental Working Group d) Clarity of roles, responsibilities and accountabilities (CAPAR Secretariat, CAPAR Working Group, participating organizations)	5.3	•		•		

Question	Indicator	Interview Groups				
		CAPAR secretariat	Senior Mgt	CAPAR funded initiatives	Multi Champs	NGOs
e) Effectiveness of coordination, communication and information-sharing undertaken by the CAPAR Secretariat						
12. Using the following scale, please indicate to what extent CAPAR has been effectively managed and coordinated overall. Please explain your answer. No extent Great extent 1 2 3 4 5	5.3	•	•	•	•	
13. Please comment on each of the following aspects of the design of CAPAR: a) Clarity of the rationale for implementing CAPAR as a horizontal initiative b) Extent to which common outcomes were agreed upon c) Extent to which initiatives were clearly linked to CAPAR objectives and priorities d) Adequacy of commitment from Senior Management e) Appropriateness of the Interdepartmental working group	6.4 6.2	•	•	•	•	
14. How cohesive have the CAPAR-funded initiatives been? More specifically: ▪ Did the various initiatives funded under CAPAR form a cohesive whole? ▪ Were there ways in which the various initiatives complemented each other in their objectives or activities?	6.3	•	•	•		

Question	Indicator	Interview Groups				
		CAPAR secretariat	Senior Mgt	CAPAR funded initiatives	Multi Champs	NGOs
Performance						
15. CAPAR was designed to achieve a number of outcomes related to inclusion and racism as well as culturally competent policing, hate crimes and race-based issues in the justice system. To what extent has CAPAR made progress in achieving the following outcomes? Please indicate if any of the following are not relevant or applicable to your experience with CAPAR. a) Providing partners with knowledge, tools, and resources to promote inclusion, address racism and discrimination and eliminate barriers to participation [If results noted for a) ask b). Others skip to c)]		•		•	•	•
b) Generating action by federal partners to promote inclusion, address racism and discrimination and eliminate barriers to participation		•		•	•	•
c) Increasing understanding among partners of culturally competent policing, hate crimes and race-based issues in the justice system [If results noted for c) ask d)]		•		•	•	•
d) Improving policies, program and services as a result of culturally-competent policing, hate crimes and race-based issues in the justice system		•		•	•	•
16. What has been the most significant impact of CAPAR?	7.3 8.3 9.2 10.2	•		•	•	•

Question	Indicator	Interview Groups				
		CAPAR secretariat	Senior Mgt	CAPAR funded initiatives	Multi Champs	NGOs
17. Using the following scale, please indicate to what extent the horizontal nature of the CAPAR initiative provided added value to the initiatives (e.g., coordination, achievement of results). Please explain your answer. No extent Great extent 1 2 3 4 5		•	•	•	•	
18. Would you recommend that a horizontal approach be taken to address issues of racism in the future? Why or why not? What are the lessons learned that should be taken into account?	6.4 12.5	•	•	•	•	•
19. Were there any unintended impacts or outcomes of the initiative, positive or negative?	11.2	•	•	•	•	•

Thank you for your assistance in this important evaluation.

Appendix E   List of documents reviewed

Corporate / accountability

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. *Report on Plans and Priorities*, 2008-2009.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. *Report on Plans and Priorities*, 2009-2010.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. *Departmental Performance Report*, 2008-2009.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. *Departmental Performance Report*, 2009-2010.

Department of Canadian Heritage. *A Canada for All: Canada's Action Plan against Racism*, 2005.

Department of Canadian Heritage. *A Canada for All: CAPAR – Horizontal and Integrated Results-Based Accountability Framework / Risk-Based Audit Framework* (date unknown).

Department of Canadian Heritage. *A Canada for All: Canada's Action Plan Against Racism: Accountability Framework* (date unknown).

Government of Canada. 2009 Speech from the Throne.

Government of Canada. 2010 Speech from the Throne.

Acts, charters, international conventions

Department of Canadian Heritage. *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, 1982.

Government of Canada. *Canada's Multiculturalism Policy*, 1971.

Government of Canada. *Canadian Human Rights Act*, 1977.

Government of Canada. *Canadian Multiculturalism Act*, 1985.

Government of Canada. *Canadian Race Relations Foundation Act*, 1990.

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination*, (1970, Canada's Ratification).

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, (1976, Canada's Ratification).

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*, (1976, Canada's Ratification).

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. *OSCE Human Dimension Commitments*, 2005.

United Nations. *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*, (1981, Canada's Ratification).

United Nations. *Millennium Development Goals*, 2000.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. *United Nations Human Rights Commission Universal Periodic Review*, 2009 (A/HCR/11/37).

Evaluation reviews

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. *Status of Anti-racism Efforts of Federal Organization Listed in CAPAR*, 2009.

Department of Canadian Heritage. *Canada's Action Plan against Racism: Management Review*, 2008.

Department of Canadian Heritage. *Management Review* (Interview guide responses), 2008.

Prairie Research Associates. *Evaluation Assessment Of Canada's Action Plan Against Racism*, 2006.

Prairie Research Associates. *Baseline Information for Canada's Action Plan Against Racism*, 2007.

Program material

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. *CAPAR Logic Model*, 2009.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. *Action Plan Unit Workplan*, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada / Department of Canadian Heritage. Media Lines (Q&As, various topics).

Department of Canadian Heritage. *CAPAR Chronology* (not dated).

Department of Canadian Heritage. Various Consultation Documents, 2005 to 2007.

Department of Canadian Heritage. *Action Plan Unit - Logic Flow* (not dated).

Department of Canadian Heritage. *Logic Model for the Horizontal Management of Canada's Action Plan Against Racism* (not dated).

Department of Canadian Heritage. CAPAR Interdepartmental Working Group Terms of Reference (not dated).

Department of Canadian Heritage. *CAPAR Interdepartmental Working Group Participant Survey*, 2006.

Department of Canadian Heritage. *CAPAR Interdepartmental Working Group Meeting Minutes* (not dated).

Department of Canadian Heritage. *Speaking notes: On the Occasion of the Review of Canada's 17th and 18th Reports Under the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination*, 2006.

Department of Canadian Heritage. *Action Plan Against Racism - 2006 Reporting Framework*, 2006.

Departmental annual reports

Canada Centre for Justice Statistics. *Annual Reports – Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate Motivated Crime*, 2005-2006 to 2008-2009.

Canada Centre for Justice Statistics. *Final Project Reports – Nationally Standardized Data Collection Strategy on Hate Motivated Crime*, 2006 to 2009.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. *Annual Reports – Welcoming Communities Initiative*, 2005-2006 to 2008-2009.

Department of Canadian Heritage. *Annual Reports - Inclusive Institutions Initiative*, 2005-2006 to 2007-2008.

Department of Canadian Heritage. *Law Enforcement and Aboriginal Diversity (LEAD) Network Report*, 2004 to 2006.

Department of Justice. *Annual Reports – Activities Completed by Department of Justice under CAPAR*, 2005-2006 to 2007-2008.

Human Resources and Skills Development Canada. *Annual Reports – Racism-Free Workplace Strategy*, 2005-2006 to 2007-2008.

Other

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. *Updating Canada's Anti-Racism Strategy: A Review of anti-racism strategies in Australia, Denmark, Germany, France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom*, 2009.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. *Key Drivers For A Federal Anti-Racism And Social Inclusion Action Plan* (not dated).

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. *Evidence of Racism and Discrimination in Canada*, 2009.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. *Annual Report: The Canadian Multicultualism Act*, 2008-2009.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. *Addressing Racism and Discrimination – Evidence and Rationale* (not dated).

Department of Canadian Heritage. *Canada's Regional Consultations Record of Proceedings in Advance of the U.N.'s World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance* (not dated).

Galabuzi, Grace-Edward (Ryerson University). *Canada's Action Plan Against Racism: A Critique* (Presentation at International Metropolis Conference), 2005.

Metropolis Conversation Series. *Developing a Framework for Institutional and Individual Behavioural Change: Towards a Fair and Inclusive Workplace*, 2010.

United Nations. *World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance*, 2001.

United Nations. *Outcome Document of the Durban Review Conference*, 2009.

Appendix F   CAPAR assessment components

Evaluation Indicator	Assessment Criteria
5.1 Extent/quality/ appropriateness of management tools (i.e., performance measurement, monitoring and reporting) and resources (human and financial) for CAPAR	CAPAR is adequately funded, taking into account the additional costs of horizontal coordination
	The requirements for joint measuring and monitoring of performance are met and incorporate readily measurable indicators that are relevant to the activities carried out by the funded initiatives
	Specific performance targets are realistic, achievable and progressive
	The risks related to the horizontal management of CAPAR are identified and managed effectively
	The requirements for joint and integrated reporting are met and do not impose an undue burden on participants
	The initiative is well supported at the political and senior management levels and by external stakeholders
	CAPAR has processes in place that enable it to learn from experience and pass this knowledge on to new participants
5.2 Extent/quality/ appropriateness of coordination, communication and information-sharing related to CAPAR: • by CAPAR Secretariat • within CAPAR Working Group	Participants have adequate opportunity to share information in a timely manner to meet their needs
	Participants share a common perspective on the nature of the racism issue and how to address it and there is a common fact base and terminology
	There is a strategy to maintain the visibility of CAPAR with respect to senior management, politicians and external stakeholders (including effective two-way communication with external stakeholders)
	There is effective coordination in the areas of performance measurement, reporting and evaluation
	There is strong leadership and support from the Action Plan Unit
	The WG functions effectively (active participation, strong commitment, trust, credibility, frank and open dialogue)
6.1 Comparisons with other horizontal federal approaches	Rationale for managing the issue horizontally is clear and understood
	The selection of partners and the depth of collaboration are appropriate, given the rationale and intended outcomes
6.2 Degree of alignment of CAPAR-funded initiatives to Action Plan objectives and priorities	The objectives, priorities and intended outcomes are clear and accepted by participating organizations
	Activities of participating organizations are aligned with the objectives, priorities and outcomes

Evaluation Indicator	Assessment Criteria
6.3 Extent / quality / degree of cohesion between CAPAR-funded initiatives	The nature and extent of the required collaboration is clearly understood and is appropriate in terms of the intended outcomes
	The governance/management structure (including the level and composition of the coordinating body or bodies) supports the required level of collaboration, while minimizing the associated costs of horizontal coordination
	The roles, responsibilities and accountabilities of the lead organization, the secretariat and the participating organizations are clear, understood and accepted
	Terms of reference/mandate of the coordinating body or bodies are clear and their level of decision-making authority is aligned with their accountabilities
	The funding arrangements are appropriate, given the nature of the collaboration and associated accountabilities
	The governance/management structure is supported by a dedicated, stable, adequately funded and neutral secretariat
	CAPAR has sufficient flexibility and capacity to be able to respond to emergent opportunities, respond to unforeseen risks and adjust to changing government priorities

Appendix G   Assessment of the classification of CAPAR

Range of Typologies	Assessment of CAPAR
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (Policy Coordination Scale)	
1. Communication with other ministries (information exchange). Ministries keep each other up to date about what issues are arising and how they propose to act in their own areas. Reliable and acceptable channels of communication must exist.	CAPAR design was intended to support this.
2. Consultation with other ministries. This is a two-way process. As well as informing other ministries of what they are doing, individual ministries consult other ministries in the process of formulating their own policies or position.	CAPAR design was intended to support this, at least in part, by fostering a more coherent approach.
3. Avoid divergences among ministries. Ensuring that ministries do not take divergent negotiating positions and that government speaks with one voice.	CAPAR design was intended to support this. Joint reporting was intended to help the government speak with one voice, although only where the funded initiatives are concerned.
4. Inter-ministerial search for agreement (seeking consensus). Beyond negative co-ordination to hide differences, ministries work together, through, for example, joint committees and project teams, because they recognize their interdependence and their mutual interest in resolving policy differences.	CAPAR was not designed to support this (a joint committee (the IWG) was formed, but its ToRs do not indicate intention to resolve policy differences).
5. Arbitration if inter-organizational differences. Where inter-organizational difference of view cannot be resolved by the horizontal coordination processes defined in levels 2 to 5, central machinery for arbitration is needed.	CAPAR was not designed to support this.
6. Setting parameters for organizations. A central organization or inter-organizational decision-making body may play a more active role by setting parameters on the discretion of individual organizations. These parameters define what the organizations must do, rather than prescribing what they should do.	CAPAR was not designed to support this.
7. Establishing government priorities. The centre of government may play a more positive role by laying down main lines of policy and establishing priorities.	CAPAR was not designed to support this.
8. Overall government strategy. This case is added for the sake of completeness, but is unlikely to be attainable in practice.	CAPAR was not designed to support this.

Range of Typologies	Assessment of CAPAR
Consulting and Audit Canada (Continuum of Escalating Options)	
9. Dialogue and information sharing (to raise mutual awareness – no impact on policies/programs).	CAPAR was designed to support this.
10. Joint projects carried out on an ad hoc basis in areas of common interest (could involve real or virtual teams, task forces, joint research contracts, etc. and may impact policies/programs).	CAPAR was designed to support this, but only to a limited extent (e.g. preparation of the TB Submission and RMAF/RBAF) and not in terms of other possible joint work, such as joint research projects.
11. On-going joint projects (similar to the preceding option, but more continuous, such as joint funding of an external research organization).	CAPAR was designed to support this to some degree in the areas of performance measurement, monitoring and reporting, but not in areas such as policy/strategy development or implementation
12. Informal coordination of policies/programs (no formal agreement, but some adjustment to improve coordination by, for example, eliminating overlap and duplication and closing gaps in coverage).	CAPAR was designed theoretically to support this through information sharing, the intent to establish common outcomes and a common monitoring and reporting framework, although this pre-supposes that the initiatives would be willing to adapt their policies to the framework whereas in practice the task appears to be to adapt the framework to the existing policies.
13. Formal (structured) coordination of policies/programs, while retaining separate implementation of various elements by the participating organizations (agreed-upon common objectives and a common reporting framework).	CAPAR was not designed to support this (design reflects this only in the sense that its original design was intended to fill gaps in program coverage – there is no ongoing requirement to identify and fill any further gaps).
14. Formal coordination with jointly managed implementation (participating organizations retain their separate identities but might be co-located).	CAPAR was not designed to support this.
15. Complete amalgamation into a single organization.	CAPAR was not designed to support this.